been holding historically for years Big Four, Big Five, and Big Six meetings all over Europe but never have they held a meeting with the leaders of Asia and Africa. Bandung was an invitation for this. I and members of the press talked to chiefs of these states and they indicated that they would be extremely well disposed to meet for a summit talk in the East. Gen. Carlos Romulo on Meet the Press on Sunday, May 8, said:

The President of the United States should come to the East and talk to the Asian leaders.

There is not much time left to do this. The world is moving with a startling rapidity that transcends not only the visual but even the imaginative. With our Yankee courage, our Madison Avenue know-how, our Christian heritage and the bulwark of the Bill of Rights, in back of us, using our 25 million colored citizens as a spearhead, we can launch a drive for peace and for full equality now in the Far East. Only through such a bold maneuver can we win. History will pass us by if we do not.

SENATE

THURSDAY, APRIL 19, 1956

(Legislative day of Monday, April 9, 1956)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

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

O God, guardian of these pilgrim days, the hurrying pace of our fleeting years frightens and awes us. Strained and tense with the pressures of our burdened lives we seek the shelter and strength that undergirds us, as Thy completeness flows round our incompleteness. As for this moment of quiet we look away from ourselves and our tasks to Thee, Thou judge of all men, strip us, we beseech Thee, of our disabling illusions, chasten us for our willful blindness. In the performance of this day's duties may we ascend the hill of the Lord with pure hearts and clean hands. In a tangled and tragic day lead us in the paths of righteousness for Thy name's sake.

As comrades of like passions as ourselves walk by our side, make us tolerant and charitable in our attitudes to those who may differ from us in conviction and opinion. As sometimes we may question their judgment, save us from impugning without cause their sincerity and integrity. We ask it in the name of that One who warns us: Judge not, that ye be not judged. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D. C., April 19, 1956.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. FREDERICK G. PAYNE, a Senator from the State of Maine, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

WALTER F. GEORGE,
President pro tempore.

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

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, April 18, 1956, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on April 18, 1956, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 2438. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to recognize the high public service rendered by Maj. Walter Reed and those associated with him in the discovery of the cause and means of transmission of yellow fever"; and

S. 3269. An act to provide transportation on Canadian vessels between ports in southeastern Alaska, and between Ryder, Alaska, and other points in southeastern Alaska or the continental United States, either directly or via a foreign port, or for any part of the transportation.

REPORT OF RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

To the Congress of the United States:

In compliance with the provisions of section 10 (b) (4) of the Railroad Retirement Act, approved June 24, 1937, and of section 12 (1) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, approved June 25, 1938, I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress, the report of the Railroad Retirement Board for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1955.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 19, 1956.*

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. 1188) to amend section 5240 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, relating to the examination of national banks, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 160) to suspend the application of certain laws of the United States with respect to counsel employed by the special committee of the Senate established by Senate Resolution 219, 84th Congress.

The message further announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 10387) to authorize appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission for acquisition or condemnation of real property or any facilities, or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

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

S. 1287. An act to make certain increases in the annuities of annuitants under the Foreign Service retirement and disability system; and

S. 1736. An act to amend section 5146 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, relating to the qualifications of directors of national bank associations.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, April 19, 1956, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 1287. An act to make certain increases in the annuities of annuitants under the Foreign Service retirement and disability system; and

S. 1736. An act to amend section 5146 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, relating to the qualifications of directors of national bank associations.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations, the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, and the Committee on Armed Services were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. FULBRIGHT, and by unanimous consent, the Minerals, Materials, and Fuel Subcommittee of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

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 a 2-minute limitation on statements.

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

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

REPORT OF SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report on the finances of the Federal Government for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

AUDIT REPORT ON FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE CORPORATION

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, Department of Agriculture, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUDIT REPORT ON VETERANS CANTEEN SERVICE

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Veterans Canteen Service, Veterans' Administration, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUDIT REPORT ON FEDERAL FACILITIES CORPORATION

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Federal Facilities Corporation, Office of Production and Defense Lending, Department of the Treasury, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUDIT REPORT ON RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION (IN LIQUIDATION), ETC.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Reconstruction Finance Corporation (in liquidation) and Defense Lending Division, Office of Production and Defense Lending, Department of the Treasury, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Three letters from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders suspending deportation of certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law as to each alien, and the reasons for such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

GRANTING OF APPLICATIONS FOR PERMANENT RESIDENCE FILED BY CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders granting the applications for permanent residence filed by certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law as to each alien, and the reasons for granting such applications (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

IMPROVEMENT OF PENTAGON ROAD NETWORK

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize funds for the improvement by the Secretary of Commerce of the Pentagon Road Network and that portion of the Henry G. Shirley Memorial Highway in Arlington County, Va., and to provide for the transfer of such highways to the Commonwealth of Virginia (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Works.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

Resolutions of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"Resolutions memorializing Congress to appropriate money for the repair of the dam at Massasoit Lake, better known as Watershops Pond in the city of Springfield

"Whereas on or about August 18, 1955 the dam at Massasoit Lake, better known as Watershops Pond, in the city of Springfield, was damaged and the top four courses of masonry show disalinement and permit passage of water at the joints, said condition making the dam unsatisfactory for its designed purpose; and

"Whereas in addition to the aforesaid damage the flashboards of said dam were washed away from the crown thereof; said boards having been a permanent wooden installation 2½ feet high permitting additional water retention above the designed top of the masonry dam; and

"Whereas, disruption of the flashboards permitted the water retained thereby to be immediately released into the brook channel causing damage along the lower extremities of the Mill River; and

"Whereas because of the damage to the masonry portion of said dam the water impounded thereby was released through the sluice gates which are a structural part of said dam; and

"Whereas the release of this water has created a condition where only the normal flow of the stream known as the Mill River passes through the brook bed above said dam and there is no appreciable impounding of water in said pond at this time; and

"Whereas the damage to said dam and the resulting lack of water in said pond causes an unsightly condition and results in loss of property value in the adjoining area and further results in the loss of recreational facilities formerly offered by said pond; and

"Whereas the properties surrounding said pond were developed, and the residences and other buildings thereon were erected in relation to the normal elevation of the surface of said pond, with the reasonable expectation that said elevation would be permanently maintained; and

"Whereas the said dam has been under the control of the United States Army for more than 100 years and the United States has a moral obligation to repair the same: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives of the General Court of Massachusetts urges the Congress of the United States to appropriate sufficient money for the repair and reconstruction of said dam to the height at which it was, including the height of flashboards, prior to said damage; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of these resolutions be forwarded by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress, and to each Member of the Senate and House of Representatives of Congress from this Commonwealth, and to each member of the appropriate Committees on Appropriations."

Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, favoring the enactment of H. R. 7225, the social-security bill, and so forth; to the Committee on Finance:

(See resolutions printed in full when presented by Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY) on April 18, 1956, p. 6452, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

A statement, in the nature of a memorial, from the National Lawyers' Guild, New York, N. Y., relating to the appearance of Philip Wittenberg as a witness before the subcommittee of the Internal Security Committee of the Senate; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the board of trustees of the national society, Sons of the American Revolution, at Washington, D. C., reaffirming its faith in the McCarran-Walter Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A statement, in the nature of a petition, from the Buffalo Chamber of Commerce, favoring the withdrawal of the United States as a member of the International Labor Organization; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

CONSTITUTION DAY—RESOLUTION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the board of trustees, national society of the Sons of the American Revolution, in Washington, D. C., relating to Constitution Day.

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

RESOLUTION OF APPRECIATION ADOPTED BY THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE NATIONAL SOCIETY OF THE SONS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION HELD IN WASHINGTON, D. C., ON FEBRUARY 25, 1956

Whereas the national society of the Sons of the American Revolution has for many years fostered and promoted throughout the Nation special observance of Constitution Day on September 17, with a resulting constantly increasing interest in and attention to the great fundamental principles of our Government emphasized by this immortal document; and

Whereas as a result of a joint resolution introduced in the Senate of the United States by our distinguished compatriot Senator KNOWLAND, of California, and unanimously passed by both Houses of Congress, and the proclamation issued in response thereto by the President of the United States designating the period beginning September 17 and ending September 23, 1955 as Constitution Week, there was a largely increased interest and participation in this observance; and

Whereas Senator KNOWLAND on January 5, 1956, introduced Senate Joint Resolution 105 authorizing and requesting the President of the United States to designate the period beginning September 17 and ending September 23 of each year as Constitution Week, and to issue annually a proclamation inviting the people of the United States to observe such week in schools, churches, and other suitable places with appropriate ceremonies and activities: Therefore be it

Resolved by the board of trustees of the national society of the Sons of the American Revolution, That we express to Senator KNOWLAND and to President Eisenhower our sincere appreciation of their patriotic actions relative to the celebration of Constitution Week in 1955; and that we further express to Senator KNOWLAND our deep appreciation of his action in sponsoring Senate Joint Resolution 105, looking to continued and annual emphasis on the meaning of our great fundamental document; be it further

Resolved, That we direct the sending of a copy of this resolution to each Member of the Senate with a personal letter from our president general expressing the deep interest of the society in the adoption of Senate Joint Resolution 105; and that we request the officers of each State society and local chapter to express to their Senators and Representatives our interest in the passage of this resolution.

PROHIBITION OF LIQUOR ADVERTISING IN INTERSTATE COMMERCE—PETITION

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred a petition signed by Harold Curtis and 23 other citizens of my State, expressing their opposition to S. 2, the so-called universal military training bill, and Senate Joint Resolution 19, relating to narcotics, and their support of S. 923, relating to the advertising of alcoholic beverages, and S. 2845 and S. 3039, which have to do with the sale or consumption of alcoholic beverages on planes.

There being no objection, the petition was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, with the signatures attached, as follows:

Hon. WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We, the undersigned members and friends of the Women's Christian Temperance Union, of Ferndale, Wash., do wish to declare ourselves as opposing or favoring certain bills as follows and we do urge that you give us your support in these matters:

We oppose:

S. 2, the Legion draft-UMT bill.

Senate Joint Resolution 19, PAYNE, of Maine, to transfer Bureau of Narcotics.

We favor:

S. 923. LANGER, to prohibit the transportation in interstate commerce and over the air of alcoholic-beverage advertising.

S. 2845. Thurmond, to prohibit service or consumption of alcoholic beverages on commercial or military aircraft.

S. 3039. NEUBERGER, to prohibit sale, service, or consumption of alcoholic beverages on commercial or military planes.

Mrs. W. R. Sager, Ferndale, Wash.; Mrs. R. L. Brant, Bellingham, Wash.; Grace Sullivan, Bellingham, Wash.; Mabel D. Pearson, Mrs. Velma Widman, Mrs. Edith Pehrson, Mrs. Fannie McGuire, Mrs. Jennie Andersen, Minnie Norgaarden, Mrs. Edith M. Gunderson, Mrs. Lisa Andres, Mrs. Edith V. Larsen, Mrs. H. H. Lewis, Mrs. Bertha M. Burrows, Alice P. Lewis, Ferndale, Wash.; Thelma E. Nelson, Bellingham, Wash.; Bertha Amundson, R. H. Funkhouser, Mina Willand, Gertrude Hall, Mrs. Harold Curtis, Mrs. Audrey Owsley, Mary LeCocq, Harold Curtis, Ferndale, Wash.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. BIBLE, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

H. R. 9078. An act to provide that the authorized strength of the Metropolitan Police force of the District of Columbia shall be not less than 2,500 officers and members; without amendment (Rept. No. 1789).

By Mr. RUSSELL, from the Committee on Armed Services:

H. R. 7993. An act to authorize the construction and conversion of certain naval vessels, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1790).

REPORT ON FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION AND VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION FISCAL STATUS (S. REPT. NO. 1788)

Mr. SPARKMAN, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, pursuant to Senate Resolution 57, submitted a report entitled "Federal Housing Administration and Veterans' Administration Fiscal Status," which was ordered to be printed.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. LEHMAN:

S. 3682. A bill for the relief of Michael Wierzbicki; and

S. 3683. A bill for the relief of Eleanor Mary Hinder; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 3684. A bill to authorize the construction of a Federal penitentiary at Bismarck, N. Dak., and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGER (for himself and Mr. KEFAUVER):

S. 3685. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to enter into contracts with the States or Territories relating to the confinement, care, or treatment of Indians who have been convicted of penal offenses, or who are juvenile delinquents or offenders; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 3686. A bill to direct the Secretary of Labor to conduct a particular survey in order to assist in promoting the economic welfare of Indians living on or adjacent to Indian reservations in the United States; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. PURTELL:

S. 3687. A bill for the relief of Vera Wisner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SYMINGTON:

S. 3688. A bill for the relief of Paul Er (Ear) Chen and Lydia Chen, nee Shih Ming Chung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine (for herself and Mr. PAYNE):

S. 3689. A bill to amend the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944 to provide for an addition to the national system of interstate highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CASE of New Jersey:

S. 3690. A bill for the relief of Leonardo Finelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ALLOTT (for himself and Mr. MILLIKIN):

S. 3691. A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to deed certain land to the city of Grand Junction, Colo.; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

AMENDMENT OF SOCIAL SECURITY ACT—AMENDMENT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on February 2, 1956, on behalf of myself, and my colleague, the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], I introduced the bill (S. 3119) to provide that certain survivor benefits received by a child under public retirement systems shall not be taken into account in determining whether the child is a dependent for income tax purposes. Our bill provides that for the purpose of determining dependency for tax purposes, up to $600 of social security or other public assistance benefits for children could be deducted by the taxpayer. Because the purpose of the bill is to protect social security benefits, which are themselves tax-exempt I now offer the bill as an amendment 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. I ask that the amendment be taken up and considered by the Committee on Finance with H. R. 7225.

Mr. President, it is a shocking fact that there are 2 million children in America whose fathers are dead. More than half of them receive social security benefits of between $288 and $624 a year. For each child the mother must show that she contributes more than half of the child's support, or more than $288 to $624 a year. The average income of families headed by women is $2293. Clearly, many widows find it impossible to show that they provide more than half a child's support if the child is receiving between $288 and $624 in social security benefits. The loss of the exemption is a very serious matter in these families, and I feel certain that this effect of the benefit for children was not intended by Congress, since we made the benefit itself tax-exempt.

I therefore ask that the amendment be favorably viewed by the Finance Committee.

I ask unanimous consent that the amendment may be printed in the RECORD.

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

The amendment was referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

At the end of the bill add the following new section:

"MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

"SEC. 203. (a) Section 152 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to definition of the term "dependent") is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(e) Special Support Test in Case of Children Receiving Survivor Benefits Under Public Retirement Systems—For purposes of subsection (a), in the case of any individual who is—

"'(1) a son, stepson, daughter, or stepdaughter of the taxpayer (within the meaning of this section), and

"'(2) a surviving dependent child under a public retirement system, amounts received by such individual, or by any person in respect of such individual, under one or more such public retirement systems shall be taken into account in determining whether such individual received more than half of his support from the taxpayer only to the extent that the total of such amounts received during the calendar year exceeds $600. For purposes of this subsection, the term "public retirement system" has the meaning given to such term in section 37 (f).'

"(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) of this section shall apply in respect of amounts received after December 31, 1956."

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (S. 3243) to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention

Act, and that it be referred to the Committee on Public Works.

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

PROTECTION AND CONSERVATION OF NATIONAL SOIL, WATER, AND FOREST RESOURCES—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my name be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 3651) to provide for the protection and conservation of national soil, water, and forest resources and to provide an adequate, balanced, and orderly flow of agricultural commodities in interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes, introduced on yesterday by the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], for himself and other Senators.

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

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

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

By Mr. LEHMAN:

Address delivered by him at the award dinner of the Albert Einstein College of Medicine, in New York City, on April 17, 1956.

AMENDMENT OF REVISED STATUTES, RELATING TO EXAMINATION OF NATIONAL BANKS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1188) to amend section 5240 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, relating to the examination of national banks, which was, on page 2, lines 3 and 4, strike out "each two-year period beginning January 1, 1955" and insert "any two-year period."

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, some weeks ago the Senate passed S. 1188, authorizing the Comptroller of the Currency to waive 1 of the 2 annual examinations of national banks as required by law, but not more frequently than once during each period of 2 years. The bill comes back from the House with a technical amendment, to make sure that what is meant is that the Comptroller of the Currency cannot waive an examination of national banks more than once in each 2 years.

Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Virginia has conferred with the distinguished minority leader and with the majority leader. We are in agreement that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON].

The motion was agreed to.

CONSTRUCTION OF RED WILLOW DAM AND RESERVOIR AND WILSON DAM AND RESERVOIR

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1194) to provide for construction by the Secretary of the Interior of Red Willow Dam and Reservoir, Nebr., and construction by the Secretary of the Army of the Wilson Dam and Reservoir, Kans., as units of the Missouri River Basin project.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1194) to provide for construction by the Secretary of the Interior of Red Willow Dam and Reservoir, Nebr., and construction by the Secretary of the Army of the Wilson Dam and Reservoir, Kans., as units of the Missouri River Basin project, which were, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That administrative jurisdiction over the construction, operation, and maintenance of Red Willow Dam and Reservoir, Nebr., an authorized unit of the Missouri River Basin project (act of Dec. 22, 1944, sec. 9, 58 Stat. 887, as amended and supplemented), is hereby transferred from the Secretary of the Army to the Secretary of the Interior and jurisdiction over the construction, operation, and maintenance of Wilson Dam and Reservoir, Kans., another authorized unit of the same project, is hereby transferred from the Secretary of the Interior to the Secretary of the Army. The principal purposes of Red Willow Dam and Reservoir shall be those of making available a regulated supply of water for irrigation and of assisting in the control of floods, and the principal purposes of Wilson Dam and Reservoir those of flood control and of assisting in making available a regulated supply of water for irrigation and low-flow regulation: *Provided*, That no expenditure of funds shall be made for construction of such projects until the Secretary of the Interior, in the case of the Red Willow Dam and Reservoir, Nebr., and the Secretary of the Army, in the case of the Wilson Dam and Reservoir, Kans., with the approval of the President, have submitted to the Congress completed reports demonstrating such projects to be economically justified, and the Congress has approved

SEC. 2. Both the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of the Army shall cause these units of the Missouri River Basin project to be coordinated and integrated physically and financially with the other Federal works constructed or authorized to be constructed under the comprehensive plans approved by section 9 of the act of December 22, 1944, aforesaid, as amended and supplemented.

SEC. 3. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this act, the Secretary of the Army shall, in the case of the Red Willow Dam and Reservoir, be responsible for flood-control regulation as provided in section 7 of the act of December 22, 1944, and the Secretary of the Interior shall, in the case of Wilson Dam and Reservoir, be responsible for the disposal of water for irrigation or space reserved for this purpose in accordance with the Federal reclamation laws.

And to amend the title so as to read: "An act to provide for transfer of administrative jurisdiction over Red Willow Dam and Reservoir, Nebr., to the Secretary of the Interior and over Wilson Dam and Reservoir, Kans., to the Secretary of the Army."

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, by direction of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House of Representatives to S. 1194, to provide for construction by the Secretary of the Interior of Red Willow Dam and Reservoir, Nebr., and construction by the Secretary of the Army of Wilson Dam and Reservoir, Kans., as units of the Missouri River Basin project.

The bill was designed to transfer jurisdiction over the proposed Red Willow Dam, Nebr., to the Bureau of Reclamation and over the proposed Wilson Dam, Kans., to the Corps of Engineers, under the Secretary of the Army. The provision represents an exchange of jurisdiction betwen the two agencies for the construction and operation of the two dams, both of which are in the coordinated Missouri River Basin project, authorized in the Flood Control Act of 1944. Red Willow Dam will be in an area in the Republican River Valley, where reclamation has the predominant interest because of the irrigation potentials. Wilson Dam will be in the Saline River Valley in Kansas, where the Corps of Engineers has predominant concern for flood-control problems.

The House approved the principle set forth in the Senate bill and, by amendment, requires that no construction expenditures shall be made on either dam until, with approval of the President, the agency shall have submitted to the Congress completed reports demonstrating the economic justification for each of the developments. Approval of the Congress of each report is required.

The committee understands that basic data in connection with the economic justification for the Red Willow Dam is in the hands of the Bureau of Reclamation, and that there should be no delay in submitting a report to the Congress. We are not advised as to the status of the Corps of Engineers' information on Wilson Dam, but understand both Reclamation and the Corps have considerable data available. Unless there is some sound reason for so doing, there would seem to be no reason for either agency to redo the work already done by the other.

The committee is advised by the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], chief sponsor of S. 1194, after consultation with his colleague [Mr. HRUSKA], that they are agreeable to acceptance of the House amendments, but are anxious that a prompt report shall be made, so that construction of Red Willow Dam may proceed. The two Kansas Senators [Mr. SCHOEPPEL and Mr. CARLSON] likewise advise that they hope the Corps of Engineers will expedite its report on Wilson Dam to the same end.

The second amendment perfects the title of S. 1194 to conform to the bill, as amended.

I believe that both the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] will agree with me that this is a desirable measure

to which the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs unanimously gave its approval.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. As I understand the situation, if we agree to the amendments which have been adopted by the House, the Wilson Dam, which originally was authorized as a part of the Bureau of Reclamation program, will now be transferred to the Corps of Army Engineers.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is correct.

Mr. CARLSON. And the reverse will be true of the Red Willow Dam, in Nebraska.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is correct.

Mr. CARLSON. Is there any report by the Army engineers on the progress being made on the Wilson Dam?

Mr. ANDERSON. No, there is not. We know the Bureau of Reclamation has made progress, and we know that the Army engineers have been at work, but we do not have information regarding how far along the work has gotten. Part of the confusion has been due to the uncertainty as to jurisdiction.

If this measure is enacted, the work will proceed more rapidly; and we are anxious to have that done.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I am thoroughly familiar with the Wilson Dam project, in Kansas; and I think the change now proposed is one which should be made in the interest of both agencies. So I am very happy that the Senator from New Mexico advocates our concurrence in the House amendments.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield to me?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, in view of all the premises, I favor our concurrence in the amendments which have been adopted by the House.

I have only one question to ask the distinguished Senator from New Mexico: Is it the intention that when the reports showing the feasibility are submitted to Congress, at that time these projects will be taken up separately? In other words, if one runs into considerable delay, that will not mean that the other will also be delayed, will it?

Mr. ANDERSON. It is the present proposal that they be considered as if they were entirely separate projects.

Mr. CURTIS. I thank the Senator from New Mexico.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from New Mexico that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House of Representatives to Senate bill 1194.

The motion was agreed to.

"MOTHBALL" ACRES URGED

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, yesterday several bills were introduced in the Congress providing for the establishment of a soil bank as a part of the farm program.

One of the early and original advocates of a program of this type was Dr. Raymond W. Miller, of Washington, D. C., and presently a lecturer at the Harvard Business School.

Dr. Miller's program is one that would compensate farmers for taking land out of production, and he states, "putting land in mothballs," and keeping it ready for future production by proper conservation methods.

Dr. Miller has been actively interested in and associated with agriculture for many years. An article he wrote, entitled "'Mothball' Acres Urged," appeared in the Christian Science Monitor on Tuesday, July 20, 1954, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD as a part of these remarks.

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

"MOTHBALL" ACRES URGED

EAST LANSING, MICH.—Retirement of cropland to fallow or nonproduction in a national program that will assure "acres for tomorrow" is the sanest and cheapest method for solving America's surplus-crops dilemma, Dr. Raymond W. Miller, visiting lecturer at the Harvard Business School, told the 280 editors assembled here for the 1954 convention of the American Association of Agricultural College Editors.

"Scientists, economists, and politicians have all tried to solve the American farmer's overproduction of grains, oil seeds, and fibers. We have failed, Dr. Miller alleged, because we haven't gone back to look at the faucet and see whether it can be turned off. While we have taken crops out of production through acreage controls, we often have planted the same acres to another crop, creating another surplus rather than keeping the land out of total commercial production.

As a result, we have developed extremely bad public relations both at home and abroad. The farmers of Europe and Asia conclude we are either very stupid, or are stockpiling for world war III.

Dr. Miller would have farmers compensated by the Federal Government for taking land out of production—"putting land in mothballs," he called it—and keeping it ready for future production by proper conservation methods. This kind of expense would cost, at a guess, perhaps less than half the present type of farm subsidy which has resulted in piling up surpluses. His project would be voluntary, Dr. Miller said. Farmers, many of whom have land they have bought as a hedge against inflation, would sign up for the mothballing payments.

The farmer would get a small return on his investment, not to exceed 3 percent, which must be spent for soil-improvement practice.

"This project would literally turn off the faucet," Dr. Miller said, "instead of trying to solve the problem with buckets and mops. We would be better off nationally to spend some money for this type of program rather than spending the millions of dollars we are allocating at the present time to warehousing crops we don't know what to do with."

Since counties and States need tax money for school and highway maintenance, he went on, the Federal Government should pay taxes on all land voluntarily retired from the production of surplus crops. This, he believes, could be worked out in an allocation program, State by State. He emphasized that it should be a voluntary act on the part of the owners and should result in taking out of production much land held by absentee owners for speculation, which now only adds to surpluses.

"Such a program might be called acres for tomorrow," he said. "That is precisely what it would be. Our population is growing and may go to 275 or 300 million during the next century. There will be an acute need then for more good cropland. Acres for tomorrow would also be a vital reserve during times of national emergency, such as the war we all pray won't come."

A California farmer for many years, Dr. Miller is an internationally recognized authority on farming and on agricultural relations. He was president of the American Institute of Cooperation from 1945 to 1947. He returned this spring from a six months' investigation of Asia's rural problems and leaves this week for similar duties in Newfoundland, Spain, Portugal, and Switzerland.

INVASION OF SCENIC REGIONS BY LUMBER INDUSTRY

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the body of the RECORD a news article from the Oregonian of Portland, Oreg., of April 9, 1956, describing a speech by Mr. A. F. Hartung, president of the International Woodworkers of America, before the Northwest Wilderness Conference held in Portland.

In that speech Mr. Hartung expressed the opposition of himself and his membership to any policy which would invade such scenic regions as the Olympic National Park and the Three Sisters Wilderness Area in an effort to secure more timber for the production of lumber. By taking this fine stand, Mr. Hartung has placed the welfare of our scenic outdoor resources above a temporary payroll gain in dollars for his own members. This is an enlightened, unselfish and courageous stand which merits the support of us all.

There are those who would strip off our forests in order to gain a temporary financial advantage. Yet such a policy would be adverse to the welfare of future generations of Americans. For that reason I believe that Mr. Hartung's address and the very favorable reaction to it among the delegates to the Northwest Wilderness Conference should be called to the attention of the Senate.

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

IWA HEAD HITS WILDERNESS EXPLOITATION

(By Bill Hulen)

Although recognizing the importance of temporary payrolls which would be created through industrial exploitation of wilderness areas, labor feels that in the long run these areas will be of much more importance in the field of recreation for the working man and woman.

This was the key remark of a talk Sunday by A. F. Hartung, president, International Woodworkers of America, at the concluding session of the 2-day Northwest Wilderness Conference at the Multnomah Hotel.

With the coming of automation and atomic development, laboring people will have more and more leisure time in which to seek outdoor recreation, and "it is our responsibility to see that we preserve and increase the areas where this is possible," Hartung declared.

Hartung hit at what he called "the greed of certain individual industrialists" who would exploit these areas for dollars instead of cooperating in attempts to preserve them. He said labor "is willing to work to protect what we now have, and to even increase these areas."

LABOR POSITION APPLAUDED

Several members of the audience of more than 200, including Rollin E. Bowles, State

president of the Izaak Walton league, got on their feet to commend Hartung's labor organization for its support in the Three Sisters and Olympic Park hearings, and for its work in behalf of the Save the Deschutes and Save the McKenzie programs.

While admitting there is some conflict between the forest-growing and harvesting interests with the wilderness concept, Ed Heacox, managing forester, Weyerhaeuser Timber Co., said that, perhaps, at some future date his company might concede that certain areas of virgin timber on public lands should be set aside as wilderness area, and so publicize that position.

Heacox took mild exception to a remark from the floor intimating that only the wilderness people were conservationists. He cited the timber industry's program of reforestation in order to perpetuate the forests.

The timber company executive said the industry takes a dim view of land dedicated to a special use, and asked: "What portions and types of public lands should be set aside for special use by a small minority of the people?" The question went unanswered.

John McKean, chief of the game division, Oregon game commission, said there was a better chance that game management and the wilderness concept could be compatible than conflicting, and declared that both groups were interested in high-quality recreation.

He said, however, that both the Oregon and Washington game departments undoubtedly would oppose any proposal to withdraw land on the Wenaha big game winter range for wilderness area purposes. He said an elk problem there made it necessary that these animals be adequately harvested.

W. H. Oberteuffer, Boy Scout leader, talked on the values of wilderness to American youth, and showed color slides of scenic areas taken in the high Cascades while on trips with Boy and Girl Scouts.

HUMAN VALUES STRESSED

Human values of wilderness were discussed by Fred M. Packard, executive secretary, National Parks Association, Washington, D. C., and scientific values by James Kezer, department of biology, University of Oregon. Kezer said the Three Sisters area offers a vast outdoor laboratory for the scientific study of plant and animal life. Packard declared the intangibles of wilderness were more important than the tangible assets.

David R. Brower, San Francisco, executive director, Sierra Club, received the National Parks Association award for distinguished service in behalf of the national parks and monuments. Brower took an active part in the Echo Park Dam controversy.

PATRIOT'S DAY—STATEMENT BY SENATOR PAYNE

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, on behalf of the distinguished junior Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE], who now occupies the chair as Acting President pro tempore, I ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by him may be printed in the body of the RECORD.

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

PATRIOT'S DAY STATEMENT BY SENATOR PAYNE

Today marks the 181st anniversary of the Battle of Lexington and Concord. This day is a public holiday in my State and in Massachusetts. I believe that it is a fitting time for this great body, and, indeed, for all Americans, to pause and reflect upon the early events in our Nation's struggle for independence. The actions of our forefathers nearly 2 centuries ago, in those little Massachusetts towns, have inspired and kindled in people everywhere down through the years the spirit to answer the call of freedom. The course which they followed, the ideals for which they died, and the ultimate victory which, with God's help, they achieved, leave us as a Nation and as a Republic a heritage far greater than that enjoyed by any other people in any other time in history.

Many times since 1775 we have stood by the "rude bridge that arched the flood" as indeed we do today. The Spirit of '76 can well be applied to Patriot's Day, 1956, for in this troubled and uneasy time, freedom-loving people everywhere are turning to America for the strength and guidance necessary to preserve their integrity and sovereignty as nations. We cannot, we must not, fail them.

I should like to conclude my remarks with the well-loved poem The Midnight Ride of Paul Revere, by Maine's great poet, Henry Wadsworth Longfellow:

"PAUL REVERE'S RIDE

"(By Henry Wadsworth Longfellow)

"Listen, my children, and you shall hear
Of the midnight ride of Paul Revere,
On the eighteenth of April, in Seventy-five;
Hardly a man is now alive
Who remembers that famous day and year.

"He said to his friend, 'If the British march
By land or sea from the town tonight,
Hang a lantern aloft in the belfry arch
Of the North Church tower as a signal light,
One, if by land, and two, if by sea;
And I on the opposite shore will be,
Ready to ride and spread the alarm
Through every Middlesex village and farm,
For the country folk to be up and to arm.'

"Then he said, 'Good night!' and with muffled oar
Silently rowed to the Charlestown shore,
Just as the moon rose over the bay,
Where swinging wide at her moorings lay
The Somerset, British man-of-war;
A phantom ship, with each mast and spar
Across the moon like a prison bar,
And a huge black hulk, that was magnified
By its own reflection in the tide.

"Meanwhile, his friend, through alley and street,
Wanders and watches with eager ears,
Till in the silence around him he hears
The muster of men at the barrack door,
The sound of arms, and the tramp of feet,
And the measured tread of the grenadiers,
Marching down to their boats on the shore.

"Then he climbed the tower of the Old North Church,
By the wooden stairs, with stealthy tread,
To the belfry-chamber overhead,
And startled the pigeons from their perch
On the sombre rafters, that round him made
Masses and moving shapes of shade,
By the trembling ladder, steep and tall,
To the highest window in the wall,
Where he paused to listen and look down
A moment on the roofs of the town,
And the moonlight flowing over all.

"Beneath, in the churchyard, lay the dead,
In their night-encampment on the hill,
Wrapped in silence so deep and still
That he could hear, like a sentinel's tread,
The watchful night-wind, as it went
Creeping along from tent to tent,
And seeming to whisper, 'All is well!'
A moment only he feels the spell
Of the place and the hour, and the secret dread
Of the lonely belfry and the dead;
For suddenly all his thoughts are bent
On a shadowy something far away,
Where the river widens to meet the bay—
A line of black that bends and floats
On the rising tide, like a bridge of boats.

"Meanwhile, impatient to mount and ride,
Booted and spurred, with a heavy stride
On the opposite shore walked Paul Revere.
Now he patted his horse's side,
Now gazed at the landscape far and near,
Then, impetuous, stamped the earth,
And turned and tightened his saddle-girth;
But mostly he watched with eager search
The belfry tower of the Old North Church,
As it rose above the graves on the hill,
Lonely and spectral, and sombre and still.
And lo! as he looks, on the belfry's height
A glimmer, and then a gleam of light!
He springs to the saddle, the bridle he turns,
But lingers and gazes, till full on his sight
A second lamp in the belfry burns!

"A hurry of hoofs in a village street,
A shape in the moonlight, a bulk in the dark,
And beneath, from the pebbles, in passing, a spark
Struck out by a steed flying fearless and fleet:
That was all! And yet, through the gloom and the light,
The fate of a nation was riding that night;
And the spark struck out by that steed, in his flight,
Kindled the land into flame with its heat.

"He has left the village and mounted the steep,
And beneath him, tranquil and broad and deep,
Is the Mystic, meeting the ocean tides;
And under the alders that skirt its edge,
Now soft on the sand, now loud on the ledge,
Is heard the tramp of his steed as he rides.

"It was twelve by the village clock,
When he crossed the bridge into Medford town.
He heard the crowing of the cock,
And the barking of the farmer's dog,
And felt the damp of the river fog,
That rises after the sun goes down.

"It was one by the village clock,
When he galloped into Lexington.
He saw the gilded weathercock
Swim in the moonlight as he passed,
And the meeting-house windows, blank and bare,
Gaze at him with a spectral glare,
As if they already stood aghast
At the bloody work they would look upon.

"It was two by the village clock,
When he came to the bridge in Concord town.
He heard the bleating of the flock,
And the twitter of birds among the trees,
And felt the breath of the morning breeze
Blowing over the meadows brown.
And one was safe and asleep in his bed
Who at the bridge would be first to fall,
Who that day would be lying dead,
Pierced by a British musket-ball.

"You know the rest. In the books you have read,
How the British Regulars fired and fled—
How the farmers gave them ball for ball,
From behind each fence and farm-yard wall,
Chasing the red-coats down the lane,
Then crossing the fields to emerge again
Under the trees at the turn of the road,
And only pausing to fire and load.

"So through the night rode Paul Revere;
And so through the night went his cry of alarm
To every Middlesex village and farm—
A cry of defiance and not of fear,
A voice in the darkness, a knock at the door,
And a word that shall echo forevermore!
For, borne on the night-wind of the Past,
Through all our history, to the last,
In the hour of darkness and peril and need,
The people will waken and listen to hear
The hurrying hoof-beats of that steed,
And the midnight message of Paul Revere."

ADVANTAGES TO INDUSTRY OF LOCATING IN WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my friend, the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. LAIRD], may have 6 minutes to address the Senate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from West Virginia may proceed.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. President, a recent issue of the New York Journal of Commerce contained a plant location survey, in which some 1,500 industrial sites suitable for chemical or allied industries were listed. On close inspection, officials of individual companies and industries seeking locations for expansion or new development will find comparatively few areas elsewhere in the country able to offer the many advantages inherent in the numerous projected locations in West Virginia.

For the further information of those executives responsible for choosing plant sites, let me list some of the data emphasizing West Virginia's natural and man-made advantages. In the first place, we are all aware of the fact that the new peaks of United States industrial activity envisioned for the coming years will be made possible because of this Nation's abundance of coal reserves. West Virginia is the Nation's leading producer of coal, the most economical and most abundant of our energy resources. Last year the total output from our mines amounted to 142 million tons, or 30.2 percent of America's total production. Our mines are modern. Our coal producers have made vast investments in order to reach the richest veins of coal and to get it out of the ground in the most efficient manner.

Modern equipment in modern mines includes electrically operated mobile machines with long blades that cut deep into the coal at the face of the seam; automatic drills that follow the cutting machines and bore uniform holes into which explosives may be tamped so that the charge will loosen the coal and make it ready for loading; electric loading machines capable of scooping up as much as 6 tons of coal a minute; and electrically drawn shuttle cars that can carry 10 tons of coal from the workingroom to the underground railroad or conveyor belt along the main haulageway. This equipment requires a great amount of capital, as do the extensive ventilation facilities and other safety devices.

About 25 percent of the total bituminous coal production in this country comes from surface mines. Here again there have been heavy investments in machinery on the part of the mining companies. Giant shovels or draglines—the monstrous machines which scoop soil and rock from atop the coal bed—may cost as much as a million dollars each. Efficient operation also requires the use of mechanical brooms and drills, electric shovels to remove the coal, and fleets of trucks.

No matter what type of mechanical mining equipment is selected, I believe more units will be found in operation in West Virginia than in any other State. There will be found the latest kinds of underground locomotives and trolley systems, the most modern lighting, the newest in belt conveyor systems.

Today a cleaning plant represents a sizable investment in the coal business. Coal preparation upgrades the product, gives maximum recovery of marketable coal from run-of-mine, and makes a salable product from low-grade seams. According to latest estimates, there are now more than 200 preparation plants in operation in West Virginia, some of them costing as much as $2 million each.

Added up, the West Virginia coal industry's determination to produce the best fuel, at as low a cost as possible, provides an attractive incentive for a diversity of industry. The men who extract this coal from the earth—that is, members of the United Mine Workers of America—have never objected in any way to management's laying the groundwork for the progress that has come through mechanization. On the contrary, they have eagerly accepted the new machinery and quickly set about absorbing the knowledge necessary to its operation and maintenance. Our coal miners are skilled technicians.

It is true that a number of short-sighted policies on the part of the incumbent administration tended to discourage our mining families from remaining in the coal districts. By inflicting upon the coal industry a number of unfavorable and inequitable policies which were detrimental to coal's markets, the Government in effect invited personnel of the coal industry to move into other fields in search of employment. Through the determined efforts of Members of Congress from coal-producing States, however, a number of remedial steps have been taken, and I am confident that a better adjustment will continue to develop. Given the chance to earn an income that will enable them to care properly for their families, our miners are going to remain within the State of West Virginia and participate in the advantages that will accrue from the overall industrial development of the State.

We have the men. We have the machines. We have the coal. By next spring, West Virginia will have contributed its six billionth ton of coal to supply heat and energy to the homes and industries of America and—to a lesser extent—for the peoples of other continents. I am inclined to believe that our State should publicize this milestone when it is reached. The people of our country should become more cognizant of West Virginia's contribution to the national economy.

Despite this enormous production over the years, there are still enough mineable coal reserves in West Virginia to last for more than three centuries at present rates of production. Scarcely more than 10 percent of all the recoverable coal in West Virginia has been extracted. The United States Geological Survey lists West Virginia's rich mineable deposits at more than 53 billion tons.

What about West Virginia's other natural advantages from the standpoint of new and expanded industries? West Virginia ranks first in production of natural gas east of the Mississippi. West Virginia has considerable reserves of petroleum, and production is expected to be increased as newer recovery techniques are utilized. All of the oil is of Pennsylvania grade, which yields a high percentage of best quality lubricants. Within our State are large deposits of limestone, clay and shale, sand and gravel. We have rich timberlands. Agriculture is a statewide activity, which means that ample foodstuffs are raised within short distances of our industrial centers. West Virginia produces corn, wheat, hay, tomatoes, and a variety of fruits. Our verdant pastures produce some of the country's best livestock and dairy products, and poultry and egg production has always been high within the borders of our State.

Perhaps one of the most important benefits of locating an industry in West Virginia comes from the fact that we are so close to the Nation's richest markets. The steelmaking center, Pittsburgh, is our next-door neighbor. The Atlantic Ocean and a number of Great Lakes ports are within 300 miles of the center of our State. Equally important, we have excellent transportation facilities, and are improving them by the day. Railroads with main lines traversing or leading into and out of our State include the Baltimore & Ohio, the Norfolk & Western, the Chesapeake & Ohio, Western Maryland, and the Virginian, with trunkline service provided by the New York Central and the Pennsylvania. Our integrated highway system is being constantly expanded with turnpikes and road improvements.

As may have been noticed, Mr. President, many of the plant sites listed in the Journal of Commerce are on navigable waterways, thus offering perhaps the most economical method of transporting heavy commodities, such as coal, steel, and steel products. In addition, rivers are doubly attractive to industry, because normally a considerable amount of water is required in plant operation, particularly in the case of electric-power generation.

The history of West Virginia is replete with experiences of waterways transportation and development. As early as 1789, coal was moving down the Monongahela on keelboats, and before the dawn of a new century it was being shipped on the Ohio River to Fort Washington—now Cincinnati. In a few short years this service was extended to Louisville, then down the Mississippi to New Orleans. As new mines opened in the various coal-bearing regions and as demand for the product increased, coal was carried on barges, rafts, cargo ships, and an assortment of other craft on our waterways. The transfer of coal from mine to consumer has in recent years come to grow in popularity, especially since industry began to realize the advantages accruing from the establishment of plants on river sites. In one mine in our State a series of conveyor belts carries coal down one mountain, around another, and through a third—a 2½-mile ride to a river front for loading into barges.

We have the coal. We have the manpower. We have the transportation facilities. We have—in various parts of our State—the most desirable plant locations to be found anywhere in the world. We invite industry to come to West Virginia. We are a hospitable State; and those who come to it will like our people, as well as our beautiful mountains, our undulant fields, our fertile agricultural areas. Scores of new companies have come to West Virginia to set up shop in the years that have passed since the conclusion of World War II.

Under the leadership of Gov. William C. Marland, West Virginia is conducting an extensive industrial-development program, and it is reaping great benefits for our State. Governor Marland has traveled to all sections of the Nation to acquaint industrial leaders with the advantages inherent in our State, and every West Virginian is enthusiastic about welcoming new friends and new business to the mountaineer State. We welcome the opportunity to show visitors around the State, so they may see for themselves what excellent possibilities are available for industrial locations.

SYSTEM

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have a letter printed in today's RECORD, written by Wallace S. Wharton, an illustrious Navy veteran. Mr. Wharton's letter is short, but in a few lines he succeeds in making several significant observations that deserve the closest attention of all those charged with the responsibility of developing our civil-defense system.

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

MARION COUNTY CIVIL DEFENSE,
Salem, Oreg., March 21, 1956.

Hon. RICHARD NEUBERGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR NEUBERGER: As director of Marion County civil defense I wish to bring to your attention the desirability and great need for such action on your part as may be required to get fire-fighting apparatus and equipment restored to the contributing program of the Federal Civil Defense Agency in the 1956–57 fiscal year.

Experience in the war clearly showed that loss of life and the destruction of resources from fire was far greater than the direct effect of the aerial bombing which caused the fires. This was especially true in metropolitan areas where great fire storms followed the attack and which got out of control because adequate fire-fighting facilities were not available.

In the case of nuclear weapons the fire problem increases manyfold in magnitude.

Since the 1952–53 contributing program, fire-fighting apparatus has not been included in the FCDA program, whereby the Federal Government aids local government in acquiring equipment for civil defense by sharing 50 percent of the cost. It is reported that abuses occurred in which some local agencies used the program to obtain apparatus and equipment that they should have purchased wholly on their own account. I submit that the need for such apparatus and equipment for national survival is so great as to offset the abuses, especially when it is possible to prevent any abuse by proper administrative action.

Therefore, I hope you will do all you can to make it possible to build our defense rampart in this vital salient.

Yours sincerely,

WALLACE S. WHARTON,
Director.

ADDRESS BY GEORGE MEANY ON ISRAEL INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, on Sunday, April 15, radio station WLIB, in New York, devoted an hour's program to Israel independence day. One of the features of the program was a brief address by Mr. George Meany, president of the AFL–CIO. Mr. Meany spoke out clearly and vigorously for America's shipment of arms to Israel. These remarks, by the spokesman for 16 million Americans, are worthy of the most careful consideration by the Congress and by the State Department.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Meany's address be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

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

ADDRESS BY GEORGE MEANY

It is a privilege to participate in this program hailing the eighth anniversary of the creation of the State of Israel.

The American labor movement from the beginning strongly favored the establishment of a Jewish national homeland in Palestine. At the conclusion of World War II, we urged our own country and our allies to make good their pledge to sanction the independence of Israel in the territory under the protectorate of Great Britain.

When this was finally accomplished 8 years ago, we were confident it would go down in history as a triumph for justice over brute force in international relations as well as the beginning of a new era of peace, freedom and progress in the Middle East.

Despite the stormy events of the ensuing years and the threatening crisis which hangs over Israel today, the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations is still confident that the cause of decency will prevail and that the free world will rally to the defense of this new nation.

The accomplishments for its people have been almost miraculous. First, it opened its doors to the oppressed and terrorized Jewish refugees of Europe, the victims of Hitler's hate. To these unfortunates, Israel offered a new start in life in a new land. With their help, flourishing farms and modern towns were created out of the desert.

Then, when anti-Semitism became a fixed policy of the Communist dictatorship, thousands of additional refugees flocked to the haven of Israel. Even today, the exiled Jews of North Africa are being welcomed in this tiny new country.

The herculean task of resettling all these immigrants and providing homes, food, jobs, schools and hospitals required a great deal of money. Israel desperately needed help from the outside. I am proud of the generous way in which American trade unions responded to this call.

Of course, the American labor movement for many years had maintained friendly relations with the Histadrut. This Israeli Federation of Labor has done a remarkable job of organizing the workers in Israel and building up their standards and the national prosperity at the same time.

Today Israel faces its gravest threat from the surrounding Arab nations whose hostility has been emboldened by military aid and assistance from the aggressive forces of communism. In fact, the situation in the Middle East has reached an explosive stage that gravely imperils the peace of the entire world.

For her own sinister purposes Soviet Russia is now openly cementing a military machine, with the Egyptian Government in the forefront, with the clear purpose of waging a war of annihilation against the Republic of Israel.

The Communists already have ignited the fuse to the powder keg of war. The free world must act immediately and effectively to stamp out that sputtering fuse and safeguard peace. If we do not act now, Israel may become another Korea.

As a first step the AFL–CIO recommends that the United States provide arms for the defense of Israel. It is unrealistic to regard military aid to Israel as an instigation of an arms race. Actually the race is already on and Israel may soon be out of the running.

Our country, along with Britain and France, has a commitment to take immediate action against the use of force and aggression in the Middle East. President Eisenhower reiterated that commitment the other day. We believe he should ask Congress for advance authority to carry out the pledge to safeguard peace in the Middle East under the tripartite declaration of 1950.

Beyond this the free world should take the lead in promoting a permanently peaceful agreement between the Arab nations and Israel, supplemented by a program of technical, economic, and financial assistance which would permit all nations in that area to work for a brighter future for their people in peace.

JUVENILE DELINQUENCY AND THE NARCOTICS TRAFFIC

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I am much concerned over the problem of narcotics, the narcotics traffic, and the impact of this traffic on the lives of our people, especially the young.

I do not profess to be an expert in this field, and I am not in a position to comment on the technical aspects of the problem. But as a layman and as a public official, I am very much aware of it and concerned with it.

I am a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 19, dealing with this problem. That joint resolution is now before the Senate Finance Committee. I joined in sponsoring this measure not because I thought it was a perfect solution to the narcotics and barbiturates problem—as a matter of fact, I reserved the right to object to several of its provisions—but because I felt it would help emphasize the urgent need for action in this area. I think the joint resolution does contain some excellent provisions; and I trust that the Finance Committee will, in its wisdom, improve and modify the resolution in such a way as to present to the Senate a measure which will effectively control the narcotic drug traffic and aid the unfortunate individuals who have become addicts.

While I have been deeply concerned about this problem for some time, I have become increasingly disturbed in recent months as a result of testimony presented in the course of the hearings held by the Senate Labor Committee's Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency, of which I am chairman. I have been very much troubled by the evidence presented

before my subcommittee, relating juvenile delinquency and crime to the problem of narcotics.

I was particularly distressed by the number of young people arrested in New York in 1954 because of the use of narcotics. Of the total number of 3,647 persons arrested for this cause, 749—or roughly 20 percent—were under 21. I do not know how this compares with figures for previous years or for the country as a whole, but I do know that it is far too many. This is only one index of the seriousness of the problem. I know there are many other figures just as revealing.

Unfortunately, attempts to cope with the problem have been relatively unsuccessful, and the seriousness of the problem continues to increase. I think perhaps one of the chief reasons for our failure to find a solution has been the attitude society has taken toward this problem. Until recently, the general tendency has been to view the use of narcotics and barbiturates as a crime, and the users of these drugs as criminals. No one would deny that there are certain aspects of the problem which are, and should be, recognized as crimes, and treated as such. But we are beginning to realize that the problem is not as simple as all that. We are coming to recognize that addicts are suffering from an illness as serious in its way as cancer or tuberculosis. They must be treated for their sickness. The question of cure must come before the question of punishment.

In this connection, I consider the report on drug addiction by the New York Academy of Medicine a major step forward in dealing with the problem. I do not necessarily subscribe to all the recommendations contained in the report, but I feel that the attitude taken by the academy can do much to help change the attitude taken by society as a whole toward the unfortunate use of habit-forming drugs. Until legislation on this subject reflects this new point of view, I do not think we can ever hope to deal successfully with this situation.

I have not attempted to discuss this problem as an expert. All I have tried to do is indicate my deep interest and concern, and to express the hope that prompt and vigorous measures will be taken to deal with it. I look forward to supporting appropriate proposed legislation to this end and I hope that such a measure or measures will be brought before the Congress of the United States at an early date.

DEVELOPMENT OF LABOR UNIONS

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, this has been a good year for the American economy. To be sure, there are segments of it that have not benefited to the extent other segments have—such as some farmers and some industrial areas. But on the whole, it has been a good year; and the indications are that it will continue to be one. It has been a good year for unions, too. The U. S. News & World Report, in its April 20 edition, brings out some very interesting information about the increases in dues collections, and the extent to which union funds have benefited by this and by the general economic condition. For instance, the article shows that the UAW in 1945 reported $2.1 million in net worth. Compare that, Mr. President, with the current resources of that union, which include nearly $3.9 million in cash $28.4 million in securities, nearly $12,000 in stocks, some $4.5 million in land and buildings, and about $560,000 in furniture and equipment, for a total worth of more than $37 million. Other unions show similar gains.

One reaction to this, Mr. President, is that it is difficult to understand why, with this unprecedented gain in net worth—which means a corresponding increase in membership—the heads of some of those organizations can be so violently against the leadership of the President or the activities of the Republican Party. Another reaction is that this development places unions in the ranks of big business. Their membership alone would do that, but their assets surely do it.

This leads to a question often asked me today: When will the unions come under monopoly laws? My answer to that inquiry, Mr. President, has been to let the unions have time in which to place their house in order, have time in which to realize the responsibilities of bigness, and have time in which to assume for themselves the leadership that bigness demands. It may well be that if these things come about, big unions can so operate that they will not infringe on the rights of others, that they will show their type of leadership to be such that they recognize their total responsibilities to the American way of life, and that legal intervention to control their bigness might not be needed.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article to which I have referred, which appeared in the U. S. News & World Report on April 20, 1956, be printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

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

IT'S BEEN A GOOD YEAR FOR UNIONS, TOO

Labor unions, like business firms, now are making public their yearly financial statements. And, as in private industry, the reports show that most unions did well in 1955.

From these profit-and-loss statements, this picture emerges:

The net worth of big unions is growing. Most of them managed to bank more money than they spent. The United Auto Workers, for example, doubled its net worth in the past year, now has nearly $40 million.

Reserves of about $200 million are reported by the International Ladies Garment Workers, including welfare and insurance funds. The United Mine Workers can count about $146 million in its union and welfare funds.

The Teamsters Union is switching from Government bonds to first mortgages and loans to employers as a way of increasing investment income. Later, the Teamsters probably will start to buy corporate stocks. Investments last year added about $900,000 to the union's assets.

The cost of operating a large union is shown by the auto union's report which lists the year's receipts at more than $48 million and expenses at more than $31 million, excluding purchase and sale of investments.

Investments of unions for the most part are in Government bonds, although a few organizations are putting part of their reserves into industrial stocks. In general, unions tend to be conservative in their investments.

That is the situation as indicated by the reports now appearing. Most unions make public financial statements during the early months of the year. Reports are required each year, under the Taft-Hartley Act, if the unions want to use the National Labor Relations Board.

The auto union offers an example of a prosperous union that came up with a sharp gain in net worth, largely because of a temporary boost in the dues of its 1.3 million members. The increase had been voted to supplement the union's strike fund, which now contains nearly $26.9 million.

Net worth of the UAW, as reported by Emil Mazey, its secretary-treasurer, was $39.4 million as of December 31, 1955. A year earlier, the net worth amounted to $20 million.

Growth of the UAW's treasury shows up more clearly if a comparison is made with that union's 1945 report. Ten years ago, UAW reported $2.1 million in net worth.

Current resources of UAW include nearly $3.9 million in cash, about $28.4 million in securities, $11,825 in stocks, about $4.5 million in land and buildings, and about $560,000 in furniture and equipment.

The securities include nearly $26.5 million in United States Government bonds and certificates of indebtedness; $10,000 in Dominion of Canada bonds and nearly $1.9 million in bonds of General Motors Acceptance Corp.

One of UAW's buildings is its Solidarity House in Detroit, main office for the union. UAW last year paid a half million dollars for the old headquarters of the CIO, near the White House in Washington.

The clothing unions, however, are far wealthier than the auto union, if their insurance reserves and welfare funds are taken into consideration.

The Ladies Garment Workers, for example, headed by David Dubinsky, is about to publish new financial statements that are reported to show total assets of about $200 million.

In the men's clothing field, the Amalgamated Clothing Workers reports about $8 million dollars in union assets, but it has estimated that its total resources at about $250 million, including two banks, two insurance companies, various housing developments, and health centers. The total also covers the treasuries and property of local-union affiliates.

The United Mine Workers is another union with large assets. John L. Lewis heads an enterprise that controls a bank, owns various office buildings, and considerable real estate in the UMW's name. He also directs a welfare fund that, at last reports, had a surplus of $104 million.

UMW assets, exclusive of the welfare fund, are reported at about $42 million. UMW does not make public an annual report, although statements are sent to local unions.

The Teamsters Union is one of the labor groups that are revamping their investment programs to bring better returns. Several unions are doing this on advice of investment counselors who argue that labor has been too conservative in putting all of its reserves in Government bonds.

Dave Beck, Teamster president, explained his policy on investments in an interview last week. He reported that the union's income from investments was running about $400,000 a year when he became president in 1952, but came to about $900,000 in 1955.

"When I came into office," Mr. Beck said, "the union's money was largely frozen in Government bonds, paying 2.5 to 2.75 percent interest. Also, there was $6.5 to $7 million sitting in a commercial account in a bank, drawing no interest. And there were time deposits at 1.5 percent.

"As soon as I could, I began to work on an investment program for the union. We started into the field of veterans' first mortgages and convention loans to business firms. We now have invested $17 to $18 million in veterans' first mortgages at a net return of 4 percent.

"We have been selling Government bonds at the market discount and buying 'veterans' on the same basis. Temporarily, we sometimes take a loss by these sales until we pick up that loss through higher interest rates on the mortgages that are bought in place of the bonds. It means a big gain over the years."

Mr. Beck said that this process of switching from Government bonds explained an item appearing in the union's financial statement for 1955. The item was carried as "loss on sale of securities, $418,632.91."

"That is a bookkeeping matter," Mr. Beck said. "There was a paper loss at the time we made the report, but the higher interest rates will more than make up for it."

The financial statement shows the net worth of the teamsters was $35 million at the end of 1955. Securities held by the union at that time were valued at more than $28.4 million.

The teamster portfolio: Mr. Beck explained that the securities included $7,650,000 in United States Government savings bonds, $200,000 in United States Treasury notes and $1,675,000 in Treasury short-term securities.

The union, which also operates in Canada, had $160,000 in Canadian Government bonds, $225,000 in school-district bonds and $65,000 in corporate bonds of Canadian firms.

The portfolio, at year's end, included nearly $13.2 million in veterans' mortgages. Mr. Beck said this figure now is more than $17 million.

Loans to business firms amounted to nearly $3.9 million when the report was drawn up. None of the loans is with a company having a contract with the teamsters, Mr. Beck said. These loans are earning interest at 4.5 percent and up in most cases, he reported.

Mr. Beck said that he does not intend to invest teamster money in corporate stocks until the union's convention next year gets a chance to vote on the question. He indicated that he might propose a program, with purchases limited to stocks with high-dividend records.

Net worth of the teamsters increased about $400,000 in the past year. Its operating expenses, outside of investment costs, went up $2.4 million.

Other unions are in the big money, too.

Near the top of the list is the railroad trainmen, with nearly $54 million in assets. This includes $2.8 million in the general fund of the union, plus more than $50.8 million in insurance reserves. The union, headed by William P. Kennedy, operates an insurance program for its 204,000 members.

Assets of $48.2 million are shown by the Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, which also has an insurance program. Assets of the Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen total $34 million, including insurance reserves.

Nearly $19 million in net worth is reported by the Steelworkers as of mid-1955. The Machinists Union reports assets of about $15 million.

Those are some of the unions now reporting to their stockholders, the dues payers. For most of them, 1955 was a profitable year.

INVITATION TO MEMBERS OF THE SENATE TO ATTEND WOODROW WILSON CENTENNIAL OBSERVANCE

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, it always is a pleasure for me to invite my Senate colleagues to visit the State of Virginia, especially the valley area where I have made my home. There is no time when the physicial attractions of such a trip are greater than in the spring season when the apple and other fruit trees are in bloom.

It also is a privilege, which I have often asserted, to recall to the attention of Members of this body some of the contributions to our American philosophy of government which were made by a distinguished native of the valley of Virginia—Woodrow Wilson.

I need hardly remind you that the 83d Congress established a national commission, on which I am proud to serve, to develop and execute plans for the celebration during 1956 of the 100th anniversary of Woodrow Wilson's birth in Staunton, Va. One of the highlights of that celebration is the Woodrow Wilson Festival Week, celebrated in Staunton from April 22 through April 29 and the climax of that festival will be on Saturday, April 28, which is the 37th anniversary of the adoption of Wilson's covenant of the League of Nations.

Wilson's conception of an organization which would settle international disputes by peaceful means still represents an ideal which seems our only alternative to the blotting out of modern civilization by weapons of mass destruction. Recognition of this fact and of Wilson's general contribution to political science and to international peace will be evidenced by attendance at the Staunton exercises on April 28 of ambassadors and representatives of foreign nations as well as important representatives of our own Government and of the teaching profession.

It is with particular pleasure, therefore, that I invite Members of the Senate to join the motor cavalcade which will leave Washington under Virginia State police escort at 9 a. m. on Saturday, April 28 and arrive at Staunton in time for a luncheon at the Ingleside Hotel, where Senators will be guests of the Federal and Virginia Woodrow Wilson Centennial Commissions. You will be expected to furnish your own cars and should assemble by 8:45 a. m. at the entrance to the Arlington Cemetery.

During the day in Staunton you will have an opportunity to see a parade of Virginia military units with proud histories, to hear concerts by outstanding musical organizations including the National Symphony Orchestra and combined college choruses and to attend ceremonies at Wilson's birthplace where one of the guests will be Mrs. Woodrow Wilson.

The principal address of the occasion will be delivered by a distinguished Virginian, Assistant Secretary of State Walter S. Robertson, who has been designated as the personal representative of President Eisenhower and who will speak on today's significance of the ideals and achievements of Woodrow Wilson.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, the complete schedule of the April 28 observance. I hope that a large number of my colleagues will find it possible to make this trip with us.

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

PROGRAM, WOODROW WILSON CENTENNIAL OBSERVANCE, STAUNTON, VA., APRIL 28, 1956

12 NOON

Luncheon for official guests, Ingleside Hotel.

2 P. M.

Military parade.

3 P. M.

Ceremonial on the east steps of the birthplace (if the weather is unsuitable, these exercises will be held in King Auditorium, Mary Baldwin College, nearby).

Band concert.

Invocation: The Reverend Richard R. Potter.

Opening remarks: Maj. Gen. E. Walton Opie (retired), Chairman, Woodrow Wilson Centennial Celebration Commission.

Greetings from the Diplomatic Corps.

Introductions.

Introduction of the speaker by the Honorable George M. Cochran, chairman, Virginia Woodrow Wilson Centennial Commission.

Address: Today's Significance of the Ideals and Achievements of Woodrow Wilson, the Honorable Walter S. Robertson, Assistant Secretary of State, representing the President of the United States.

Benediction.

8 P. M.

Music for Young American concert, King Auditorium, National Symphony Orchestra, Howard Mitchell conducting.

College choral festival, auspices Virginia Federation of Music Clubs.

10 P. M.

Woodrow Wilson centennial ball, Staunton Military Academy Gymnasium.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I am happy to join my distinguished colleague from Virginia in urging our colleagues, if possible, to attend the celebration at Staunton, Va., as the culmination of a series of events in connection with the Woodrow Wilson Centennial observance.

As a member of the Commission, and also as a personal friend of Woodrow Wilson during his life, I am very happy to join in the work of the Commission. This celebration is the climax of a good many weeks and months of effort. I hope the Senate will be well represented on that occasion.

RECOMMENDATION BY FRANK C. SPANGLER, OF GRESHAM, OREG., CONCERNING INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS COMMITTEE

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, one of the unique aspects of American life is our tradition that any citizen, no matter what his employment, education or wealth, may freely express his views. In particular this is the case in regard to an American's participation in his Government. Suggestions from individual citizens play an important role in our Government. Recently I received a suggestion from a fellow Oregonian, and I believe it deserves to be brought to the attention of the Senate.

This suggestion is that the Foreign Relations Committee of this body should be renamed the International Relations Committee. The idea is that of Frank C. Spangler of Gresham, Oreg., and it

was given in brief in the January 1956, issue of the Rotarian, published by Rotary International. I ask unanimous consent to have this article printed in the RECORD at this point.

I think it significant that Mr. Spangler is a Rotarian and that his suggestion appeared first in print in the Rotary magazine. This organization emphasizes a worldwide outlook even in its name, Rotary International. Mr. Spangler's action is another example of the many ways in which Rotary International constantly aids the spread of understanding and friendship throughout the free world. Rotarians know that there are no foreigners, only friends with whom they are not acquainted yet.

In correspondence with me, Mr. Spangler has elaborated on his suggestion. He notes that when the Foreign Relations Committee was formed years ago, the name may have been fitting.

At that time—

He wrote—

the world was a vast little known Universe * * * transportation and communications were so slow that it took weeks and even months for the events of one part of the world to reach other parts of the world.

Mr. Spangler noted that recently this has changed; the farthest corners of the world are just around the corner, figuratively. Americans have found, he wrote, that "the foreigners they were meeting were not too different from themselves."

But the old committee title still remains in use. Mr. Spangler believes "as the name now stands, foreign relations to some means poor relatives, and in some languages suffers greatly in the process of translation until it is almost an insult to some people."

It seems to me that there is a parallel here with the recent switch in terms from "foreign aid" to "mutual security." I feel that this suggested change in name and title of the Foreign Relations Committee is a worthy one, and that Mr. Spangler should be commended for his interest in this subject.

I ask unanimous consent to have the brief article from Rotary magazine printed in the body of the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

Suggestion: Frank Spangler, a Rotarian of Gresham, Oreg., is a man who believes in going right to the top when he thinks something should be changed. He got to thinking about the title "Foreign Relations Committee" as used in the United States Congress, and, being a good Rotarian, it didn't "rub him right." As he says, "A stranger is merely a friend I haven't met, so why should I call him a foreigner?" So to Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States, Rotarian Spangler suggested that the committee be renamed the "International Relations Committee." As he put it in his letter to President Eisenhower, "The term * * * always upsets me when I hear it, for in these modern times when transportation and communications have become so speedy, the world has shrunk until the farthest people are now practically next-door neighbors, and the only reason they are 'foreign' is because we have not taken the time or trouble to get acquainted with them and their problems.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY HON. CHARLES PANNELL, MEMBER OF BRITISH PARLIAMENT

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I take this opportunity to present to my colleagues in the Senate a distinguished member of the British House of Commons, Hon. Charles Pannell, representing Leeds West. I will ask him to take a bow. [Applause, Members rising.]

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is very happy indeed to welcome the distinguished visitor.

MODIFICATION OF UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the treaties on the executive calendar be considered prior to the call of the legislative calendar. My request yesterday was that the treaties be considered following the call of the Legislative Calendar.

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The ACTING 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 A COMMITTEE

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, from the Committee on Armed Services I report favorably the nominations of a small group of flag and general officers relating to temporary appointment in the Army in the grades of major general and brigadier general and retirement and special assignment of vice admirals in the Navy, and ask that these be placed on the Executive Calendar.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The nominations will be placed on the Executive Calendar, as requested by the Senator from Massachusetts.

The nominations were placed on the Executive Calendar, as follows:

Brig. Gen. Robert George Butler, and sundry other officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States; and

Vice Adm. Herbert G. Hopwood, Rear Adm. Roscoe H. Hillenkoetter, Rear Adm. John M. Will, and Vice Adm. Francis C. Denebrink, designated for commands and other duties by the President, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of vice admiral while so serving.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, from the Committee on Armed Services I also report favorably a total of 2,252 routine nominations in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force, in grades from ensign to colonel; 456 of them are Naval Academy graduates, and 887 are NROTC graduates. All of these names have already appeared in the RECORD, so to save the expense of printing on the Executive Calendar I ask unanimous consent that they be ordered to lie on the Vice President's desk for the information of any Senator.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Massachusetts.

PROTOCOL RELATING TO CERTAIN AMENDMENTS TO THE CONVENTION ON INTERNATIONAL CIVIL AVIATION, CONVENTION CONCERNING CUSTOMS FACILITIES FOR TOURING, AND CUSTOMS CONVENTION ON THE TEMPORARY IMPORTATION OF PRIVATE ROAD VEHICLES

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I send to the desk a proposed order, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The proposed order will be stated.

The proposed order was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

Ordered, That a yea-and-nay vote be taken on the question of advising and consenting to the ratification of Executive F, 84th Congress, 2d session, and that, with respect to Executive A, 84th Congress, and Executive B, 84th Congress, the advice and consent of the Senate shall be deemed to be given or refused (as the case may be) to their ratification by the vote on Executive F.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the proposed order? The Chair hears none, and the order is entered.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider, en bloc, the following protocol and conventions:

Executive F (84th Cong., 2d sess.): A protocol dated at Montreal, June 14, 1954, relating to certain amendments to the Convention on International Civil Aviation.

Executive A (84th Cong., 2d sess.): A convention concerning customs facilities for touring, signed at New York on June 4, 1954.

Executive B (84th Cong., 2d sess.): A customs convention on the temporary importation of private road vehicles, signed at New York on June 4, 1954.

The protocol and conventions were severally read the second time, as follows:

[Ex. F (84th Cong., 2d sess.)]

PROTOCOL RELATING TO CERTAIN AMENDMENTS TO THE CONVENTION ON INTERNATIONAL CIVIL AVIATION

The Assembly of the International Civil Aviation Organization,

Having met in its Eighth Session, at Montreal, on the first day of June 1954, and

Having considered it desirable to amend the Convention on International Civil Aviation done at Chicago on the seventh day of December 1944,

Approved, on the fourteenth day of June of the year one thousand nine hundred and fifty-four, in accordance with the provisions of Article 94 (a) of the Convention afore-

said, the following proposed amendments to the said Convention:

In Article 48 (a), substitute for the word "annually" the expression "not less than once in three years";

In Article 49 (e), substitute for the expression "an annual budget" the expression "annual budgets"; and

In Article 61, substitute for the expressions "an annual budget" and "vote the budget" the expressions "annual budgets" and "vote the budgets",

Specified, pursuant to the provisions of the said Article 94 (a) of the said Convention, forty-two as the number of contracting States upon whose ratification the proposed amendments aforesaid shall come into force, and

Resolved, That the Secretary General of the International Civil Aviation Organization draw up a Protocol, in the English, French and Spanish languages, each of which shall be of equal authenticity, embodying the proposed amendments above mentioned and the matters hereinafter appearing.

Consequently, pursuant to the aforesaid action of the Assembly,

This Protocol shall be signed by the President of the Assembly and its Secretary General;

This Protocol shall be open to ratification by any State which has ratified or adhered to the said Convention on International Civil Aviation;

The instruments of ratification shall be deposited with the International Civil Aviation Organization;

This Protocol shall come into force among the States which have ratified it on the date on which the forty-second instrument of ratification is so deposited;

The Secretary General shall immediately notify all contracting States of the deposit of each ratification of this Protocol;

The Secretary General shall immediately notify all States parties or signatories to the said Convention of the date on which this Protocol comes into force;

With respect to any contracting State ratifying this Protocol after the date aforesaid, the Protocol shall come into force upon deposit of its instrument of ratification with the International Civil Aviation Organization.

In faith whereof, the President and the Secretary General of the Eighth Session of the Assembly of the International Civil Aviation Organization, being authorized thereto by the Assembly, sign this Protocol.

Done at Montreal on the fourteenth day of June of the year one thousand nine hundred and fifty-four in a single document in the English, French and Spanish languages, each of which shall be of equal authenticity. This Protocol shall remain deposited in the archives of the International Civil Aviation Organization; and certified copies thereof shall be transmitted by the Secretary General of the Organization to all States parties or signatories to the Convention on International Civil Aviation done at Chicago on the seventh day of December, 1944.

WALTER BINAGHI,
President of the Assembly.
CARL LJUNGBERG,
Secretary General of the Assembly.

Certified to be a true and complete textual copy of the Act deposited in the Archives of the Organization

P. A. ROY,
(*For Secretary General*).

[Ex. A (84th Cong., 2d sess.)]

CONVENTION CONCERNING CUSTOMS FACILITIES FOR TOURING

The Contracting States,

Desiring to facilitate the development of international touring,

Having decided to conclude a Convention and have agreed as follows:

ARTICLE 1

For the purpose of this Convention:

(a) The term "import duties and import taxes" shall mean not only Customs duties but also all duties and taxes whatever chargeable by reason of importation;

(b) The term "tourist" shall mean any person without distinction as to race, sex, language or religian, who enters the territory of a Contracting State other than that in which that person normally resides and remains there for not less than twenty-four hours and not more than six months in the course of any twelve-month period, for legitimate non-immigrant purposes, such as touring, recreation, sports, health, family reasons, study, religious pilgrimages or business;

(c) The term "temporary importation permit" shall mean the Customs document testifying to the guarantee or deposit of import duties and import taxes chargeable in the event of failure to re-export the article temporarily imported.

ARTICLE 2

1. Subject to the other conditions laid down in this Convention, each of the Contracting States shall admit temporarily free of import duties and import taxes the personal effects imported by a tourist, provided they are for the personal use of the tourist, that they are carried on the person of or in the luggage accompanying the tourist, that there is no reason to fear abuse, and that these personal effects will be re-exported by the tourist on leaving the country.

2. The term "personal effects" shall mean all clothing and other articles new or used which a tourist may personally and reasonably require, taking into consideration all the circumstances of his visit, but excluding all merchandise imported for commercial purposes.

3. Personal effects shall include among other articles the following, provided that they can be considered as being in use:

personal jewelry;
one camera with twelve plates or five rolls of film;
one miniature cinematograph camera with two reels of film;
one pair of binoculars;
one portable musical instrument;
one portable gramophone with ten records;
one portable sound-recording apparatus;
one portable wireless receiving set;
one portable typewriter;
one perambulator;
one tent and other camping equipment;
sports equipment (one fishing outfit, one sporting firearm with fifty cartridges, one nonpowered bicycle, one canoe or kayac less than 5½ metres long, one pair of skis, two tennis racquets, and other similar articles).

ARTICLE 3

Subject to the other conditions laid down in this Convention each of the Contracting States shall admit free of import duties and import taxes the following articles imported by a tourist for his personal use, provided that these articles are carried on the person of or in the hand luggage accompanying the tourist, and provided that there is no reason to fear abuse:

(a) 200 cigarettes or 50 cigars or 250 grammes of tobacco, or an assortment of these products, provided that the total weight does not exceed 250 grammes;

(b) one regular-size bottle of wine and one-quarter litre of spirits;

(c) one-quarter litre of toilet water and a small quantity of perfume.

ARTICLE 4

Subject to the other conditions laid down in this Convention each of the Contracting States shall grant to the tourist, provided that there is not reason to fear abuse:

(a) authorization to import in transit and without a temporary importation permit, travel souvenirs for a total value not exceeding 50 U. S. A. dollars, provided that such souvenirs are carried on the person of or in the luggage accompanying the tourist and that they are not intended for commercial purposes;

(b) authorization to export, without the formalities applying to currency controls and free of export duties, travel souvenirs which the tourist has bought in the country for a total value not exceeding 100 U. S. A. dollars, provided that they are carried on the person of or in the luggage accompanying the tourist and that such souvenirs are not intended for commercial purposes.

ARTICLE 5

Each of the Contracting States may require a temporary importation permit in respect of articles of a high value covered by article 2.

ARTICLE 6

The Contracting States shall endeavour not to introduce Customs procedures which might have the effect of impeding the development of international touring.

ARTICLE 7

In order to expedite Customs procedures, contiguous Contracting States shall endeavour to place their respective Customs posts close together and to keep them open during the same hours.

ARTICLE 8

The provisions of this Convention shall not prejudice in any way the application of police or other regulations concerning the importation, possession and carrying of arms and ammunition.

ARTICLE 9

Each of the Contracting States recognizes that any prohibitions which that State imposes on the importation or exportation of articles which benefit under this Convention shall apply only in so far as they are based on considerations other than economic in character, for example, of public morality, public security, public health, hygiene, veterinary or phyto-pathological considerations.

ARTICLE 10

The exemptions and facilities provided by this Convention shall not apply to frontier traffic.

Nor shall the applications of these exemptions and facilities be considered as automatic:

(a) when the total quantity of a commodity to be imported by a tourist exceeds substantially the limit laid down in this Convention;

(b) in case of a tourist who enters the country of import more than once a month;

(c) in case of a tourist under 17 years of age.

ARTICLE 11

In the event of fraud, contravention or abuse the Contracting States shall be free to take proceedings for the recovery of the corresponding import duties and import taxes and also for the imposition of any penalties to which the persons who have been granted exemptions or other facilities may have rendered themselves liable.

ARTICLE 12

Any breach of the provisions of this Convention, any substitution, false declaration or act having the effect of causing a person or an article improperly to benefit from the system of importation laid down in this Convention, may render the offender liable in the country where the offense was committed to the penalties prescribed by the laws of that country.

ARTICLE 13

Nothing in this Convention shall prevent Contracting States which form a Customs or economic union from enacting special provisions applicable to residents of the States forming that union.

ARTICLE 14

1. The Convention shall be open for signature until 31 December 1954 on behalf of any State Member of the United Nations and any other State invited to attend the United Nations Conference on Customs Formalities for the Temporary Importation of Private Road Motor Vehicles and for Tourism held in New York in May and June 1954, hereinafter referred to as the Conference.

2. This Convention shall be subject to ratification and the instruments of ratification shall be deposited with the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

ARTICLE 15

1. From 1 January 1955 this Convention shall be open for accession by any State referred to in paragraph 1 of article 14 and any other State so invited by the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations. It shall also be open for accession on behalf of any Trust Territory of which the United Nations is the Administering Authority.

2. Accession shall be effected by the deposit of an instrument of accession with the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

ARTICLE 16

1. This Convention shall enter into force on the ninetieth day following the date of the deposit of the fifteenth instrument of ratification or accession either without reservation or with reservations accepted in accordance with article 20.

2. For each State ratifying or acceding to the Convention after the date of the deposit of the fifteenth instrument of ratification or accession in accordance with the preceding paragraph, the Convention shall enter into force on the ninetieth day following the date of the deposit by such State of its instrument of ratification or accession either without reservation or with reservations accepted in accordance with article 20.

ARTICLE 17

1. After this Convention has been in force for three years, any Contracting State may denounce it by so notifying the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

2. Denunciation shall take effect fifteen months after the date of receipt by the Secretary-General of the United Nations of the notification of denunciation.

ARTICLE 18

This Convention shall cease to have effect if, for any period of twelve consecutive months after its entry into force, the number of Contracting States is less than eight.

ARTICLE 19

1. Any State may, at the time of the deposit of its instrument of ratification or accession or at any time thereafter, declare by notification addressed to the Secretary-General of the United Nations that this Convention shall extend to all or any of the territories for the international relations of which it is responsible. The Convention shall extend to the territories named in the notification as from the ninetieth day after its receipt by the Secretary-General if the notification is not accompanied by a reservation, or from the ninetieth day after the notification has taken effect in accordance with article 20, or on the date on which the Convention enters into force for the State concerned, whichever is the later.

2. Any State which has made a declaration under the preceding paragraph extending this Convention to any territory for whose international relations it is responsible may denounce the Convention separately in respect of that territory in accordance with the provisions of article 17.

ARTICLE 20

1. Reservations to this Convention made before the signing of the Final Act shall be admissible if they have been accepted by a majority of the members of the Conference and recorded in the Final Act.

2. Reservations made after the signing of the Final Act shall not be admitted if objection is expressed by one-third of the Signatory States or of the Contracting States as hereinafter provided.

3. The text of any reservation submitted to the Secretary-General of the United Nations by a State at the time of the signature, the deposit of an instrument of ratification or accession or of any notification under article 19 shall be circulated by the Secretary-General to all States which have at that time signed, ratified or acceded to the Convention. If one-third of these States expresses an objection within ninety days from the date of circulation, the reservation shall not be accepted. The Secretary-General shall notify all States referred to in this paragraph of any objection received by him as well as of the acceptance or rejection of the reservation.

4. An objection by a State which has signed but not ratified the Convention shall cease to have effect if, within a period of nine months from the date of making its objection, the objecting State has not ratified the Convention. If, as the result of an objection ceasing to have effect, a reservation is accepted by application of the preceding paragraph, the Secretary-General shall so inform the States referred to in that paragraph. The text of any reservation shall not be circulated to any signatory State under the preceding paragraph if that State has not ratified the Convention within three years following the date of signature on its behalf.

5. The State submitting the reservation may, within a period of twelve months from the date of the notification by the Secretary-General referred to in paragraph 3 that a reservation has been rejected in accordance with the procedure provided for in that paragraph, withdraw the reservation, in which case the instrument of ratification or accession or the notification under article 19 as the case may be shall take effect with respect to such State as from the date of withdrawal. Pending such withdrawal, the instrument or the notification as the case may be, shall not have effect, unless, by application of the provisions of paragraph 4, the reservation is subsequently accepted.

6. Reservations accepted in accordance with this article may be withdrawn at any time by notification to the Secretary-General.

7. No Contracting State shall be required to extend to a State making a reservation the benefit of the provisions to which such reservation applies. Any State availing itself of this right shall notify the Secretary-General accordingly and the latter shall communicate this decision to all signatory and Contracting States.

ARTICLE 21

1. Any dispute between two or more Contracting States concerning the interpretation or application of this Convention shall so far as possible be settled by negotiation between them.

2. Any dispute which is not settled by negotiation shall be submitted to arbitration if any one of the Contracting States in dispute so requests and shall be referred accordingly to one or more arbitrators selected by agreement between the States in dispute. If within three months from the date of the request for arbitration the States in dispute are unable to agree on the selection of an arbitrator or arbitrators, any of those States may request the President of the International Court of Justice to nominate a single arbitrator to whom the dispute shall be referred for decision.

3. The decision of the arbitrator or arbitrators appointed under the preceding paragraph shall be binding on the Contracting States concerned.

ARTICLE 22

1. After this Convention has been in force for three years, any Contracting State may, by notification to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, request that a conference be convened for the purpose of reviewing the Convention. The Secretary-General shall notify all Contracting States of the request and a review conference shall be convened by the Secretary-General if, within a period of four months following the date of notification by the Secretary-General, not less than one-half of the Contracting States notify him of their concurrence with the request.

2. If a conference is convened in accordance with the preceding paragraph, the Secretary-General shall notify all Contracting States and invite them to submit within a period of three months such proposals as they may wish the conference to consider. The Secretary-General shall circulate to all Contracting States the provisional agenda for the conference together with the texts of such proposals at least three months before the date on which the conference is to meet.

3. The Secretary-General shall invite to any conference convened in accordance with this article all Contracting States and all other States Members of the United Nations or of any of the specialized agencies.

ARTICLE 23

1. Any Contracting State may propose one or more amendments to this Convention. The text of any proposed amendment shall be transmitted to the Secretary-General of the United Nations who shall circulate it to all Contracting States.

2. Any proposed amendment circulated in accordance with the preceding paragraph shall be deemed to be accepted if no Contracting State expresses an objection within a period of six months following the date of circulation of the proposed amendment by the Secretary-General.

3. The Secretary-General shall notify as soon as possible all Contracting States whether an objection to the proposed amendment has been expressed, and if no such objection has been expressed, the amendment shall enter into force for all Contracting States three months after the expiration of the period of six months referred to in the preceding paragraph.

ARTICLE 24

The Secretary-General of the United Nations shall notify all Member States of the United Nations and all other States invited to attend the Conference of the following:

(a) Signatures, ratifications and accessions, received in accordance with articles 14 and 15;

(b) The date upon which this Convention shall enter into force in accordance with article 16;

(c) Denunciations received in accordance with article 17;

(d) The abrogation of this Convention in accordance with article 18;

(e) Notifications received under article 19;

(f) Entry into force of any amendment in accordance with article 23.

ARTICLE 25

The original of this Convention shall be deposited with the Secretary-General of the United Nations who shall transmit certified copies thereof to all Members of the United Nations and all other States invited to the Conference.

In witness whereof the undersigned, being duly authorized thereto, have signed this Convention.

Done at New York, this fourth day of June one thousand nine hundred and fifty-four, in a single copy in the English, French and Spanish languages, each text being equally authentic.

The Secretary-General is requested to prepare an authoritative translation of this Convention in the Chinese and Russian languages and to add the Chinese and Russian texts to the English, French and Spanish texts when transmitting certified copies thereof to the States in accordance with article 25 of this Convention.

For Afghanistan:
For Albania:
For Argentina:
Ad Referendum.
LUIS J. ESTEVARENA.
For Australia:
For Austria:
Dr. J. STANGELBERGER.
For the Kingdom of Belgium:
Sous réserve de ratification.
CH. HOPCHET.
For Bolivia:
For Brazil:
For Bulgaria:
For the Union of Burma:
For the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic:
For Cambodia:
IEM KADUL.
For Canada:
For Ceylon:
H. SHIRLEY AMERASINGHE.
For Chile:
For China:
For Colombia:
For Costa Rica:
ad-referendum.
J. F. CARBALLO.
July 20th, 1954.
For Cuba:
JOSÉ MIGUEL RIBAS.
For Czechoslovakia:
For Denmark:
For the Dominican Republic:
Ad Referendum.
R. O. GALVÁN.
For Ecuador:
B. OQUENDO.
For Egypt:
Subject to the reservation recorded in the final act.
RACHAD MOURAD.
For El Salvador:
For Ethiopia:
For Finland:
For France:
PHILIPPE DE SEYNES.
For the Federal Republic of Germany:
RICHARD PAULIG.
WALTER WAGNER.
For Greece:
For Guatemala:
Con sujeción a las reservas consignadas en el Acta Final
E. CASTILLO ARRIOLA.
For Haiti:
Sous La réserve consignée dans l'Acte Final
ERNEST G. CHAUVET.
For Honduras:
TIBURCIO CARÍAS JR.
June 15, 1954.
For Hungary:
For Iceland:
For India:
For Indonesia:
For Iran:
For Iraq:
For Ireland:
For Israel:
For Italy:
UGO CALDERONI.
For Japan:
For the Hashemite Kingdom of the Jordan:
For the Republic of Korea:
For Laos:
For Lebanon:
For Liberia:
For Libya:
For the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg:
For Mexico:
JOSÉ A. BUFORT.
For Monaco:
MARCEL A. PALMARO.
For Nepal:
For the Kingdom of the Netherlands:
PAYMANS.
For New Zealand:
For Nicaragua:
For the Kingdom of Norway:
For Pakistan:
For Panama:
ad referendum
ERNESTO DE LA OSSA.
For Paraguay:
For Peru:
For the Philippine Republic:
MAURO MÉNDEZ.
For Poland:
For Portugal:
ad referendum
FREIRE DE ANDRADE.
For Romania:
For San Marino:
For Saudi Arabia:
For Spain:
ad referendum
R. DE LA PRESILLA.
For Sweden:
Sous la réserve consignée dans l'Acte final
G. DE SYDOW.
A. APPELTOFFT.
For Switzerland:
FR. LÜTHI.
For Syria:
For Thailand:
For Turkey:
For the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic:
For the Union of South Africa:
For the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics:
For the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland:
CHARLES HENRY BLAKE.
For the United States of America:
JAMES J. WADSWORTH.
HENRY H. KELLY.
For Uruguay:
ad Referendum
E. RODRÍGUEZ FABREGAT.
For Vatican City:
Monseigneur THOMAS J. MCMAHON.
For Venezuela:
For Viet-Nam:
For Yemen:
For Yugoslavia.

[Ex. B (84th Cong., 2d sess.)]

CUSTOMS CONVENTION ON THE TEMPORARY IMPORTATION OF PRIVATE ROAD VEHICLES

The Contracting States,

Desiring to facilitate the development of international touring.

Having regard to the aims of the Convention on Road Traffic, adopted by the United Nations Conference on Road and Motor Transport held at Geneva from 23 August to 19 September 1949 and opened for signature at Geneva on 19 September 1949,

Have decided to conclude a Convention and have agreed upon the following provisions:

CHAPTER 1—DEFINITIONS

Article 1

For the purpose of this Convention:

(a) The term "import duties and import taxes" shall mean not only Customs duties but also all duties and taxes whatever chargeable by reason of importation;

(b) The term "vehicles" shall, unless the context otherwise requires, mean all road motor vehicles (including cycles with engines) and trailers (whether imported with the vehicle or separately), together with their component parts, and normal accessories and equipment, when imported with the vehicle;

(c) The term "private use" shall exclude the transport of persons for remuneration, reward or other consideration and the industrial or commercial transport of goods with or without remuneration;

(d) The term "temporary importation papers" shall include the Customs document showing the guarantee or deposit of import duties and import taxes;

(e) The term "persons" shall mean both natural and legal persons unless the context otherwise requires.

CHAPTER II—IMPORTATION WITHOUT PAYMENT OF IMPORT DUTIES AND IMPORT TAXES AND FREE OF IMPORT PROHIBITIONS AND RESTRICTIONS

Article 2

1. Each of the Contracting States shall grant temporary admission without payment of import duties and import taxes and free of import prohibitions and restrictions, subject to re-exportation and to the other conditions laid down in this Convention, to vehicles owned by persons normally resident outside its territory which are imported and utilized, for their private use on the occasion of a temporary visit, either by the owners of the vehicles or by other persons normally resident outside its territory.

2. Such vehicles shall be covered by temporary importation papers guaranteeing payment of import duties and import taxes, and if the case should arise, of any Customs penalties incurred, subject to the special provision of paragraph 4 of article 27.

Article 3

The fuel contained in the ordinary supply tanks of vehicles temporarily imported shall be admitted without payment of import duties and import taxes and free of import prohibitions and restrictions, it being understood that the ordinary tank is that designed by the maker for the type of vehicle concerned.

Article 4

1. Component parts imported for the repair of a particular vehicle already temporarily imported shall be admitted temporarily without payment of import duties and import taxes and free of import prohibitions and restrictions. Contracting States may require these parts to be covered by temporary importation papers.

2. Replaced parts which are not re-exported shall be liable to import duties and import taxes except where, in conformity with regulations of the country concerned, they may be abandoned free of all expense to the Exchequer or destroyed, under official supervision, at the expense of the parties concerned.

Article 5

Temporary importation papers and international circulation papers intended to be issued to persons residing in the country into which the papers are imported who wish to enter other countries and which are sent to the authorized touring associations by the corresponding foreign associations, by international organizations or by the Customs authorities of the Contracting States shall be admitted without payment of import duties and import taxes and free of import prohibitions and restrictions.

CHAPTER III—ISSUE OF TEMPORARY IMPORTATION PAPERS

Article 6

1. Subject to such guarantees and under such conditions as it may determine, each Contracting State may authorize associations, such as those affiliated to an international organization, to issue either directly or through corresponding associations the temporary importation papers covered by this Convention.

2. Temporary importation papers may be valid for a single country or Customs territory, or for several countries or Customs territories.

3. The period of validity of these papers shall not exceed a year from the date of issue.

Article 7

1. Temporary importation papers valid for the territories of all or several of the Contracting States shall be known as carnets de passages en douane and shall conform to the standard form contained in Annex 1 of this Convention.

2. If a carnet de passages en douane is not valid for one or several territories, the issuing association shall indicate the fact on the cover and on the importation vouchers of the carnet.

3. Temporary importation papers valid only for the territory of a single Contracting State may conform to the standard form contained in Annex 2 or in Annex 3 of this Convention. Contracting States may also use other documents, in accordance with their legislation or regulations.

4. The period of validity of temporary importation papers, other than those issued by authorized associations as provided for in article 6, shall be laid down by each Contracting State in accordance with its legislation or regulations.

5. Each Contracting State shall, upon request, supply the other Contracting States with models of temporary importation papers valid for its territory, other than those appearing in the annexes to this Convention.

CHAPTER IV—PARTICULARS ON TEMPORARY IMPORTATION PAPERS

Article 8

Temporary importation papers issued by authorized associations shall be made out in the name of the person who own the vehicles temporarily imported or who have the possession or control of them provided that, if the vehicle has been hired, the papers shall be made out in the name of the hirer.

Article 9

1. The weight to be declared on temporary importation papers is the net weight of the vehicles. It shall be expressed in the metric system. In the case of papers valid for one country only, the Customs authorities of that country may prescribe the use of another system.

2. The value to be declared on temporary importation papers valid for one country only shall be expressed in the currency of that country. The value to be declared on a carnet de passages en douane shall be expressed in the currency of the country where the carnet is issued.

3. The articles and tool-kit which form the normal equipment of vehicles need not be specially declared on the temporary importation papers.

4. When the Customs authorities so require, parts (such as wheels, tyres, and innertubes) and accessories not considered as constituting the normal equipment of the vehicle (such as radio sets, trailers not declared on a separate document, or luggage carriers) shall be declared on the temporary importation papers with the necessary particulars (such as weight and value) and shall be produced on exit from the country visited.

Article 10

Any particulars inserted on temporary importation papers by the issuing association may be altered only with the approval of the issuing or guaranteeing association. No alteration to the papers may be made after they have been passed by the Customs authorities of the country of importation except with the consent of those authorities.

Article 11

1. Vehicles admitted under the cover of temporary importation papers may be used, for their private use, by third persons duly authorized by the holders of the papers, provided that those third persons normally reside outside the country of importation and also fulfil the other conditions laid down in this Convention. The Customs authorities of the Contracting States have the right to require evidence that such persons have been duly authorized by the holders of the papers and fulfil the aforesaid conditions. If this evidence does not appear sufficient, the Customs authorities may refuse use of the vehicle in their country under cover of the papers. In the case of vehicles which have been hired, each Contracting State may, in the case of fear of abuse, require that the holder of the temporary importation paper be present at the time of importation of the vehicle.

2. Notwithstanding the provisions of the preceding paragraph, the Customs authorities of the Contracting States may permit, in special circumstances and under conditions of which they shall be sole judges, a vehicle circulating under cover of temporary importation papers to be driven by a person who is normally resident in the country of importation, in particular when the driver drives the vehicle on behalf of or under instructions from the holder of the temporary importation papers.

CHAPTER V—CONDITIONS OF TEMPORARY IMPORTATION

Article 12

1. The vehicles mentioned in the temporary importation papers shall be re-exported in the same general state, except for wear and tear, within the period of validity of such papers. In the case of vehicles which have been hired, the Customs authorities of the Contracting States shall have the right to require the re-exportation of the vehicle as soon as the hirer has left the country of temporary importation.

2. Evidence of re-exportation shall be provided by the exit visa properly appended to the temporary importation papers by the Customs authorities of the country into which the vehicles were temporarily imported.

Article 13

1. Notwithstanding the requirement of re-exportation laid down in article 12, the re-exportation of badly damaged vehicles shall not be required, in the case of duly authenticated accidents, provided that the vehicles:

(a) are subjected to the import duties and import taxes to which they are liable; or

(b) are abandoned free of all expenses to the Exchequer of the country into which they were imported temporarily; or

(c) are destroyed, under official supervision, at the expense of the parties concerned

as the Customs authorities may require.

2. When a vehicle temporarily admitted cannot be re-exported as a result of a seizure, other than a seizure made at the suit of private persons, the requirement of re-exportation within the period of validity of the temporary importation papers shall be suspended for the duration of the seizure.

3. The Customs authorities shall notify, so far as possible, to the guaranteeing association, seizures made by or on behalf of these Customs authorities of vehicles admitted under cover of temporary importation papers guaranteed by that association and shall advise it of the measures they intend to take.

Article 14

Vehicles imported into the territory of one of the Contracting States under cover of temporary importation papers may not be used even incidentally for transport against payment, reward or other consideration between points within the frontiers of that territory.

Article 15

Persons entitled to temporary importation facilities may, during the period of validity of temporary importation papers, import the vehicles covered by those papers as often as necessary, on condition that they have each passage (entry and exit) established by a visa of the Customs officers concerned if the Customs authorities so require. Temporary importation papers may be made valid for a single journey only.

Article 16

When temporary importation papers without detachable vouchers for each passage are used, the visas given by the Customs officers between the first entry and the final exit are provisional. Nevertheless, when the last visa is a provisional exit visa, it will be admitted as proof of the re-exportation of the vehicle or component parts temporarily imported.

Article 17

When temporary importation papers with a detachable voucher for each passage are used, each entry implies the passing of the document by the Customs, and each subsequent exit constitutes its final discharge, except as provided in article 18.

Article 18

When the Customs authorities of a country have finally and unconditionally discharged temporary importation papers they can no longer claim from the guaranteeing association payment of import duties and import taxes, unless the certificate of discharge was obtained improperly or fraudulently.

Article 19

Visas on temporary importation papers used under the conditions laid down in this Convention shall not be subject to the payment of charges for Customs attendance during the authorized hours for Customs offices and posts.

CHAPTER VI—EXTENSION OF VALIDITY AND RENEWAL OF TEMPORARY IMPORTATION PAPERS

Article 20

The lack of proof of re-exportation within the time allowed of vehicles temporarily imported shall be disregarded when the vehicles are presented to the Customs authorities for re-exportation within fourteen days from the expiry of the papers and satisfactory explanations of the delay are given.

Article 21

Each of the Contracting States shall recognize as valid extensions of validity of carnets de passages en douane granted by another Contracting State in accordance with the procedure laid down in Annex 4 of this Convention.

Article 22

1. Requests for extension of validity of temporary importation papers shall be presented to the competent Customs authorities before the expiry of the period of validity of these papers, unless this is rendered impossible by force majeure. If the temporary importation paper has been issued by an authorized association, the request for extension shall be made by the association which guarantees the papers.

2. Extensions of time necessary for the re-exportation of vehicles or component parts imported temporarily shall be granted when the persons concerned can establish to the satisfaction of the Customs authorities that they are prevented by force majeure from re-exporting the said vehicles or component parts within the time allowed.

Article 23

Each of the Contracting States shall, unless the conditions of temporary admission are no longer satisfied, authorize, subject to whatever measures of control they may consider necessary, the renewal of temporary importation papers issued by the authorized associations and relating to vehicles or component parts temporarily imported into its territory. Requests for renewal shall be presented by the guaranteeing association.

CHAPTER VII—REGULARIZATION OF TEMPORARY IMPORTATION PAPERS

Article 24

1. If temporary importation papers have not been regularly discharged, the Customs authorities of the country of importation shall (whether the papers have expired or not) accept as evidence of re-exportation of the vehicle or component parts the presentation of a certificate based on the standard form shown in Annex 5 of this Convention issued by an official authority (consul, Customs, police, mayor, judicial officer, etc.), attesting the facts that the vehicle or component parts in question have been presented to it and are outside the country of importation. They may also accept any other documentary evidence that the vehicle or component parts are outside the country of importation. In the case of papers, other than the carnets de passages en douane, which have not expired, the papers shall be produced at the same time as the evidence referred to above. In the case of carnets account shall be taken, as evidence of re-exportation of the vehicles or component parts, of the visas entered thereon by the Customs authorities of countries subsequently visited.

2. In the case of the destruction, loss or theft of a temporary importation paper not regularly discharged but relating to a vehicle or component parts which have been re-exported, the Customs authorities of the country of importation shall accept as proof of re-exportation the presentation of a certificate based on the standard form shown in Annex 5 of this Convention issued by an official authority (consul, Customs, police, mayor, judicial official, etc.), attesting the facts that the vehicle or component parts in question have been presented to it and are outside the country of importation after the date of expiry of the paper. They may also accept any other documentary evidence that the vehicle or component parts are outside the country of importation.

3. In the case of the destruction, loss or theft of a carnet de passages en douane while the vehicle or component parts to which it refers are in the territory of one of the Contracting States, the Customs authorities of that State shall, at the request of the association concerned, accept a replacement document, the validity of which expires on the date of expiration of validity of the carnet which it replaces. This acceptance will annul the previous acceptance of the carnet destroyed, lost or stolen. If, instead of a replacement document, an export license or similar document is issued for the re-exportation of the vehicle or component parts, the exit visa on this license or document shall be considered as sufficient proof of re-exportation.

4. If the vehicle is stolen after having been re-exported from the country of temporary importation, without the exit having been regularly endorsed on the temporary importation papers and in the absence of entry visas on the papers entered thereon by the Customs authorities of countries subsequently visited, the papers may nevertheless be regularized provided that the guaranteeing association furnishes the papers together with such evidence of theft as may be considered sufficient. If the temporary importation papers have not expired, the Customs authorities may require their surrender.

Article 25

In the cases referred to in article 24, the Customs authorities shall have the right to charge a regularization fee.

Article 26

Customs authorities shall not have the right to require from the guaranteeing association payment of import duties and import taxes on vehicles or component parts temporarily imported when the nondischarge of the temporary importation papers has not been notified to the guaranteeing association within a year of the date of expiry of the validity of those papers.

Article 27

1. The guaranteeing associations shall have a period of one year from the date of notification of the non-discharge of temporary importation papers in which to furnish proof of the re-exportation of the vehicles or component parts in question under the conditions laid down in this Convention.

2. If such proof is not furnished within the time allowed, the guaranteeing association shall forthwith deposit or pay provisionally the import duties and import taxes payable. This deposit or payment shall become final after a period of one year from the date of the deposit or provisional payment. During the latter period, the guaranteeing association may still avail itself of the facilities provided by the preceding paragraph with a view to repayment of the sums deposited or paid.

3. For countries whose regulations do not provide for the deposit or provisional payment of import duties, payments made in conformity with the provisions of the preceding paragraph will be regarded as final, it being understood that the sums paid may be refunded when the conditions laid down in this article are fulfilled.

4. In the case of the non-discharge of temporary importation papers, the guaranteeing association shall not be required to pay a sum greater than the total of the import duties and import taxes applicable to the vehicles or component parts not re-exported, together with interest if applicable.

Article 28

In the event of fraud, contravention or abuse, the Contracting States shall, notwithstanding the provisions of this Convention, be free to take proceedings, against persons using temporary importation papers, for the recovery of the import duties and import taxes and also for the imposition of any penalties to which such persons have rendered themselves liable. In such cases, the guaranteeing associations shall lend their assistance to the Customs authorities.

CHAPTER VIII—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

Article 29

The Contracting States shall endeavor not to introduce Customs procedures which might have the effect of impeding the development of international touring.

Article 30

In order to expedite customs procedures contiguous Contracting States shall endeavor to place their respective Customs posts close together and to keep them open during the same hours.

Article 31

Any breach of the provisions of this Convention, any substitution, false declaration or act having the effect of causing a person or an article improperly to benefit from the system of importation laid down in this Convention, may render the offender liable in the country where the offence was committed to the penalties prescribed by the laws of that country.

Article 32

Nothing in this Convention shall prevent Contracting States which form a customs or economic union from enacting special provisions applicable to residents of the States forming that union.

CHAPTER IX—FINAL PROVISIONS

Article 33

1. This Convention shall be open for signature until 31 December 1954 on behalf of any State Member of the United Nations and any other State invited to attend the United Nations Conference on Customs Formalities for the Temporary Importation of Private Road Motor Vehicles and for Tourism held in New York in May and June 1954, hereinafter referred to as the Conference.

2. This Convention shall be subject to ratification and the instruments of ratification shall be deposited with the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

Article 34

1. From 1 January 1955 this Convention shall be open for accession by any State referred to in paragraph 1 of article 33 and any other State so invited by the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations. It shall also be open for accession on behalf of any Trust Territory of which the United Nations is the Administering Authority.

2. Accession shall be effected by the deposit of an instrument of accession with the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

Article 35

1. This Convention shall enter into force on the ninetieth day following the date of the deposit of the fifteenth instrument of ratification or accession either without reservation or with reservations accepted in accordance with article 39.

2. For each State ratifying or acceding to the Convention after the date of the deposit of the fifteenth instrument of ratification or accession in accordance with the preceding paragraph, the Convention shall enter into force on the ninetieth day following the date of the deposit by such State of its instrument of ratification or accession either without reservation or with reservations accepted in accordance with article 39.

Article 36

1. After this Convention has been in force for three years, any Contracting State may denounce it by so notifying the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

2. Denunciation shall take effect fifteen months after the date of receipt by the Secretary-General of the United Nations of the notification of denunciation.

Article 37

This Convention shall cease to have effect if, for any period of twelve consecutive months after its entry into force, the number of Contracting States is less than eight.

Article 38

1. Any State may, at the time of the deposit of its instrument of ratification or accession or at any time thereafter, declare by notification addressed to the Secretary-General of the United Nations that this Convention shall extend to all or any of the territories for the international relations of which it is responsible. The Convention shall extend to the territories named in the notification as from the ninetieth day after its receipt by the Secretary-General if the notification is not accompanied by a reservation, or from the ninetieth day after the notification has taken effect in accordance with article 39, or on the date on which the Convention enters into force for the State concerned, whichever is the later.

2. Any State which has made a declaration under the preceding paragraph extending this Convention to any territory for whose international relations it is responsible may denounce the Convention separately in respect of that territory in accordance with the provisions of article 36.

Article 39

1. Reservations to this Convention made before the signing of the Final Act shall be admissible if they have been accepted by a majority of the members of the Conference and recorded in the Final Act.

2. Reservations made after the signing of the Final Act shall not be admitted if objection is expressed by one-third of the Signatory States or of the Contracting States as hereinafter provided.

3. The text of any reservation submitted to the Secretary-General of the United Nations by a State at the time of the signature, the deposit of an instrument of ratification or accession or of any notification under article 38 shall be circulated by the Secretary-General to all States which have at that time signed, ratified or acceded to the Convention. If one-third of these States expresses an objection within ninety days from the date of circulation, the reservation shall not be accepted. The Secretary-General shall notify all States referred to in this paragraph of any objection received by him as well as of the acceptance or rejection of the reservation.

4. An objection by a State which has signed but not ratified the Convention shall cease to have effect if, within a period of nine months from the date of making its objection, the objecting State has not ratified the Convention. If, as the result of an objection ceasing to have effect, a reservation is accepted by application of the preceding paragraph, the Secretary-General shall so inform the States referred to in that paragraph. The text of any reservation shall not be circulated to any signatory State under the preceding paragraph if that State has not ratified the Convention within three years following the date of signature on its behalf.

5. The State submitting the reservation may, within a period of twelve months from the date of the notification by the Secretary-General referred to in paragraph 3 that a reservation has been rejected in accordance with the procedure provided for in that paragraph, withdraw the reservation, in which case the instrument of ratification or accession or the notification under article 38 as the case may be shall take effect with respect to such State as from the date of the withdrawal. Pending such withdrawal, the instrument or the notification as the case may be, shall not have effect, unless, by application of the provisions of paragraph 4, the reservation is subsequently accepted.

6. Reservations accepted in accordance with this article may be withdrawn at any time by notification to the Secretary-General.

7. No Contracting State shall be required to extend to a State making a reservation the benefit of the provisions to which such reservation applies. Any State availing itself of this right shall notify the Secretary-General accordingly and the latter shall communicate this decision to all signatory and Contracting States.

Article 40

1. Any dispute between two or more Contracting States concerning the interpretation or application of this Convention shall so far as possible be settled by negotiation between them.

2. Any dispute which is not settled by negotiation shall be submitted to arbitration if any one of the Contracting States in dispute so requests and shall be referred accordingly to one or more arbitrators selected by agreement between the States in dispute. If within three months from the date of the request for arbitration the States in dispute are unable to agree on the selection of an arbitrator or arbitrators, any of those States may request the President of the International Court of Justice to nominate a single arbitrator to whom the dispute shall be referred for decision.

3. The decision of the arbitrator or arbitrators appointed under the preceding paragraph shall be binding on the Contracting States concerned.

Article 41

1. After this Convention has been in force for three years, any Contracting State may, by notification to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, request that a conference be convened for the purpose of reviewing the Convention. The Secretary-General shall notify all Contracting States of the request and a review conference shall be convened by the Secretary-General if, within a period of four months following the date of notification by the Secretary-General, not less than one-half of the Contracting States notify him of their concurrence with the request.

2. If a conference is convened in accordance with the preceding paragraph, the Secretary-General shall notify all Contracting States and invite them to submit within a period of three months such proposals as they may wish the conference to consider. The Secretary-General shall circulate to all Contracting States the provisional agenda for the conference together with the texts of such proposals at least three months before the date on which the conference is to meet.

3. The Secretary-General shall invite to any conference convened in accordance with this article all Contracting States and all other States Members of the United Nations or of any of the specialized agencies.

Article 42

1. Any Contracting State may propose one or more amendments to this convention. The text of any proposed amendment shall be transmitted to the Secretary-General of the United Nations who shall circulate it to all Contracting States.

2. Any proposed amendment circulated in accordance with the preceding paragraph shall be deemed to be accepted if no Contracting State expresses an objection within a period of six months following the date of circulation of the proposed amendment by the Secretary-General.

3. The Secretary-General shall notify as soon as possible all Contracting States whether an objection to the proposed amendment has been expressed, and if no such objection has been expressed, the amendment shall enter into force for all Contracting States three months after the expiration of the period of six months referred to in the preceding paragraph.

Article 43

The Secretary-General of the United Nations shall notify all Member States of the United Nations and all other States invited to attend the conference of the following:

(a) Signatures, ratifications and accessions, received in accordance with articles 33 and 34;

(b) The date upon which this convention shall enter into force in accordance with article 35;

(c) Denunciations received in accordance with article 36;

(d) The abrogation of this convention in accordance with article 37;

(e) Notifications received under article 38;

(f) Entry into force of any amendment in accordance with article 42.

Article 44

The original of this Convention shall be deposited with the Secretary-General of the United Nations who shall transmit certified copies thereof to all Members of the United Nations and all other States invited to the Conference.

In witness whereof the undersigned, being duly authorized thereto, have signed this Convention.

Done at New York this fourth day of June, one thousand nine hundred and fifty-four, in a single copy in the English, French and Spanish languages, each text being equally authentic.

The Secretary-General is requested to prepare an authoritative translation of this Convention in the Chinese and Russian languages and to add the Chinese and Russian texts to the English, French and Spanish texts when transmitting certified copies thereof to the States in accordance with article 44 of this Convention.

For Afghanistan:
For Albania:
For Argentina:
Ad Referendum
LUIS J. ESTEVARENA.
For Australia:
For Austria:
Dr. J. STANGELBERGER.
For the Kingdom of Belgium:
Sous réserve de ratification
CH. HOPCHET.
For Bolivia:
For Brazil:
For Bulgaria:
For the Union of Burma:
For the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic:
For Cambodia:
IEM KADUL.
For Canada:
For Ceylon:
Subject to the reservation recorded in the Final Act
H. SHIRLEY AMERASINGHE.
For Chile:
For China:
For Colombia:
For Costa Rica:
ad-referendum
J. F. CARBALLO.
July 20th, 1954.
For Cuba:
JOSÉ MIGUEL RIBAS.
For Czechoslovakia:
For Denmark:
For the Dominican Republic:
Ad Referendum
R. O. GALVÁN.
For Ecuador:
B. OQUENDO.
For Egypt:
RACHAD MOURAD.
For El Salvador:
For Ethiopia:
For Finland:
For France:
PHILIPPE DE SEYNES.
For the Federal Republic of Germany:
RICHARD PAULIG.
WALTER WAGNER.
For Greece:
For Guatemala:
Con sujeción a las reservas consignadas en el Acta Final.
E. CASTILLO ARRIOLA.
For Haiti:
ERNEST G. CHAUVET.
For Honduras:
TIBURCIO CARÍAS JR.
June 15, 1954.
For Hungary:
For Iceland:
For India:
Subject to the reservations recorded in the Final Act.
A. S. LALL.
For Indonesia:
For Iran:
For Iraq:
For Ireland:
For Israel:
For Italy:
UGO CALDERONI.
For Japan:
For the Hashemite Kingdom of the Jordan:
For the Republic of Korea:
For Laos:
For Lebanon:
For Liberia:
For Libya:
For the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg:
For Mexico:
Con subjeción a la reserva consignada en el Acta Final.
JOSÉ A. BUFORT.
For Monaco:
MARCEL A. PALMARO.

For Nepal:
For the Kingdom of the Netherlands:
PAYMANS.
For New Zealand:
For Nicaragua:
For the Kingdom of Norway:
For Pakistan:
For Panama:
Ad referendum
ERNESTO DE LA OSSA.
For Paraguay:
For Peru:
For the Philippine Republic:
MAURO MÉNDEZ.
For Poland:
For Portugal:
ad referendum
FREIRE DE ANDRADE.
For Romania:
For San Marino:
For Saudi Arabia:
For Spain:
ad referendum
R. DE LA PRESILLA.
For Sweden:
G. DE SYDOW.
A. APPELTOFFT.
For Switzerland:
FR. LÜTHI.
For Syria:
For Thailand:
For Turkey:
For the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic:
For the Union of South Africa:
For the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics:
For the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland:
J. K. HULME.
For the United States of America:
JAMES J. WADSWORTH.
HENRY H. KELLY.
For Uruguay:
Ad Referendum
E. RODRÍGUEZ FABREGAT.
For Vatican City:
Monseigneur THOMAS J. MCMAHON.
For Venezuela:
For Viet-Nam:
For Yemen:
For Yugoslavia:
Certified true copy
For the Secretary-General:
C. A. STAVROPOULOS,
Principal Director in Charge of the Legal Department.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, the protocol, Executive F, 84th Congress, 2d session, now before the Senate for advice and consent to ratification, has as its only purpose to change the requirement for an annual meeting of the assembly of the International Civil Aviation Organization—ICAO—to a triennial meeting, that is, a meeting once every 3 years.

The Organization has found over the years of its operations that full meetings of the assembly every year are not necessary for its effective functioning. It believes that a meeting once every 3 years would suffice to deal with questions of major policy and organization.

This Civil International Aviation Organization handles technical problems related to international air traffic. Other organizations of this nature, like the Postal Union, the Telecommunications Union, the Meteorological Organization, meet about once every 4 or 5 years, which has proven to be entirely adequate. If an unforeseen problem of major importance should arise during the intervening years between sessions, the assembly could still be called together in an extraordinary meeting to deal with the situation.

The protocol itself amends the three provisions in the convention which require or make reference to annual meetings or the voting of annual budgets.

I believe the Senate will go along with me when I say that perhaps we have fallen into the habit of having too many international meetings in some fields and that it is refreshing to find an international body deciding that it could get along with fewer meetings. This should, moreover, result in a budgetary saving, both for the Organization, and for each member, who, after all, has to bear the costs for sending delegations to these meetings.

I hope that the Senate will give its advice and consent to ratification of this protocol.

I do not know whether it is preferable that I proceed with my statement on the two conventions at this time.

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

Mr. GREEN. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. In view of the fact that under the order previously entered a vote on the protocol will be considered a vote on the two conventions, I believe it would be more helpful if the Senator from Rhode Island were to explain all three matters before a vote is had.

Mr. GREEN. Then I shall proceed to explain the two conventions, which will be considered together, and to say a word of explanation and justification for them.

The purpose of the two conventions is to simplify and standardize customs procedures in connection with the international transportation of the personal belongings and automobiles of tourists. The essence of the touring convention is an agreement to allow tourists to bring into and take out of the country duty-free a limited amount of personal effects and souvenirs. The main point of the convention on private road vehicles is the agreement to admit the automobiles of tourists duty-free for visits of not more than 6 months' duration.

These conventions will be of great help to travelers. They will reduce substantially the complex and time-consuming formalities for crossing international borders. The conventions will cost the United States nothing. The 1956 travel season is about to begin and it would be a great help to Americans who plan to go abroad if the United States were to ratify the conventions and if they were to become effective soon. Also our ratification may hasten approval of the other nations that are parties to them.

The two conventions require no change in United States law and they will have no effect on State laws.

Citizens of the United States will be the chief beneficiaries of the conventions because more of our people travel abroad than do citizens of any other country and because United States Customs procedures are already more liberal than those which the conventions require. In addition, the spur to travel which these conventions will make will have an important and beneficial effect on the trade and cultural interchange of the free world.

The two conventions are endorsed by the Department of State and Department of Commerce and by the American Automobile Association. No objections to the conventions have been received.

I hope that the Senate will give its advice and consent to the ratification of these two conventions.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, on the question of agreeing to the resolutions of ratification I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no objection, the protocol and conventions will be considered as having passed through their various parliamentary stages, up to the point of consideration of the resolutions of ratification. The clerk will now read the resolutions of ratification.

The Chief Clerk read the resolutions of ratification, as follows:

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of Executive F, 84th Congress, 2d session, a protocol dated at Montreal June 14, 1954, relating to certain amendments to the convention on international civil aviation.

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of Executive A, 84th Congress, 2d session, a convention concerning customs facilities for touring, signed at New York on June 4, 1954.

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of Executive B, 84th Congress, 2d session, a customs convention on the temporary importation of private road vehicles, signed at New York on June 4, 1954.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

The Senate has under consideration Executive F, 84th Congress, 2d session, on the Executive Calendar. The yeas and nays have been ordered on Executive F, and, by order of the Senate previously agreed to, ratification of Executive F will automatically be deemed to include ratification of Executive A, 84th Congress, 2d session, and Executive B, 84th Congress, 2d session. The yeas and nays having been ordered, the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SCOTT], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] is absent because of a death in his family.

I further announce that if present and voting the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SCOTT], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] would each vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] is detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], and the Senators from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY and Mr. WILEY] would each vote "yea."

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 81, nays 0, as follows:

YEAS—81

Aiken	Frear	McNamara
Allott	Fulbright	Millikin
Anderson	Goldwater	Morse
Barkley	Gore	Mundt
Barrett	Green	Murray
Beall	Hayden	Neely
Bender	Hennings	Neuberger
Bennett	Holland	O'Mahoney
Bible	Hruska	Pastore
Bricker	Humphrey	Payne
Bridges	Jackson	Potter
Bush	Jenner	Purtell
Capehart	Johnson, Tex.	Robertson
Carlson	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Case, N. J.	Kennedy	Saltonstall
Case, S. Dak.	Kerr	Schoeppel
Chavez	Knowland	Smith, Maine
Clements	Kuchel	Smith, N. J.
Cotton	Laird	Sparkman
Curtis	Langer	Stennis
Dirksen	Lehman	Symington
Douglas	Long	Thye
Duff	Magnuson	Watkins
Dworshak	Malone	Welker
Ellender	Martin, Iowa	Williams
Ervin	Martin, Pa.	Wofford
Flanders	McClellan	Young

NOT VOTING—15

Butler	Hickenlooper	McCarthy
Byrd	Hill	Monroney
Daniel	Ives	Scott
Eastland	Kefauver	Smathers
George	Mansfield	Wiley

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein, the resolution of ratification to Executive F, 84th Congress, 2d session, is agreed to.

In accordance with the order previously entered, the advice and consent of the Senate is hereby deemed to have been given to the ratification of Executive A and Executive B, 84th Congress, 2d session, and the resolutions of ratification thereto are agreed to by the same vote.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask that the President be immediately notified of the ratification of the protocol and the two customs conventions upon which a vote has just been taken.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be so 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.

CALL OF THE CALENDAR

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous unanimous-consent agreement, following the consideration of the treaties on the Executive Calendar, the Senate will now proceed to the call of the calendar. The clerk will state the first measure on the calendar.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 5566) to terminate the existence of the Indian Claims Commission, and for other purposes, was announced as first in order.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I call the attention of the minority leader to the fact that Calendar No. 1748, House bill 5566, is being called, and I do not believe the Senator's calendar committee is present. I have a notation that that bill should be held on the calendar.

Mr. KNOWLAND. That bill should be held on the calendar.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I ask that the bill go over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 3025) to amend paragraph (2) of subdivision (c) of section 77 of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended, was announced as next in order.

Mr. ERVIN. I ask that the bill go over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

WAYMON H. A. MASSEY

The bill (H. R. 3152) for the relief of Waymon H. A. Massey was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CENTENNIAL OF THE BIRTH OF WOODROW WILSON

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 444) to authorize and request the President to issue a proclamation in connection with the centennial of the birth of Woodrow Wilson was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

GRANTING OF STATUS OF PERMANENT RESIDENCE TO CERTAIN ALIENS

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 163) granting the status of permanent residence to certain aliens was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That, in the case of each alien hereinafter named, in whose case deportation has been suspended for 6 months pursuant to section 19 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended (54 Stat. 671; 56 Stat. 1044; 62 Stat. 1206), the Attorney General is authorized and directed to cancel deportation proceedings and to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of each alien in accordance with the provisions of section 244 (d) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 216–217), upon the payment to the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization of a fee of $18, which fee shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the account of miscellaneous receipts:

A–2568385, Frett, Lilly M.
A–9605857, Frett, Rudyard D.
A–8014941, Todman, Edith Eileen.
A–3148643, Todman, William Isaac.
A–5978822, Turnbull, Joyce E.
A–8057169, Turnbull, Norwell Leon.

ISABEL TRE

The bill (S. 146) for the relief of Isabel Tre was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Isabel Tre shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee.

ELLI YORGIYADIS

The bill (S. 1364) for the relief of Elli Yorgiyadis was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Elli Yorgiyadis shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

MARIO FARABULLINI AND ALLA FARABULLINI, HIS WIFE

The bill (S. 1885) for the relief of Mario Farabullini and Alla Farabullini, his wife, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mario Farabullini and Alla Farabullini, his wife, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States

for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct the required numbers from the appropriate quota or quotas for the first year that such quota or quotas are available.

GIUSEPPE CULCASI

The bill (S. 2095) for the relief of Giuseppe Culcasi was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Giuseppe Culcasi shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee.

MARIA NOVAK

The bill (S. 2244) for the relief of Maria Novak was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (b) (2) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the alien Maria Novak shall be held and considered to be the alien parent of Janvid John Staut, a citizen of the United States.

CECILE ANGELE CHAFFOO

The bill (S. 2563) for the relief of Cecile Angele Chaffoo was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Cecile Angele Chaffoo shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

THEODORE F. HARTUNG AND MRS. ELIZABETH HARTUNG

The bill (H. R. 1099) for the relief of Theodore F. Hartung and Mrs. Elizabeth Hartung was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SALIH HOUGI AND OTHERS

The bill (H. R. 1179) for the relief of Salih Hougi, Bertha Catherine, Noor Elias, Isaac, and Mozelle Rose Hardoon was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. KHATOUN MALKEY SAMUEL

The bill (H. R. 2796) for the relief of Mrs. Khatoun Malkey Samuel was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

GUGLIELMO JOSEPH PERRELLA

The bill (H. R. 2948) for the relief of Guglielmo Joseph Perrella was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

GEORGE E. BERGOS (FORMERLY ATHANASIOS KRITSELIS)

The bill (H. R. 3276) for the relief of George E. Bergos (formerly Athanasios Kritselis) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LOIS O. JENNINGS

The bill (H. R. 4466) for the relief of Lois O. Jennings was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ANTONIO PENNA

The bill (H. R. 4588) for the relief of Antonio Penna was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

GIUSEPPE LADDOMADA AND OTHERS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 586) for the relief of Giuseppe Laddomada, Antonietta Laddomada, and children, Concetta and Paolo Laddomada, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, on page 1, line 7, after the word "of", where it appears the second time, to strike out "their entries into the United States" and insert "the enactment of this act", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Giuseppe Laddomada, Antonietta Laddomada, and children, Concetta and Paolo Laddomada, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct four numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

MELECIO ACOSTA-MORALES

The bill (S. 1013) for the relief of Melecio Acosta-Morales was announced as next in order.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, this bill provides for cancellation of deportation proceedings in behalf of a 39-year-old native and citizen of Mexico, who last entered the United States on December 5, 1953, as a returning resident. He was first admitted to the United States in 1920. On December 16, 1953, the beneficiary was convicted of the crime of knowingly and fraudulently importing narcotic drugs into the United States, and was sentenced to imprisonment for 2 years and a fine. Upon payment of the fine, the prison sentence was suspended.

The beneficiary states that while visiting across the border in Mexico, narcotic drugs were placed in his car, and when he attempted to reenter the United States, the drugs were discovered. The beneficiary is married to a United States citizen, and the couple have four citizen children. The beneficiary is well thought of in the community in which he resides, and this is the only time he has been arrested.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Attorney General is authorized and directed to discontinue any deportation proceedings and to cancel any outstanding order and warrant of deportation, warrant of arrest, and bond, which may have been issued in the case of Melecio Acosta-Morales. From and after the date of enactment of this act, the said Melecio Acosta-Morales shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which such deportation proceedings were commenced or any such warrants and order have issued.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

MARTINO PALMERI

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1101) for the relief of Martino Palmeri, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, in line 7, after the word "fee", to strike out "Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Martino Palmeri shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act upon payment of the required visa fee.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

RELIEF OF CERTAIN RELATIVES OF UNITED STATES CITIZENS

The Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 457) for the relief of certain relatives of United States citizens, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments: on page 2, line 5, after the name "Chamberis", to insert "Olga

P. Cheek"; in line 6, after the name "Corra", to insert "Nicola G. D'Armi"; in line 8, after the name "Falcone", to insert "Anna G. Favia"; in line 9, after the name "Gasparatos", to insert "Lilli Gerlinsky"; in line 10, after the name "Gibson", to insert "Lieselotte W. Grimmer"; in line 11, after the name "Israel", to insert "Efstathios Katsikis"; in line 12, after the name "Kikel", to insert "Hedwig B. Krause, Gertrud H. E. T. Kruger"; in line 13, after the name "Labellarte", to insert "Margaret W. Lampinen"; in line 14, after the name "Larson", to insert "Chieko S. Lee"; in line 16, after the name "Loukatos", to strike out "Elfriede Luker"; in the same line after the name "McGrath", to strike out "Maria McWalters" and insert "Marianne Putz McWalters"; in line 19, after the name "Mavromatis", to insert "Tatjana Meerman"; in line 25, after the name "Pantera", to insert "Armaranti N. Papanikitas, Maria M. Regina"; on page 3, line 1, after the name "Ruschak", to insert "Anna Sagan"; and in line 6, after the name "Wilson", to insert "Brian Woo."

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the joint resolution to be read a third time.

The joint resolution was read the third time and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 9390) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Over.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

TRANSFER OF LAND IN THE HUALAPAI INDIAN RESERVATION, ARIZ.

The bill (S. 2822) to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to transfer approximately 9 acres of land in the Hualapai Indian Reservation, Ariz., to school district No. 8, Mohave County, Ariz., was announced as next in order.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

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

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, the Hualapai Tribe of Indians is located in the northwestern part of Arizona. In their entire history they have not had adequate school buildings. Recently the tribe met and sent a resolution to the Department of the Interior authorizing and approving the transfer of 9 acres of Indian land to school district No. 8, Mohave County, Ariz.

I should like to relate to the Senate an amusing incident in this connection. Only 1 voter, 1 property owner, lives in school district No. 8. The other day the polls were opened for her. She went to the polls and voted "aye" on the school bonds.

Money will be expended in the sum of about $129,000 to construct this school. I may say to the Senator from Oregon that if the school is ever abandoned, the land will revert to the Department of the Interior in trusteeship for the Hualapai Tribe of Indians.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with amendments, on page 2, line 2, after the word "purposes", to insert "and are available to Indians and non-Indians on the same terms unless otherwise approved by the Secretary of the Interior"; in line 5, after the word "school", to strike out "purposes," and insert "purposes or is made available to Indians and non-Indians on different terms without the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary may publish in the Federal Register a declaration to that effect and"; and, in line 10, after the word "Tribe", to insert a colon and "Provided also, That the Secretary of the Interior may not approve any terms or conditions which would discriminate against Indians", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to transfer by patent to school district No. 8, Mohave County, Ariz., all right, title, and interest of the United States and the Hualapai Tribe of Indians in and to a tract of approximately 9 acres of land within the Hualapai Indian Reservation described as part of the southwest quarter of section 23, township 25 north, range 11 west, Gila and Salt River meridian, as long as such lands are used for school purposes and are available to Indians and non-Indians on the same terms unless otherwise approved by the Secretary of the Interior: *Provided*, That if said tract no longer is used for school purposes or is made available to Indians and non-Indians on different terms without the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary may publish in the Federal Register a declaration to that effect and all right, title, and interest therein shall revert to the United States in trust for the Hualapai Tribe: *Provided also*, That the Secretary of the Interior may not approve any terms or conditions which would discriminate against Indians: *And provided further*, That all mineral rights, including gas and oil, are reserved for the use and benefit of the Hualapai Tribe. The lands to be so transferred to said school district are described in detail as follows: Starting at the north quarter corner of section 23, township 25 north, range 11 west, Gila and Salt River meridian, Mohave County, Arizona, marked by a Government set brass capped iron pipe; thence, north 89 degrees 57 minutes east, along the north line of said section 23, a distance of 109.09 feet to a point; thence, south 2 degrees 48 minutes 30 seconds west, a distance of 2646.76 feet to a point; thence, north 84 degrees 20 minutes 45 seconds west, a distance of 109.04 feet to a point; thence, south 33 degrees 28 minutes 15 seconds west, a distance of 949.8 feet to the place of beginning, marked by a half-inch iron pipe; thence, south 28 degrees 31 minutes 45 seconds west, a distance of 313.73 feet to a corner, marked by a half-inch iron pipe; thence south 61 degrees 48 minutes 15 seconds east, a distance of 167.08 feet to a corner and point along the northwesterly right-of-way boundary of an oil cake paved road, marked by a half-inch iron pipe; thence, south 26 degrees 41 minutes 45 seconds west, a distance of 273.58 feet along the said northwesterly right-of way boundary of said paved road, marked by a half-inch iron pipe; thence, north 63 degrees 29 minutes 45 seconds west, a distance of 446.41 feet to a corner marked by a half-inch iron pipe; thence, south 26 degrees 40 minutes 30 seconds west, a distance of 188.92 feet to a corner marked by a half-inch iron pipe; thence, north 63 degrees 29 minutes 45 seconds west, a distance of 403.75 feet to a corner marked by a half-inch iron pipe; thence, north 9 degrees 16 minutes 15 seconds east, 365.56 feet to a corner marked by a half-inch iron pipe; thence, south 88 degrees 47 minutes 15 seconds east, a distance of 433.09 feet to a corner point marked by a half-inch iron pipe; thence, north 75 degrees 12 minutes 45 seconds east, a distance of 289.71 feet to a corner marked by a half-inch iron pipe; thence, south 79 degrees 28 minutes 45 seconds east, a distance of 202.51 feet to the place of beginning.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

AUTHORIZATION OF CERTAIN APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

The bill (S. 3673) to authorize appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission for acquisition or condemnation of real property or any facilities, or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there any objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I request the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] to explain the bill.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, last year, for the first time, the Atomic Energy Commission was required to seek authorization for the construction or expansion of existing facilities, or the acquisition or condemnation of any real property. That situation arose because of the new Atomic Energy Act of 1954. For a long time, of course, there was extreme secrecy even as to where the installations were located. However, as the program has developed, it has seemed proper for those sponsoring the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, to require that the Atomic Energy Commission, in its budget, set forth the installations it desired to build and the expansion it desired to make.

Section 261 of Public Law 703 provides as follows:

SEC. 261. Appropriation.—There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary and appropriate to carry out the provisions and purposes of this act except such as may be necessary for acquisition or condemnation of any real property or any facility or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion.

The first part of this section grants general authorization for the appropriation of money needed by the Atomic Energy Commission for operating purposes. The latter portion of the above cited section, however, specifically provides that each year authority must be

sought for any moneys to be used for construction or acquisition purposes.

The initial authority last year—which became Public Law 141—established the format and general limitations upon the expenditure of such money. It will be noted that on page 2 of the pending bill there is a series of items for the Hanford, Wash., installation totaling about $30 million. Heretofore, when money was needed, the Atomic Energy Commission came forward and asked for one and a half or two billion dollars, and because of the generally secret nature of the work, as the distinguished majority leader well knows, we did not try to itemize the projects.

This time it is different. The first item calls for an authorization of $22,200,000; then there is an item of $55 million for an aircraft nuclear propulsion ground test plant, and so forth, throughout the bill. This time the items are all set forth as clearly as security will permit.

Section 101 contains a list of the projects identified by numbers. This section is broken down into general categories which relate to major programs being carried on by the Commission. It is further subdivided for purposes of setting specific limitations under which the various projects may be started when the deviation is at variance from the estimate originally prepared by the Atomic Energy Commission.

In section 102 these deviations are detailed.

Section 103 authorizes the Atomic Energy Commission to use funds currently or otherwise available to it for such purposes for advance planning, construction, design, and architectural services it deems necessary but which are not otherwise authorized by law.

Section 104 of the bill authorizes the appropriations of funds necessary to restore or replace plants or facilities destroyed or otherwise seriously damaged. In addition the Commission is authorized to use such funds as may be currently or otherwise available to it under these emergency conditions.

Section 105 of the bill authorizes the Commission to utilize not only the moneys authorized to be appropriated in section 101 of this bill but also any other funds which may be currently available to it for accomplishing the purposes of this bill.

Section 106 authorizes the Commission under certain specific procedures to substitute within the limits of money authorized by this bill a new project, the estimate for which is not contained in this bill.

The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, through its Subcommittee on Legislation, has held detailed hearings on the projects identified in this bill and is satisfied that these items are essential to the national defense and to the furtherance of the civilian application of atomic energy.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill? The Chair hears none.

The Chair is advised that there is on the desk a House bill, H. R. 10387, which is identical with the Senate bill.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House bill 10387.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 10387), to authorize appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission for acquisition or condemnation of real property or any facilities, or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion, and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the House bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which was read twice by its title.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, Senate bill 3673 is indefinitely postponed.

RATES CHARGED PUBLIC BODIES AND COOPERATIVES FOR ELECTRIC POWER GENERATED AT FEDERAL PROJECTS

The bill (S. 3338) relating to rates charged to public bodies and cooperatives for electric power generated at Federal projects was announced as next in order.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

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

Mr. PURTELL. Reserving the right to object—and I shall object, in view of the fact that no report on the bill is available—I ask that the bill be passed over.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. May we have an explanation?

Mr. PURTELL. I have no objection to an explanation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The report may be available later in the day. I understand the bill was unanimously reported from the committee. An explanation could be made.

Mr. PURTELL. I welcome an explanation. However, I shall still object to the passage of the bill on the call of the calendar.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Connecticut withhold his objection pending an explanation?

Mr. PURTELL. I withhold my objection pending an explanation.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, this bill was introduced as the result of action on the part of the Department of the Interior, which was taken to bring about an increase in the rates charged by the Southwestern Power Administration, an agency of the Interior Department, for power sold to the preference customers of the Government, namely, rural electric cooperatives, municipalities, and Government installations.

The rate now in effect was put into effect, I believe, in 1946, for a period of a certain number of years, with the notice that the interim rate would then terminate, and the future rate would be as fixed by the Federal Power Commission, or as approved by the Federal Power Commission upon the application of the Southwestern Power Administration.

A number of actions have been taken since the expiration of the primary term of the rates, whereby the same rate was continued in effect, on the application of the Department of the Interior, and with the approval of the Federal Power Commission. Now the Department of the Interior seeks to increase the rate by about 40 percent.

Pursuant to action by the Public Works Committee and the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee of the Senate, and the corresponding committees in the House, whereby they requested the Department of the Interior to postpone its effort to bring about an increase in the rate, the Department of the Interior has three times postponed the action whereby it sought to bring about an immediate increase in the rate. Each of the postponements was for 30 days. The last one was made on April 7.

In the absence of a further request by the Department of the Interior, which we do not anticipate, or in the absence of a denial by the Federal Power Commission of the application of the Department of the Interior to increase the rate, it means that 30 days after April 7 the rate charged by the Southwest Power Administration for electric power furnished to the rural electric cooperatives, municipalities, and the Government installations served will be increased by about 40 percent. That will result, in my judgment, and on the basis of testimony brought before the committee, either in the serious impairment of the financial structure of most rural electric cooperatives in the Southwest, or in their being forced into such a position that they will have to fail to meet their commitments for repayment of their loans to the Government.

It is the position of those who introduced the bill and of the sponsors of the bill—and they are on both sides of the aisle, and action on it was unanimous by the Public Works Committee—that if the bill is not passed, a crisis will confront the power consumers which will result in an impairment of their position. Such a result, in my judgment, would be contrary to the wishes of Congress and contrary to the spirit of the act under which the preference customers were created, and would cause to the farmers of the country hardship and a great burden, which would be added to the other burdens which we know about, and with which we are so well acquainted and familiar.

It is my hope, and the hope of the sponsors of the proposed legislation, that the bill will be passed by the Senate. It would freeze the rates as of this date until June 30, 1957. During the interim it would be the purpose of the sponsors of the proposed legislation to seek to

bring about, by further legislation, a declaration of policy by Congress which would control the Department of the Interior in the fixing of its rates to the REA's, the municipalities, and Government installations.

If it is not done, we will be confronted with the very amazing situation that the Reynolds Aluminum Co., under the terms of a contract made some three or four years ago, to run for 25 years, would be getting power from the Southwest Power Administration, through the Arkansas Light and Power Co. transmission facilities, at a rate less than 5 mills per kilowatt-hour, while at the same time every rural electric cooperative which is being served by the Southwest Power Administration would be paying a little more than 7¾ mills per kilowatt-hour.

We would be confronted by a situation whereby the REA's, municipalities, and Government installations themselves would not only be paying the Government a sufficient amount to reimburse the Government for the part of the power facilities which furnish power dedicated to these customers, but the REA's and the others would also be paying a deficit which the Interior Department says has been and is being created because they are selling power too cheap or at less than cost, first, to the utilities themselves and, second, to the Reynolds Aluminum Co.

I know it is not the purpose of Congress either to bring that about or to permit it. However, unless the bill is passed, that situation will develop.

Therefore, in view of the fact, first, that the action of the committee was unanimous and, second, that the bill was amended in a way which, in my judgment, meets the specific objections both of the Department of the Interior and of the Budget Bureau, it is my hope, Mr. President, that the objection will be withdrawn and the bill permitted to be passed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to announce, for the information of the Senate, that the Government Printing Office seems to be slow in sending to the Senate reports on some of the bills on the calendar. I do not know the extent of the hearings involved, or how voluminous is the report on the pending bill which makes it impossible for the Printing Office to have the report available when the bill is being considered. However, I assume that the Government Printing Office has its own justification. I have asked that the matter be looked into. I assume that the report on the bill will reach the Senate some time during the day. I would therefore like to inform the Senate that at the conclusion of the consideration of the bills on the calendar, if the report is available—so that Senators who prefer to read the report, may study it—it will be the purpose of the leadership to bring the bill up on motion.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to commend the Senator from Texas for handling the business of the Senate so rapidly that he even keeps ahead of the Government Printing Office.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, if I may address an inquiry to the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma, I should like to ask him whether a delay in the consideration of the bill until the report is received would in any way interfere with the objective of the bill. My objection is based entirely on the fact that no report on the bill is available to us.

Mr. KERR. I will say to the distinguished Senator from Connecticut that it would not. However, the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], who sits with him, and who participated in the hearings on the bill and in the writing of the bill, is thoroughly familiar with it, and indeed helped to bring about the action which resulted in the bill being reported to the Senate. I would be glad to accept from him any amendment to the statement I made to the bill if I in any way failed to give a correct or adequate explanation of it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, it is not the purpose of the majority leader that the Senate consider any measure unless and until each Senator can hear the report, feel the report, actually touch it, and even smell it, if he wants to do so, notwithstanding the fact that it may be an oral report. For that reason I will myself ask that the bill go over until the report on it is available.

The majority leader wishes to call attention to the fact that the Government Printing Office should have had the report available for us.

Mr. KERR. I thank the Senator from Connecticut for his attitude, and I thank the Senator from Texas for his kind remarks, and I shall be very glad to accede to their request.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with what the Senator from Oklahoma has said about the conditions which have arisen. It is very unfortunate that discrimination should exist in that area under the new formula of the Department of the Interior. I wish to associate myself with what the Senator from Oklahoma has said about it today.

Mr. KERR. I thank the Senator from Arkansas. I wish to say one further word. It is the purpose of the Department of the Interior to follow through on this policy wherever the Department of the Interior provides power.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I also wish to associate myself with the Senator from Oklahoma in supporting the bill, and to point out that if for any reason the parliamentary situation should be such that we cannot consider the bill on the call of the calendar, I hope the majority leader will schedule the bill for debate at a very early date.

It is obviously a very sound bill. The Senator from Oklahoma will recall that he offered it during the debate on the farm bill as an amendment to the farm bill. At that time it was ruled—and I believe erroneously ruled—that the amendment was not germane to the farm bill. In due time, I intend to file with the Senate a memorandum on that parliamentary ruling, because I believe it is a precedent which must be erased from the records of the Senate. The bill is actually a farm aid bill, in that it comes to the assistance of the REA's. In my judgment, it is just as germane to a farm bill as any aid provision in any farm bill could possibly be.

I hope the bill will be considered at a very early date, either on the call of the calendar or by way of its being scheduled for debate on motion.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. On request of the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] the bill will be passed over.

RESOLUTION AND BILL PASSED OVER

The resolution (S. Res. 240) certifying the report of the Senate Committee on the judiciary concerning Mary Knowles was announced as next in order.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I ask that Calendar 1784, Senate Resolution 240, just announced, and Calendar 1785, Senate Resolution 241, certifying the report of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary concerning Herman Leveright, be passed over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolutions will be passed over.

The bill (S. 924) to confer jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon claims of customs officers and employees to extra compensation for Sunday, holiday, and overtime services after August 31, 1931, and not heretofore paid in accordance with existing law, was announced as next in order.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

AMENDMENT OF TITLE 18 OF THE UNITED STATES CODE—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code, so as to increase the penalties applicable to seditious conspiracy, advocating overthrow of Government, and conspiracy to advocate overthrow of Government was announced as next in order.

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

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. An explanation is requested of Calendar No. 1787, H. R. 2854.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, the committee reported the bill with the statement that the penalties imposed were not sufficient in cases of this kind. The bill raises the amount of the fine from not more than $5,000 to not more than $20,000 in cases of seditious conspiracy, and the term of imprisonment from not more than 6 years

to not more than 20 years. The bill increases the fine and the term of the sentence.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is advised that there is no report accompanying the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask that the bill be passed over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

MEMORIAL TO THE AMERICAN INDIAN FOUNDATION

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 71) to commend the foundation known as the Memorial to the American Indian Foundation for its project to establish a permanent memorial in honor of the North American Indians was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Whereas it is fitting that there should be a permanent memorial in honor of the North American Indians, the original Americans;

Whereas there has been chartered by the State of Michigan a nonprofit corporation known as the Memorial to the American Indian Foundation for the purpose of establishing such a memorial, which will be located in the State of New Mexico; and

Whereas the establishment of such a memorial would acknowledge the contribution made to our Nation by the North American Indians: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That the Congress hereby commends the Memorial to the American Indian Foundation for its noteworthy project to establish a permanent memorial in honor of the North American Indians, and extends to such Foundation its best wishes in carrying out such project.

EXCLUSION OF CERTAIN LANDS FROM ACADIA NATIONAL PARK, MAINE

The bill (S. 2305) to exclude certain lands from Acadia National Park, Maine, and to authorize their disposal as surplus Federal property was announced as next in order.

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

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, the bill simply permits the Federal Government to dispose of 300 acres of certain surplus property for which the Federal Government finds no further use. It is referred to as a part of the Acadia National Park. However, it is located some 35 miles away from that park. There was formerly a fish hatchery located on the property which the Government closed some time ago.

Mr. MORSE. I suppose the transaction is in accordance with terms and conditions of the Surplus Property Act?

Mr. LONG. That is correct.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the tract of land in Acadia National Park, State of Maine, comprising approximately 300 acres and identified as the "Green Lake Fish Hatchery Tract" is hereby excluded from Acadia National Park, and the said tract is authorized to be disposed of in accordance with the laws relating to the disposition of Federal property.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LANDS BY THE COUNTY OF CUSTER, MONT.

The bill (S. 3254) to authorize the county of Custer, State of Montana, to convey certain lands to the United States was announced as next in order.

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

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, this bill relates to property conveyed originally for fairground purposes. The Federal Government would like to have back a small parcel of the land, and the State has no use for the particular property involved in the bill. Inasmuch as the law requires that the property must be disposed of in a block, the bill would permit the State to give back the desired portion of the property without affecting the status of the remainder.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted etc., That the county of Custer, State of Montana, may, notwithstanding the provisions of the act of April 15, 1924 (43 Stat. 97), convey by quitclaim deed to the United States of America, for acceptance by the Secretary of the Interior under existing law, the following tract of land:

That portion of tract "C" as shown on the supplemental plat of townships 7 and 8 north, range 47 east, principal meridian, Montana, accepted by the assistant commissioner of the General Land Office on March 23, 1927, which is described as follows: Beginning at a point on the south boundary of tract "C", 669.23 feet north 73 degrees 10 minutes west of corner numbered 11 of tract "C", which point is 80 feet south 28 degrees 08 minutes west of the fair grounds boundary fence; thence north 61 degrees 52 minutes west, parallel with and 80 feet from the fair grounds boundary fence, a distance of 1,280.123 feet to the west boundary of tract "C"; thence south 16 degrees 50 minutes west along the west boundary of tract "C", a distance of 250.84 feet to a corner numbered 3 of tract "C"; thence south 73 degrees 10 minutes east along the south boundary of tract "C", a distance of 1,255.33 feet to the place of beginning, containing 3.614 acres, more or less.

TITLE AND POSSESSION TO CERTAIN REAL PROPERTY, PENSACOLA, FLA.

The bill (H. R. 5310) to quiet title and possession with respect to certain real property in the city of Pensacola, Fla., was announced as next in order.

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

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, this is a bill to quiet title to certain property in Pensacola, Fla. The title to this property runs back prior to the date when the United States took possession of Florida. The Federal Government has no objection to the proposed legislation. There might be some question as to whether a rather complicated lawsuit should be used to accomplish the objective, but there is no objection to quieting the title.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the bill involves a 39-foot lot in the city of Pensacola, title to which had passed from the Spanish Government 6 years prior to the acquisition of the Floridas. There is no objection by anyone to this bill, which, in effect, quiets title to that 39-foot lot. There is an explanation contained in the House Report No. 1772, a reading of which would, I think, prevent any question arising as to adjoining lands, because the point raised here does not apply to the adjoining lands.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the portion of the House report, consisting of about one page, under the heading "Explanation," be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the House Report No. 1772 was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXPLANATION

Pensacola was an established town when the United States acquired Florida in 1819. Under the Spanish grant the United States succeeded to the rights of Spain in lands within the city of which disposition had not been made.

It appears from the records that the 39-foot lot described in the bill was disposed of 6 years before the United States acquired Florida from Spain. However, it appears that in order to perfect title it is necessary that the United States disclaim any interest whatsoever by quitclaim deed.

A photostatic copy of the abstract of title to the land, prepared by the Title Guarantee Co. of Florida, shows that on June 26, 1813, the parcel of land described in the bill was sold for the city, of Pensacola by Don Antonio Cabanas, minister of army and finance, to one Maria Louisa Gayarre. The deed is recorded in Spanish Archives A, page 321, and recites that it was sold by order of the Governor and Ayuntamento to provide for the purchase of provisions for the garrison. In 1817 the property was deeded to James Falconal. There followed a long succession of recorded deeds in the chain of title down to the present claimants to the property.

The Department of the Interior has no objection to the enactment of legislation which would accomplish the objective of this measure. However, the Department's report suggested an amendment to the act of January 12, 1925 (43 Stat. 738), so as to permit the claimant to have his claim adjudicated under the Color of Title Act of December 22, 1928 (45 Stat. 1069), as amended (43 U. S. C., secs. 1068–1068b). The departmental report and testimony before the Public Lands Subcommittee base support for the suggested amendment primarily on the declared belief, or on speculation, that there may be other property in the old city tract of Pensacola subject to the same title uncertainties here involved, i. e., other property which might require quitclaiming of title by the United States at some time in the future. The feeling of the Department, also acknowledged to be based on speculation, that the issuance of a quitclaim deed on the property might cloud the title of adjacent land patented (patent No. 996,407) in 1927, is not shared by the committee.

The committee notes and the Department witness so affirmed during the hearing on the bill, that the amendment proposed by the

Department would involve a complicated procedure requiring an adjudication by the Federal Government as to the ownership of the land, whereas nothing more than a simple action to quiet title, as provided by H. R. 5310, is all that is necessary in this instance. The author of H. R. 5310, the Honorable Robert L. F. Sikes, suggests, and the committee agrees, that in the event that any other property in Pensacola is found to require similar treatment, it should be considered and disposed of on its merits.

The committee recommends the enactment of H. R. 5310.

No expenditure of Federal funds is required by this legislation.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

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

BURIAL IN NATIONAL CEMETERIES OF REMAINS OF CERTAIN COMMISSIONED OFFICERS, PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The bill (H. R. 8728) to authorize the burial in national cemeteries of the remains of certain commissioned officers of the Public Health Service was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RELEASE OF CERTAIN LANDS IN MONTANA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1053) to amend the act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to lease certain lands in the State of Montana to the Phillips County Post of the American Legion in order to authorize the renewal of such lease, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of the Interior may dispose of the southwest quarter southeast quarter and the east half of southeast quarter southwest quarter of section 35, township 32 north, range 32 east, Montana principal meridian, comprising 60 acres, to Phillips County Post, No. 57, of the American Legion, Department of Montana, under the provisions of the Recreation Act of June 14, 1926, as amended by the act of June 4, 1954 (68 Stat. 173).

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to dispose of certain lands in the State of Montana to the Phillips County Post of the American Legion."

CONVEYANCE BY QUITCLAIM DEED OF CERTAIN PROPERTY TO THE FAIRVIEW CEMETERY ASSOCIATION

The bill (S. 2144) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey by quit claim deed certain real property of the United States to the Fairview Cemetery Association was announced as next in order.

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, in view of the fact that we have no report accompanying this bill, I ask that it be passed over.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut withhold his request?

Mr. PURTELL. I shall be delighted to withhold it.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, this bill involves 20 acres of property in the State of North Dakota. The property would be sold in order that it could be used for burial plots. It would be sold at its appraised value. If there is good reason for delaying action on the bill, I shall not insist on explaining it, but I am sure the Senator from Connecticut would have no objection to it.

Mr. PURTELL. I have no objection to the bill being brought up later today, but by reason of the fact that we have no report accompanying the bill, I ask that it go over.

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

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I see no objection to considering any bill passed over only because no report was available as, in effect, a new bill, and not as one included with those bills which are passed over for cause, because, as the Senator knows, we sometimes begin a calendar call with a new bill. If objection is raised only because of the report not being before us, I think it would be well to consider such a bill subsequently as being called up for the first time.

Mr. LONG. I think there are three other bills now on the calendar which do not happen to have reports.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I wonder if I might propound a question. Is that to be the attitude taken with reference to every bill on which no report is available? I am asking the question for the simple reason that there is another measure on the calendar in which I am interested, and I shall not wait for it to come up if this is to be the course followed.

Mr. PURTELL. I am sure the Senator agrees that bills might be considered even in a case where we have studied the report only half an hour ago, but where there is no report, it seems to me such a bill should be passed over.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I do not object to that procedure. I think it is perfectly good. I was simply asking for information. But I hope that later in the day Calendar 1796, Senate bill 3515, to amend the National Housing Act, may be taken up in the event the report becomes available, because it is an urgent matter.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the majority leader will attempt to comply with the request of the Senator from Alabama. It may be that the influence of the distinguished Senator from Alabama, which is very great in this body and in many parts of the Nation, can be exercised on the Government Printing Office and cause it to send reports to the Senate a little more promptly. It sends reports without bills, and bills without reports.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, most of these bills were only reported on April 18. We are going to find a good many from now on. Would it not be better not to place on the calendar bills which have no reports accompanying them?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Except that in some cases a bill will go on the calendar of bills to which there is no objection.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, if there be no objection, I should like to ask that, starting at this point, at the next calendar call we begin with this bill, because there are several other bills from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs on which reports have been sent to the Government Printing Office but have not yet been received by the Senate.

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, I subscribe to the suggestion of the minority leader as to the manner in which such bills should be treated. In every instance, of course, the explanation is given that the objection is raised only on the basis that no report is available.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is the understanding of the Chair that the bills to which there has been objection and which have been passed over, and regarding which no report is available, shall be considered as new bills on the reprinting of the calendar.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to have all Senators on notice that when the reports arrive, the majority leader may move to take up any of those bills today or tomorrow, or whenever it is convenient. I had hoped that explanations could be given, so that all Senators could understand the bills. They were unanimously reported from committee and there were no objections to the bills.

I had hoped that the Senate might go over from Thursday until Monday. If the reports can be obtained later in the day, it may be that those bills can be considered then. So I want all Senators to be on notice of the possibility that the bills may be called up on motion.

Mr. PURTELL. I think the majority leader will agree that we have been trying to cooperate; but, as I said, up to the time of the quorum call the reports had not been received. I wanted that fact to be known.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, on April 18, 32 bills were sent to the Government Printing Office, but some of them were not returned as it was expected they would be.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague on the committee, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], I wish to say that we could not ask for finer cooperation than we have received from the members of the Calendar Committee on the other side of the aisle, the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL] and the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA].

Mr. PURTELL. I thank the Senator from North Carolina.

ADVISABILITY OF ESTABLISHING FORT CLATSOP, OREG., AS A NATIONAL MONUMENT

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the next bill on the calendar.

The bill (S. 2498) to provide that the Secretary of the Interior shall investigate and report to the Congress as to the advisability of establishing Fort Clatsop, Oreg., as a national monument was announced as next in order.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill has not been called before. Is there objection to its present consideration?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to make a full and complete investigation of the advisability of establishing Fort Clatsop, located in Clatsop County, Oreg., as a national monument.

SEC. 2. As soon as practicable after the date of the enactment of this act, the Secretary of the Interior shall report to the Congress the results of such investigation and study made by him under the first section of this act, together with such recommendations as he deems appropriate. Such report shall contain specific findings with respect to (1) the national historical importance of the proposed memorial, (2) the size, present status, and condition of Fort Clatsop, and (3) the estimated total cost of establishing such memorial.

AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL HOUSING ACT, AS AMENDED—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 3515) to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, to assist in the provision of housing for essential civilian employees of the Armed Forces, was announced as next in order.

Mr. PURTELL. In the absence of a report on the bill, and only because at the moment no report is available, I ask that the bill go over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

SALE OF TIMBER WITHIN THE TONGASS NATIONAL FOREST, ALASKA—BILL PASSED OVER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk does not have a copy of Calendar No. 1797, Senate bill 2517, to amend subsection 3 (a) of the act approved August 8, 1947, to authorize the sale of timber within the Tongass National Forest, Alaska.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Let the bill go over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

LENGTHENING OF TERMS OF OFFICE FOR JUSTICES OF THE SUPREME AND CIRCUIT COURTS OF HAWAII—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 6162) to provide for longer terms of office for the justices of the Supreme Court of Hawaii and the circuit courts of Hawaii was announced as next in order.

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

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, the bill merely provides that the Chief Justice and Justices of the Supreme Court of Hawaii shall have their terms increased from 4 to 7 years, and that the judges of the Circuit Courts of Hawaii shall have their terms increased from 4 to 6 years. The bill merely lengthens the judicial terms of the justices of those courts.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I desire to look further into the bill. Because I am opposed to life tenure for Presidential appointees, I should like to study this extension of tenure for territorial courts. I therefore object to the consideration of the bill until I have had an opportunity to examine further into the matter.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

COMPENSATION OF SUPREME COURT JUSTICES AND CIRCUIT COURT JUDGES—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 7058) to amend the act of May 29, 1928 (45 Stat. 997), in respect of the compensation of Supreme Court Justices and circuit court judges was announced as next in order.

Mr. ERVIN. Over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

ESTABLISHMENT OF PUBLIC RECREATION FACILITIES IN ALASKA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4047) relating to the establishment of public recreation facilities in Alaska, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with an amendment, at the end of the bill to add a new section, as follows:

SEC. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $100,000 per year for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1957, June 30, 1958, June 30, 1959, June 30, 1960, and June 30, 1961.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The bill was read the third time and passed.

AUTHORIZATION FOR THE TERRITORY OF ALASKA TO INCUR INDEBTEDNESS—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 4781) to authorize the Territory of Alaska to incur indebtedness, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Since the clerk does not have a copy of the bill at the desk, the bill will go over.

RELIEF OF ALISON MacBRIDE

The bill (H. R. 6078) for the relief of Alison MacBride, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PAYMENT OF A GRATUITY TO MARY MARGARET O'HARA

The resolution (S. Res. 242) to pay a gratuity to Mary Margaret O'Hara was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Mary Margaret O'Hara, widow of Robert E. O'Hara, an employee of the Senate at the time of his death, a sum equal to 11 months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

RESOLUTIONS PASSED OVER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk does not have at the desk copies of Calendar No. 1804, Senate Resolution 243, and Calendar No. 1805, Senate Resolution 244. The resolutions will be passed over.

PRINTING AS A SENATE DOCUMENT OF SENATE DOCUMENT NO. 97, 82D CONGRESS, ENTITLED "ELECTION LAW GUIDEBOOK"

The resolution (S. Res. 245) authorizing the printing as a Senate document of the revised edition of Senate Document No. 97 of the 82d Congress, entitled "Election Law Guidebook," was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the revised edition of Senate Document No. 97 of the 82d Congress, entitled "Election Law Guidebook" be printed as a Senate document.

PRINTING AS A SENATE DOCUMENT OF 58TH ANNUAL REPORT OF NATIONAL SOCIETY OF THE DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

The resolution (S. Res. 246) to print the 58th annual report of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution for the year ended April 1, 1955, as a Senate document, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the 58th annual report of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution for the year ended April 1, 1955, be printed, with an illustration, as a Senate document.

RESOLUTIONS PASSED OVER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Copies of Calendar No. 1808, Senate Resolution 239, and Calendar No. 1809, Senate Resolution 238 are not at the desk. The resolutions will be passed over.

ERECTION OF APPROPRIATE MARKERS IN NATIONAL CEMETERIES

The bill (S. 2512) to amend the act of August 27, 1954, so as to provide for the erection of appropriate markers in national cemeteries to honor the memory of certain members of the Armed Forces who died or were killed while serving in such forces was considered, ordered to

be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to provide for the erection of appropriate markers in national cemeteries to honor the memory of members of the Armed Forces missing in action," approved August 27, 1954 (68 Stat. 880), is amended by striking out "missing in action" and inserting in lieu thereof "who died or were killed while serving in such forces, and whose remains have not been identified, have been buried at sea, or have been determined to be nonrecoverable."

BILLS PASSED OVER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Copies of Calendar No. 1811, H. R. 1774, to abolish the Verendrye National Monument, and to provide for its continued public use by the State of North Dakota for a State historic site, and for other purposes; Calendar No. 1812, H. R. 8957, to extend the time within which the District of Columbia Auditorium Commission may submit its report and recommendations with respect to the civic auditorium to be constructed in the District of Columbia; and Calendar No. 1813, S. 2875, to revise the Civil Service Retirement Act, are not at the desk. Therefore, all three bills will be passed over.

That completes the call of the calendar.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if I may have the attention of the calendar committees on the minority side and the majority side, I wish to express the gratitude of the leadership for the fine work done thus far today, and for the cooperation of all Senators concerned, on both the minority and the majority legislative review committees. Theirs is not a pleasant task, and it requires much sacrifice on the part of the members of the committees involved. The majority leader wishes to commend the Senators involved for the most excellent work they have done.

I also wish to inform those Senators, and also the members of their staffs, that at the conclusion of the consideration of the unfinished business, if reports are available on the bills which have been passed over, the Senate may consider them, in the hope that we may go over until next Monday, and not meet tomorrow.

PARTICIPATION BY THE UNITED STATES IN THE FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION AND INTERNATIONAL LABOR ORGANIZATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 97) to amend certain laws providing for membership and participation by the United States in the Food and Agriculture Organization and International Labor Organization, and authorizing appropriations therefor.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, as I understand, under the unanimous-consent agreement, on the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 97, 2 hours will be allowed on any amendment or motion, and 1 hour on the passage of the joint resolution, the time to be equally divided. Is that correct?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is correct.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, before proceeding with the unfinished business, I should like to ask unanimous consent that I may speak for 5 minutes on a subject on which I could have spoken during call of the calendar. I withheld making my request at that time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding the fact that the unfinished business has been laid before the Senate, the senior Senator from Oregon may be recognized for 6 minutes, without the time being charged to either side.

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

OBSERVANCE OF PAN AMERICAN DAY

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on April 14, last Saturday, there was held at the Pan American Union in Washington a ceremony of great interest for those of us in the Western Hemisphere. The Ambassadors of 21 American Republics representing 335 million Americans met at the headquarters of the Organization of American States. They were there to attend the unveiling of a bust of the late beloved Cordell Hull, American Secretary of State from 1933 to 1944, and one of the foremost advocates in his time of the doctrine of Pan-Americanism. The occasion marked the 66th anniversary of the founding of the Pan American Union, or Pan American Day as it has come to be known in its annual observance throughout this hemisphere.

During his years as Secretary of State, Mr. Hull came to be regarded in many ways as the personification of the inter-American spirit of unity and common purpose which is symbolized in this annual observance. His active and continuing interest in the relationship of the United States with our sister republics is too well known here to require elaboration. It was during his tenure that the concept of the good-neighbor as applied to the free nations of the Americas became a practical reality.

Since Mr. Hull's day, the principles which he helped to establish as a basis for our relationships with the other countries have been tried and proved on many occasions.

To mention only a few instances during the past year, many will recall that when a difficult situation arose several months ago between two of our neighbor nations in this area, the peace machinery of the Organization of American States was successfully used in helping to bring about a settlement. This machinery has been forged slowly, and sometimes painfully, over the years, to give concrete expression to the desires of the 21 American Republics that disputes between them should be settled amicably, and without endangering the security or well-being of other nations in the community. It is a model that some of the governments of the Old World might well adopt. Indeed, in a sense they have done so, for many of the principles embodied in the United Nations Charter were based on concepts developed within the inter-American system.

In another field entirely, Members of the Senate will recall, I am sure, the quick and effective assistance which was rendered by our Government to Mexico and Honduras when parts of those countries were damaged by floods. More recently, during the past month in fact, we have helped to provide medication and equipment to Argentina, to help her people cope with a severe epidemic of polio.

It is perhaps not so well known, but should be equally recorded here, that when floods and hurricanes damaged parts of our own Northeast in 1955, contributions were made by us to several of the Latin American Republics.

Meanwhile, our own Government has continued to give expression to the policy of inter-American cooperation through its programs of technical assistance, and cultural exchanges, as well as through negotiations of specialized agreements in many fields, such as those providing for the joint development of peaceful uses of atomic energy.

All this of course does not mean that our relations with our sister republics are perfect. There are from time to time subjects on which we disagree heartily and emphatically. We realize, for example, that while great progress has been made in recent years in the development of representative government in Latin America, there is still room for improvement. However, it must also be said in justice that from the Latin point of view, some of our policies also often may seem less than ideal, perhaps including some in the field of economic affairs. But such disagreements are common among good neighbors, and quite possibly further help to lend strength and vitality to our friendship. After all, it would be a sterile partnership which did not occasionally have its disagreements.

While it is proper and constructive to acknowledge such areas of difference, I believe the important thing to bear in mind on Pan American Day is the spirit of unity and progress which makes the inter-American system work—and which was reflected so magnificently in the personality of Cordell Hull.

Consider for example the inspiration it must provide to the captive peoples of the Communist satellites to look across the ocean and observe the mutual respect and consideration with which our 21 Republics, the great and the small, conduct their business with each other. They should take hope for their own future freedom from the spectacle of so many nations, so different in language, background, economic development, and military strength, sitting at the common council table to resolve their differences in harmony and work out their individual destinies with due regard for the rights of their neighbors. It proves that such relations are possible among nations no less than among individuals. Therein lies the great hope and faith which we all express, knowingly or not, when we celebrate Pan American Day.

THE SOUTH—THE NATION'S NEW ECONOMIC FRONTIER

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 10 minutes, with the same understanding under which the Senator from Oregon addressed the Senate. I just spoke to the acting minority leader, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], about the request I was about to make.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, it is satisfactory to me, so long as we can, as soon as possible, get to the business at hand. There are some Senators who desire to leave as early as possible.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I may say it will save time if I make my statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DOUGLAS in the chair). Is there objection to the unanimous consent request? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Arkansas may proceed.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, almost 18 years have passed since President Roosevelt referred to the South as the Nation's No. 1 economic problem. Since then, the South has undergone deep and penetrating changes, as has the entire Nation. To take stock of the economic changes in the South, I instructed the staff of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee to study the economic and financial status of the southeastern region of the United States, including the area comprised of Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, and Virginia. The study is being conducted with the cooperation of the Legislative Reference Service and is now entering its final stages. It will be presented to the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency before the 18th anniversary of the famous Roosevelt speech on the South.

The preliminary findings of the study are becoming clear: the South is no longer the Nation's No. 1 economic problem; it is now the Nation's new economic frontier.

The level of economic development in the South is still considerably behind that of the rest of the Nation. However, we no longer view our difficulties as a national problem, but as a challenge to ourselves; a challenge to develop our potentials to reach the national level of economic development so that the people of the South may share fully in the American standard of living. That is the birthright of every American from every region of the country—on the farm and in the city.

LOW INCOME OF INDIVIDUALS IN THE SOUTH

The economic well-being of the people in the South has risen markedly in the past years, but it still falls below that enjoyed by the rest of the country. Possibly the best single measurement of the economic well-being of a region is its per capita income. Measured in these terms, the average income of persons outside the South is almost 50 percent higher than in the South—see table 1.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, at the conclusion of my remarks, a number of tables relating to the substance of the remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, several factors, some of them rather complicated, account for these differences in income. Here are just a few of them.

First. Farming is relatively more important in the South than it is in the rest of the country. The proportion of persons engaged in agriculture is twice as great in the South as it is in the rest of the United States. In my own State of Arkansas, the comparable ratio is three times as high as in the rest of the country. This puts us at an economic disadvantage, since farmworkers earn less than half of that earned by workers in nonagricultural occupations.

Second. In the South, we have relatively less manufacturing than in the other sections of the country. More than 1 out of 4 workers in the United States is engaged in manufacturing, compared with less than 1 out of 5 in the South. Arkansas, unfortunately, in this respect lags behind most other States. In my State, manufacturing provides jobs for only about 1 out of 7 gainfully employed persons—see table 2.

Third. On the whole, the breadwinner in the South shares his lower income with more persons than does his counterpart in other sections of the country. The birth rate in the South is higher than in other regions, and, consequently, so is the proportion of dependent children. Many southerners migrate to other areas when they get to be of working age, and are a source of vitality to growing urban centers throughout the country. In recent years, the net outmigration from the South has exceeded inmigration by about 300,000 a year—see table 3.

Fourth. The growth of cities and schools has a direct bearing upon income, as has the type of industry and commerce. In all these aspects the South is below the national average. It has a higher percentage of rural population and a higher ratio of workers in the less-efficient forms of industry and commerce, while the level of educational achievements of the southern people is lower.

Fifth. Wages and salaries in the South are lower. As of 1954, hourly earnings of manufacturing production workers in the South averaged $1.36, or only about three-fourths of the national average. The South does not have its share of high-paying industries, such as automobiles, steel, and rubber. On this basis, the production worker outside the South had to work 9 months to get the same income as the southern worker earned in a whole year. Nevertheless, since the end of World War II, the progress of manufacturing wages in the South has kept pace with that in the rest of the country—see table 4.

Sixth. The financial and credit institutions are not developed as efficiently as similar institutions in the more industrialized parts of the country.

RECENT ECONOMIC GROWTH OF THE SOUTH

All these facts sound rather grim, but they hide the story of the remarkable growth and progress that the South has achieved during the past few decades. Per capita income in the South has risen to two and a half times the 1929 average, while for the whole country it rose only one and a half times. In the past 15 years alone the per capita income in my State almost quadrupled, while in the United States it tripled.

Another over-all measurement of economic progress is the rise in total nonagricultural employment. Here, too, the South's growth has been more rapid than in the rest of the Nation. Between 1939 and 1954 nonfarm employment in the 11 southern States rose by 72 percent. In the other 37 States, it rose 56 percent—see table 5.

Another excellent gage to measure the progress of a region is the development of electric energy—the lifeblood of industry. Between 1939 and 1954 electric energy output in the South grew more than one and a half times as fast as it did in the Nation as a whole. In this respect I am happy to point to Arkansas, whose electric output in the last 15 years increased twenty-eight-fold. A recent survey of southern electric utilities showed that total installed generating capacity doubled in the past 5 years, and it is expected that it will double again in the next 6 or 7 years. For the Nation as a whole it is anticipated that it will take 50 percent longer to double electric capacity.

Economic growth and expansion require investments, and the southern share of manufacturers' expenditures for new plants and equipment has increased over the years even more than has the phenomenal rise in industry nationwide. In 1939 the South accounted for 12.4 percent of the total; this share ran to 13.8 percent in 1947 and 15.5 percent in 1953, the latest year for which data are available. Here again, I am happy to note that manufacturers' expenditures for new plant and equipment rose relatively more than 50 percent faster in Arkansas than in the Nation as a whole—see table 6.

Yes, the South is the Nation's new economic frontier, but its potential is still far from being a reality. The area is ideal both for work and play. Its recreational facilities are unexcelled, its climate delightful, and its investment opportunities abundant. The climate pays off not only in year-round recreation and sunshine, but also in dollars and cents. Investors in the South find that a dollar invested in southern plant goes further, because the mild climate precludes the necessity of winterized building. Similarly, available data indicate that a dollar invested in agricultural development—particularly raising livestock—in the South goes further than in the rest of the country.

But let me hasten to add that, as any frontier, our economic problems are still far from being solved, and we must not and do not intend to rest on the laurels of past achievements. Thus far, the per capita income of even the richest State in the South is still below the national average. So we must continue to strive to improve our economic conditions to reach the national level, and, I hope, even forge ahead of the national average.

The people of the South have made sacrifices to achieve economic progress. During the 15-year period between 1939 and 1954 State taxes in the South have increased threefold, while the comparable increase for the rest of the country was less than double—see table 7.

In this connection, the increased expenditures for education are particularly significant. We know that there is a direct relationship between levels of education achieved by persons and their income. Comparable data on educational attainment and income show that the differentials in income between the South and the rest of the country decrease with the increased level of education—see table 8. It can be expected, therefore, that increased expenditures for education in the South would be rewarded in cultural enrichment as well as in rising income.

The expenditures made for education is a good gage for measuring educational progress. In this respect, too, the South is also catching up with the rest of the Nation. Between 1939–40 and 1953–54 the South enlarged its expenditures per pupil in public elementary and secondary education by 306 percent. During the same period, the Nation as a whole increased its spending per pupil by 235 percent—see table 9.

THE NEED FOR INTENSIFIED INDUSTRIALIZATION

On the economic front we must concentrate our energies on accelerating the development of our industries. The South still does not have its appropriate share of manufacturing, and a considerable proportion of its limited manufacturing is concentrated in the relatively less efficient industries. The census of manufacturing divides American industries into 20 major groups. The value added per employee by those industries varied in 1953 between a high of $12,200 in the chemical industry to a low of $4,400 in apparel. More than half of the manufacturing employees in the South were employed in 1953 in the five industries which rank lowest according to the value added per employee. The same industries accounted for less than a fifth of the workers in the rest of the United States. These industries were apparel, leather, textiles, lumber, and furniture. The top five industries according to value added per employee—petroleum, chemicals, tobacco, primary metals, and paper—accounted for a fifth of the total employees in the South as well as in the other regions of the United States.

The value added by manufacturing per employee averaged $7,100 in 1953 in the country, as compared with $5,800 for the South. Moreover, between 1947 and 1953, the value added per employee rose more sharply in the rest of the United States than in the South. Apparently the higher concentration of lower ranking productive industries in the South accounted for the fact that its industry trailed behind the rest of the Nation in terms of value added—this despite the fact that the number of manufacturing employees had increased at about the same rate in the South as it had in the rest of the country—see table 10.

TO HIM THAT HATH

But again I am optimistic as to the future. The South is blessed with richness of resources, both human and natural, that are needed in the most rapidly growing United States industries, including petroleum, chemicals, and paper. And the old practice of shipping the raw materials for processing and manufacturing to other areas is slowly but surely disappearing.

This growth has in turn attracted the location of new industry, though not in sufficient quantity. The automobile industry serves as an excellent illustration. Motor vehicle registration in the Southern States has increased more rapidly than in the rest of the country. The automobile manufacturers have responded to this rise by building new assembly lines. Each new assembly plant, in turn, attracts associated industries: tire plants, producers of fabricated metal parts, chemicals, and others.

The experience of Arkansas, if I may turn again to my favorite State, illustrates this point. Barely 6 years ago lumber, which in terms of value added per employee is the least productive industry group in Arkansas, accounted for 40 percent of the production workers in manufacturing. Since then employment in lumber has declined by 25 percent, but the slack in employment has been taken up by relatively more productive industries, such as metals, chemicals, and petroleum.

POSITIVE POLICIES ACCOUNTING FOR GROWTH

I am also counting on the competitive factors to benefit the South. The southern advantages in resources will continue to spur the establishment and expansion of new industry. It is on this basis that I oppose the distortion of the Walsh-Healey Act which the Secretary of Labor has used as a basis for setting uniform nationwide minimum rates for establishments bidding on Government contracts. A realistic policy should take cognizance of the fact that labor costs, as well as other costs, may vary from market to market and region to region.

Now, lest I be misunderstood, I do not favor that industries move to the South solely because of its lower wages. I fully expect and hope that the wages and salaries of the working people in the South will rise to the national average with further increase of industrialization. But I am equally opposed to the Government favoring one region over the other in awarding contracts.

A positive Government policy to stimulate competition calls for Government recognition of the need to encourage small and new business. In this connection, I have introduced recently a bill on behalf of myself and a majority of the distinguished members of the Committee on Banking and Currency, representing both parties, which is designed to relieve the Federal income-tax burden on small business. I am convinced that this is the most practical way to help small business and stimulate competition, which is the lifeblood of American industry. Briefly, this bill will reduce taxes of corporations earning up to $25,000 per year by 26.7 percent; corporations earning $50,000 per year will pay approximately 10 percent less; corporations earning $100,000 per year will pay between 2.7 and 4.3 percent less, while the Federal income taxes of larger corporations will remain virtually unchanged or will be increased, if it is found necessary to make up the loss in revenue due to the reduction of taxes of smaller corporations.

I believe that this bill would be of material benefit to the smaller business of the Nation, and would encourage the growth of new business throughout the Nation.

I am also deeply concerned with the fact that not all the sections of our economy have been sharing in the rising income of recent years. Prosperity cannot last long when large sections of the population do not get their fair share of the total national pay. Such a situation is also manifestly unfair and unjust.

It is for these reasons that I am particularly disturbed about the present depression in agriculture. So far, my own State has not been hit as hard as others. But, as I have stressed earlier, the economic well-being of the South is still largely dependent upon agriculture, and a depression in agriculture threatens the very foundations of our economy.

Government responsibility in this area is paramount. The staff study to which I referred earlier points to the scarcity of long-term and intermediate-term credit that is now available to farmers. There is ample evidence that the judicious use of these types of credit can increase farm efficiency and income, particularly that of small and part-time farmers. The additional resources made possible by credit have increased productivity of farmers and have tended to reduce underemployment. The private credit institutions in the South have accomplished a great deal in recent years toward extending agricultural credit facilities in the South, but I believe that a more energetic and positive Federal Government policy in this area is highly desirable.

Expansion of credit facilities is, however, only one facet of a rounded Federal program to aid the farmer. But, since we have just spent a considerable amount of time on the Senate floor in discussing this question in great detail, I do not think that it is necessary to elaborate on this point.

I should also like to say a few words about the role of the South in the all-pervading problem—the present uneasy peace which is threatened by aggressive world communism.

The needs of our national defense require greater dispersal of our industrial capacity. Thus far little has been done in this direction. Industry has favored geographic concentration as a means to achieving greater efficiency and economy of operations. The Government has hardly intervened with industry's natural desire to achieve expansion at the lowest possible cost. This practice will have to be seriously revised. The threat of atomic warfare will force us to disperse our industrial capacity as a defense measure.

The geopolitics of this situation favors the South, which is located at the farthest point on the continental United States from likely sources of atomic attack. Naturally, regional interests are

secondary to the needs of national defense. But it is the very interests of national defense and survival that require greater dispersion of industry, and the South stands to benefit from these regrettable, but unfortunately compelling, circumstances.

CONCLUSION

Mr. President, my remarks were addressed to the conditions which have accounted for the South's becoming the Nation's new economic frontier and the challenge that is before us to make this a reality.

But we must not forget for one moment that only what is good for the Nation is also good for the South. We cannot materialize the economic promise of the South unless we ascertain that conditions of full employment prevail throughout the Nation. A national policy of full employment is an essential ingredient for the economic growth of the South. The region's greatest gains in per capita income occurred during the years when full employment prevailed throughout the country. Only under conditions of full employment can all the regions and economic groups share in the blessings of plenty and the promise that is a free and prosperous United States.

The tables ordered to be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of Senator FULBRIGHT's remarks are as follows:

TABLE 1.—*Per capita income, United States and South, 1954*

State	Per capita	Percent of United States	Rank among 48 States	State	Per capita	Percent of United States	Rank among 48 States
United States	$1,770	100.0		Kentucky	$1,216	68.7	41
South	1,233	69.7		Louisiana	1,302	73.6	38
Rest of United States	1,909	107.9		Mississippi	873	49.3	48
Alabama	1,091	61.6	45	North Carolina	1,190	67.2	43
Arkansas	979	55.3	47	South Carolina	1,063	60.1	46
Florida	1,610	91.0	27	Tennessee	1,212	68.5	42
Georgia	1,237	69.9	39	Virginia	1,480	83.6	33

Source: U. S. Department of Commerce. Survey of Current Business, September 1955.

TABLE 2.—*Distribution of civilian labor force, 1950*

	South	Percent of total civilian labor force				South	Percent of total civilian labor force		
		United States	South	Rest of Nation			United States	South	Rest of Nation
	Thousands				Nonagricultural—Continued	*Thousands*			
Total	10,968	100	19.5	80.5	Transportation, communications, and basic utilities	690	7.8	6.3	8.1
Agriculture	2,526	12.2	23.0	9.6	Wholesale and retail trade	1,800	18.8	16.4	19.3
Forestry and fisheries	53	.2	.5	.1	Finance, insurance, and real estate	244	3.4	2.3	3.7
Nonagricultural, total	8,018	87.6	73.1	91.3	Services	1,795	18.0	16.4	20.6
Mining	189	1.7	1.7	1.6	Public administration	428	4.4	3.9	4.6
Construction	699	6.1	6.4	6.1	Industries not reported	177	1.5	1.6	1.5
Manufacturing	2,173	25.9	19.8	27.4					
Durable goods	817	13.8	7.4	15.3					
Nondurable goods	1,344	11.9	12.3	11.8					

Source: 1950 Census of Population, vol. II. Characteristics of the Population: United States Summary, tables 55 and 80, individual State volumes, table 30 in each.

TABLE 3.—*Net civilian migration, United States and South, April 1950 to July 1954, and percent natural growth, 1954*

Area	Net migration [1] (thousands)	Percent natural growth	Area	Net migration [1] (thousands)	Percent natural growth
United States	+1,233	1.6	Kentucky	−176	1.6
South	−1,191	1.9	Louisiana	−30	2.1
Rest of country	+2,424	1.5	Mississippi	−231	2.3
Alabama	−277	1.9	North Carolina	−170	2.0
Arkansas	−247	1.7	South Carolina	−67	2.2
Florida	+330	1.6	Tennessee	−128	1.7
Georgia	−147	2.0	Virginia	−48	1.8

[1] Net total migration comprises both net immigration from abroad and net interstate migration.

Source: Bureau of the Census. Current Population Reports, Series P-25, No. 124.

TABLE 4.—*Average hourly earnings in manufacturing, United States and South, 1954*

	Hourly rate	Percent of United States		Hourly rate	Percent of United States
United States	$1.81	100	Kentucky	$1.66	92
South	1.36	75	Louisiana	1.58	87
Rest of United States	1.89	104	Mississippi	1.18	65
Alabama	1.43	79	North Carolina	1.25	69
Arkansas	1.25	69	South Carolina	1.26	70
Florida	1.36	75	Tennessee	1.45	80
Georgia	1.27	70	Virginia	1.42	78

Source: U. S. Department of Labor. Employment and Earnings, May 1955.

TABLE 5.—*Employment in nonagricultural establishments by major industry groups, United States and South, 1939 and 1954*

Industry	Employment 1954 (thousands)			1954 as percent of 1939			Industry	Employment 1954 (thousands)			1954 as percent of 1939		
	South	United States	Rest of Nation	South	United States	Rest of Nation		South	United States	Rest of Nation	South	United States	Rest of Nation
Total	7,541	48,285	40,744	172	159	157	Trade	1,726	10,498	8,772	197	159	153
Mining	141	770	629	96	91	90	Finance, insurance, and real estate	264	2,114	1,850	240	155	148
Contract construction	488	2,527	2,039	224	220	219	Service	788	5,629	4,841	174	169	168
Manufacturing	2,310	15,989	13,679	155	159	158	Government	1,219	6,751	5,532	184	169	166
Transportation and public utilities	612	4,008	3,396	146	138	136							

Source: U. S. Department of Labor. Employment and Earnings. Annual Supplement, May 1955.

TABLE 6.—*Percentage increase in electric energy output, 1939–47 and 1939–54, and in manufacturers' expenditures for new plant and equipment, United States and South, 1939–47 and 1939–53*

State	Electric energy output		Manufacturers' expenditures for new plant and equipment		State	Electric energy output		Manufacturers' expenditures for new plant and equipment	
	1939–47	1939–54	1939–47	1939–53		1939–47	1939–54	1939–47	1939–53
United States	135.9	318.0	381.9	505.3	Louisiana	163.2	542.1	515.2	1,307.0
South	198.9	570.2	434.2	651.0	Mississippi	500.0	3,600.0	312.7	447.3
Alabama	117.9	341.0	508.4	728.6	North Carolina	236.0	488.0	361.7	525.5
Arkansas	800.0	2,850.0	588.6	763.6	South Carolina	118.8	300.0	466.1	440.4
Florida	245.5	909.1	542.3	1,223.1	Tennessee	320.0	800.0	265.9	583.0
Georgia	150.0	406.3	368.3	421.7	Virginia	205.3	447.4	482.4	599.0
Kentucky	277.8	1,311.1	747.3	1,033.0					

Source: National Industrial Conference Board. The Conference Board Business Record, December 1955.

TABLE 7.—*State tax collections, United States and South, 1954, and 1954 increase over 1939*

	1954 (millions of dollars)	1954 percent increase over 1939		1954 (millions of dollars)	1954 percent increase over 1939
United States	11,088.9	207	Kentucky	138.1	167
South	2,153.3	288	Louisiana	294.7	291
Rest of United States	8,935.6	192	Mississippi	119.9	329
Alabama	159.9	231	North Carolina	294.8	272
Arkansas	105.7	244	South Carolina	157.0	423
Florida	267.8	320	Tennessee	194.7	302
Georgia	224.7	340	Virginia	196.0	258

Source: U. S. Bureau of the Census.

TABLE 8.—*Median income by level of highest formal education attained, United States and South, 1949*

Years of school completed	United States	South	Years of school completed	United States	South
No. years of school	$1,108	$777	High school, 1 to 3 years	$2,517	$2,498
Elementary school, 1 to 4 years	1,365	1,023	High school, 4 years	3,285	3,079
Elementary school, 5 to 7 years	2,035	1,591	College, 1 to 3 years	3,522	3,382
Elementary school, 8 years	2,533	2,032	College, 4 years or more	4,407	4,251

Source: Bureau of the Census.

TABLE 9.—*Expenditures for public education—total current expenditures and expenditures per pupil: United States and South, 1953–54, and increase over 1939–40*

	Total expenditures		Expenditures per pupil		Expenditures for public education as percent of personal income, 1954		Total expenditures		Expenditures per pupil		Expenditures for public education as percent of personal income, 1954
	1953–54 (millions of dollars)	Percent increase 1953–54 over 1939–40	1953–54	Percent increase 1953–54 over 1939–40			1953–54 (millions of dollars)	Percent increase 1953–54 over 1939–40	1953–54	Percent increase 1953–54 over 1939–40	
United States	9,109.0	294	$355	235	3.19	Kentucky	81.7	204	$160	302	2.26
South	1,399.9	385	224	306	3.43	Louisiana	156.2	440	320	321	4.16
Rest of United States	7,709.1	281	398	232	3.15	Mississippi	57.2	260	127	273	3.08
Alabama	101.5	316	165	293	3.10	North Carolina	202.9	387	232	373	4.04
Arkansas	71.1	356	200	440	4.04	South Carolina	130.1	554	285	506	5.39
Florida	161.7	492	299	321	3.04	Tennessee	122.2	309	191	254	3.00
Georgia	139.8	478	198	340	3.13	Virginia	175.5	483	285	360	3.33

Source: Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Preliminary data.

TABLE 10.—*Value added by manufacturing per employee, United States and South, 1947 and 1953*

Industry	1947			1953			Industry	1947			1953		
	South	United States	South as percent of United States	South	United States	South as percent of United States		South	United States	South as percent of United States	South	United States	South as percent of United States
Total	$4,465	$5,207	85.8	$5,799	$7,117	81.5	Petroleum and coal products	$10,612	$9,506	111.6	$15,565	$12,191	127.6
Food and kindred products	5,613	6,259	89.7	7,244	8,204	88.2	Rubber products	6,154	5,028	122.4	10,049	7,492	134.1
Tobacco manufactures	6,589	5,737	114.9	12,612	10,342	121.9	Leather and leather products	3,600	4,000	90.0	4,747	4,558	104.1
Textile mill products	4,114	4,330	95.0	4,155	4,671	88.9	Stone, clay, and glass products	4,160	4,991	83.4	6,404	7,410	86.4
Apparel and related products	2,868	4,107	69.8	3,144	4,412	71.2	Primary metal industries	4,487	4,982	90.1	7,518	8,545	87.9
Lumber and products (except furniture)	2,804	3,928	71.4	3,340	4,862	68.6	Fabricated metal products	4,358	5,066	86.0	6,243	7,286	85.6
Furniture and fixtures	3,587	4,274	83.9	4,603	5,672	81.1	Machinery (except electrical)	4,049	5,055	80.1	6,553	7,911	82.8
Paper and allied products	7,099	6,391	111.1	9,620	8,368	114.9	Electrical machinery	4,500	4,859	92.6	6,378	7,187	88.7
Printing and publishing industries	5,057	5,967	84.7	6,852	7,781	88.0	Transportation equipment	4,491	4,966	90.4	6,411	7,602	84.3
Chemicals and allied products	6,619	8,484	78.0	10,362	12,129	85.4	Instruments and related products	3,564	4,656	76.5	4,858	7,599	63.9
							Miscellaneous manufacturers	3,071	4,500	68.2	4,844	6,249	77.5

Source: United States figures: Annual Survey of Manufactures, 1953, table 2. South: Special tabulation by Bureau of Census.

ORDER FOR RECESS UNTIL MONDAY

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 on Monday next.

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

PARTICIPATION BY THE UNITED STATES IN THE FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION AND INTERNATIONAL LABOR ORGANIZATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 97) to amend certain laws providing for membership and participation by the United States in the Food and Agriculture Organization and International Labor Organization, and authorizing appropriations therefor.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment which I intend to offer later.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will lie on the table.

The pending question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER].

The Chair calls attention to the fact that the Senate now is operating under the provisions of the unanimous-consent agreement which was entered on yesterday.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be a quorum call at this time, without charging to either side the time required therefor.

Mr. BRICKER. Certainly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Then, Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER]. Will the Senator from Ohio indicate how much time he yields?

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I yield myself 15 minutes. I may not require all of it. This record was largely made last week, when the joint resolution was brought up for consideration, but I wish briefly to supplement the record at this time.

Mr. President, the amount of money involved in the pending resolution, Senate Joint Resolution 97, is relatively small. However, a very great moral issue is presented for our decision. The question is: Shall the Congress of the United States, by raising the ceiling on United States contributions to the International Labor Organization from $1,750,000 to $3 million, condone by implication the action of the ILO in recognizing that Communist agents masquerading as employer and employee representatives from Soviet countries are entitled to participate and to vote in meetings of the International Labor Organization?

My amendment to Senate Joint Resolution 97 does not—

First. Call for United States withdrawal from ILO. My amendment to the pending resolution will not prevent United States employer, employee, and Government delegates to the ILO from fighting out the Communist issue within that organization.

Second. If my amendment to the pending resolution is adopted, it will not cause the United States to be delinquent in assessments made on the United States by the ILO. The present ceiling on United States contributions to the ILO will not be pierced prior to the time when the Congress considers the budget for fiscal 1958. If the next Congress—unwisely in my judgment—wants to give the ILO more money, even though the ILO recognizes that there are no free and independent business and labor organizations behind the Iron Curtain, the next Congress can do so.

My amendment to Senate Joint Resolution 97 simply provides that no sums in excess of the present ceiling, $1,750,000, shall be contributed to the ILO for any calendar year after 1956 if during the preceding calendar year phony employer and employee delegates from the Soviet bloc countries are permitted to vote at ILO meetings. If the Senate does not adopt the pending amendment, we shall, in effect, have endorsed the ILO's action in seating and granting voting privileges to phoney employer and employee representatives from Communist countries.

The Communist delegates and their friends can then say, "Look at what the Congress of the United States has done." The argument can easily be made in ILO circles that the Congress, knowing that so-called Communist employer and employee delegates were granted voting privileges, nevertheless increased the statutory ceiling and, in fact, by the amendment adopted in the Senate last Monday, has permitted the United States percentage share of the ILO budget to rise from its present figure of 25 percent to 33⅓ percent. That is the great danger in passing Senate Joint Resolution 97 in its present form.

I should now like to clarify in several respects the record which was made in the Senate last Monday. The distinguished junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] pointed out that no hearings had been held on the resolution but that "the reason why there were no public hearings is that there were no requests on the part of anyone to come before the committee at that time." I am confident that the reason no requests were made to be heard on this important matter is that interested parties outside of the executive branch were not advised that the matter was under consideration. Senate Joint Resolution 97 was not introduced in the Senate, but reported as an original resolution from the Senate Foreign Relations Committee at the request of executive agencies.

Some misunderstanding exists as to Communist voting strength in the International Labor Organization. The United States, of course, is outvoted by the Communist bloc 32 to 4. While there are 280 votes in the ILO, 4 for each of its 70 members, the average vote at the ILO Conference is about 175. There are some small countries which do not send delegations, some countries are in arrears on their dues, and there are always some abstentions in voting and some absentees. On most votes in the ILO, 87 is a majority. Accordingly, a solid Communist bloc of 32 votes can carry most measures with the support of so-called neutralist nations.

Passage of my amendment will maintain the status quo until the executive branch has completed its study on United States participation in the organization, until the Senate Foreign Relations Committee has had an opportunity to hear representatives of American labor and business organizations, and until the International Labor Organization itself has had an opportunity to reconsider its ill-advised action in seating as bona fide employer and employee representatives mere mouthpieces of the Kremlin. According to my information, the 1956 ILO Conference will discuss, but not decide, the Communist issue in ILO; the ILO governing body will consider the issue at its November 1956 meeting; and the 1957 ILO Conference may place the issue on its agenda for a final decision.

In my judgment, passage of the pending amendment will strengthen the bargaining position of United States delegates representing employers, employees and the Government of the United States. Our entire delegation strongly opposed the acceptance of employers and worker delegates from Communist countries by the ILO. They recognized that these delegates were completely controlled by the Soviet Government, and that their acceptance by the ILO violated the ILO constitution and the fundamental tripartite character of the organization. But whatever others may think, the Congress of the United States should not take any action which would even remotely imply that there exists free and independent labor and business organizations behind the Iron Curtain.

In this connection, I should like to read to the Senate two telegrams which I have received. The first is from Mr. Charles P. McCormick, president of McCormick & Co., of Baltimore, Md., which reads as follows:

> As United States employer delegate to the ILO during the years of 1949 to 1952, member of the governing body of the ILO from 1949 to 1952, president of the International Organization of Employers in 1951 and vice president of the ILO Conference in 1950, I am absolutely in favor of Senator Bricker's amendment to Senate Joint Resolution 97.
>
> When a communistic power sends a representative to the employers' meeting as an employer, he is definitely controlled in mind and action and ceases to become a free man. The spirit of the ILO is tripartite and each employer, worker, or government delegate should be free to act as an independent man and not have his vote controlled. Until such time as this is clarified, Senator BRICKER's

amendment should stand to stimulate only fair and tripartite work in the ILO.

As a citizen and employer, I believe that man should have freedom of choice and not be subject to pressure or coercion when voting as an employer or as a worker in any international gathering.

The second telegram is from Mr. W. L. McGrath, of Cincinnati, Ohio, and it reads as follows:

If the ILO budget and United States contributions to the ILO are to be increased, it is of even greater importance to support Senator BRICKER'S proposal that no additional funds from the United States may be used for this purpose as long as agents of the Communist Party, masquerading as representatives of free employers and free workers, are allowed to sit in ILO conferences.

As the United States employer-delegate to the ILO 1954 and 1955 conferences, I watched these men use the ILO as an international forum for denouncing the United States and promoting the cause of the Communist Party. They have 32 votes to our 4. As long as they are allowed to participate in ILO conferences, any increase in ILO contributions from the United States of America will, in fact, have the effect of helping to finance Communist anti-United States propaganda. Why should the United States taxpayers help the Communist spread international poison?

It is my belief that the participation of Communist so-called employer and worker delegates in the ILO is contrary to the ILO constitution on the ground that such delegates do not represent employers or workers but represent governments and are indistinguishable from government representatives. A debate on this subject is now going on in the ILO but it is my belief that no constructive action will be taken unless the ILO is jolted by action such as is proposed by Senator BRICKER.

For the purpose of the record, I ask unanimous consent that the text of a speech delivered by Mr. McGrath, who has had as extensive experience in this field as anyone else, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

THE SURPRISING CASE OF THE ILO

(By William L. McGrath, president, the Williamson Heater Co., Cincinnati, Ohio,[1] before the 54th annual meeting of the National Machine Tool Builders' Association, the Waldorf Astoria, New York, N. Y., October 25, 1955)

At its next session, our Congress will be asked to raise the ceiling for the United States contribution to the International Labor Organization from $1,750,000 a year to $3 million a year. This provision is contained in Senate Joint Resolution 97. If this is agreed to by the Congress, it will be just another example of $3 million of the taxpayers' money going for a purpose that few people know anything about and most Americans have never even heard of.

The total budget of the ILO is arrived at by multiplying by four the contribution of the United States. We pay 25 percent, and the other 69 member countries pay the remaining 75 percent. If we boost our contribution from $1,750,000 to $3 million, this boosts the total ILO budget from $7 million to $12 million, and will enable it to expand its activities accordingly.

How many of you men here today are familiar with the ILO, and what it does? Most of you know, I presume, that it is affiliated with the United Nations. But are you aware that the International Labor Organization has been in existence for some 36 years, considers itself an international parliament, and is drafting basic laws on social and economic matters which are having profound influence upon legislation all over the world?

As the years have gone by you have seen one Socialist proposal after another introduced into the House and the Senate of the United States. Haven't you ever wondered where these things came from? Well, I can give you the answer. Many of them have originated in the ILO, which has for years been the breeding ground of international socialistic legislation.

The ILO originated with the League of Nations, with the idea that an international organization devoted to consideration of the problems of labor the world over would be a useful adjunct to the league, and an instrument on behalf of world peace.

The League of Nations died, but the ILO kept right on going; and the United States joined it in 1934.

Then along came the United Nations, and the ILO hooked up with the United Nations in 1945. The ILO is, however, not under the direction of the United Nations. The United Nations gives the ILO an additional $2 million a year, of which we pay 33⅓ percent, for what it calls its technical-assistance program, but the ILO runs its own show and gets its own budget appropriations directly from member governments.

The ILO as originally conceived was supposed to concern itself purely with questions dealing with labor—but at a meeting in Philadelphia in 1944 they adopted a declaration which said, among other things, that "poverty everywhere constitutes a danger to prosperity everywhere," that people have a "right" to economic security, and which stated, "It is the responsibility of the International Labor Organization to examine and consider all international, economic, and financial policies in the light of this fundamental objective."

By this device the ILO arrogated unto itself the supposed right to draft basic laws, on social and economic questions, for adoption by member countries all over the world.

In 1954 Russia, which had long been absent from the ILO came back in a big way, bringing satellite countries also into the picture. The Communists gained a strong foothold in 1954 and strengthened their position in 1955.

That in the main brings you up to date on the origin and development of the ILO.

Now let's consider the functioning of the ILO. As I said before, although it is a United Nations affiliate, it isn't bossed by the United Nations, and furthermore it is unique among international agencies because it is not composed solely of representatives of government.

At its annual conference held each June in Geneva, Switzerland, each participating nation has 4 voting delegates; 2 representing government, 1 representing employers, and 1 representing workers. The delegates are accompanied by advisers. Total attendance is usually over 600, with over 60 nations represented.

At the annual conference, the ILO enacts proposals which are in effect skeleton drafts of legislation which it hopes will be enacted by member countries. These may be passed in the form of a resolution, a recommendation or a convention. A convention—and pay close attention to this—is a draft of a proposed international law which, when ratified by member nations, stands as a treaty among them. By this means the ILO seeks to introduce standardized basic laws into countries all over the world.

When the United States joined the ILO in 1934, it was with the reservation that our country would not be bound by such convention procedure, but would consider any ILO proposals as recommendations only. In 1944, however, when our Congress, by joint resolution, approved the Philadelphia declaration, we entered the ILO on the same basis as other member nations—so that today, if we ratify an ILO convention, it stands as an international treaty and we are bound by it accordingly.

The ILO has a governing body, composed of representatives of governments, workers, and employers, which serves, you might say, as its board of directors. I was elected 1 of the 10 employer members of the governing body.

It has a permanent office in Geneva headed by a Director General, and a staff of about 800 persons. This is known as the International Labor Office. It sends missions of technical assistance to countries all over the world, supposedly to help increase productivity, but I suspect largely to propagandize on behalf of socialism. It conducts research and makes investigations, the purposes and results of which are not too clear, and releases publications, the purpose of which is only too clear—namely, that of propagandizing all over the world on behalf of the ILO and the socialistic measures which it champions and promotes.

There is something unique about the Geneva ILO staff and personnel—they are all tax-exempt. Although they constantly recommend measures that will add to the taxes of everybody else, they themselves pay no income taxes to any country.

In its earlier years the ILO devoted itself to matters directly concerned with labor. It enacted conventions, for example, on living quarters of seamen in the international marine service, the employment of women in underground mines, the employment of children in factories, safety provisions, and so forth, and proposed a series of constructive practices which everybody in our country would agree should apply to employment conditions the world over.

But then the ideology of state socialism came into ascendancy in Europe and spread to other parts of the world. The ILO fell completely under the domination of a Socialist government-labor coalition. It decided that anything in industry, government, or social systems that in any way affected the workingman was a subject for consideration by the ILO. This was how the state Socialists moved in on the Organization, and used it as a means of promoting Socialist ideology.

The employer delegates to the ILO have consistently and eloquently objected to the proposed drafts of international Socialist laws fostered by the ILO; but they have been hopelessly in the minority, and outvoted on practically all issues.

Now, I have told you that the ILO is a breeding ground of Socialist ideas. So now I think I had better get down to cases and give you a few specific examples.

First of all, suppose I review the basic principles of socialism as I understand them from my ILO experience.

In the United States we believe, as was said in our Declaration of Independence, that men are born with certain inalienable rights, and that government derives its powers from the consent of the governed.

The principle of socialism is exactly the opposite. The premise of socialism is that all rights belong to government—and government then parcels them out to the people in line with its own divine judgment. I have sometimes said that the main purpose of the ILO is that of trying to substitute government for God.

The underlying theme of ILO proposals is always government regulation, government domination, government control, government

[1] Mr. McGrath was United States employer delegate, ILO Annual Conferences of 1954 and 1955; United States employer adviser, ILO Annual Conferences of 1949, 1950, 1951, and 1952; member, ILO governing body.

direction, government supervision, and, of course, in the long run, government ownership of industry, government price control, and government dictation as to jobs and wages. There is no half-way stopping point on the road to collectivism.

Well, to start with specific cases, let's take the subject of collective bargaining.

It is certainly quite proper for the ILO to endeavor to protect the right of collective bargaining, but let me tell you how far the ILO is going in that direction.

The ILO has proposed that if most of the workers in an industry have signed a collective bargaining agreement, government should have the power to compel the rest of the workers in that industry to sign up likewise, regardless of whether or not they wished to do so. What they want is nationwide collective bargaining enforced by government decree.

But the Socialists go further than that. Some of them in the ILO suggested that one-half of the board of directors of a company should be chosen by management, and the other half should be chosen by the union, which would have an equal right with the management as to the course of action of the company. In case of a deadlock, the matter would be submitted to government. This would put government in the position of being the controlling factor in the future destiny of industrial enterprises.

Do you think this is farfetched?

It is nothing of the sort. This device is known as codetermination, and it is the law in Germany today.

Well, let's go on to another subject. Let's take social security.

It may interest you to know that the ILO brags that one of its earliest and most successful technical-assistance projects was when it sent two experts over to the United States to show us how to set up our social-security system. For social security was born and bred in the ILO.

And social security, according to the ILO, is still in its infancy. In 1952 the ILO enacted a convention entitled "Minimum Standards of Social Security." I want to emphasize that word "minimum," because it is the intent of the ILO at some time in the future to develop, God help us, what they are going to call advanced standards of social security.

Under the title "Minimum Standards of Social Security" the ILO drafted an international law providing government benefits for practically all the ills the flesh is heir to. It is a blueprint for the biggest giveaway program yet devised.

Under this proposal government would pay people money for the following:

Any condition requiring medical care of a preventive or corrective nature, including pregnancy, and any morbid condition, whatever its cause.

Loss of earnings due to sickness or unemployment.

Survival beyond a prescribed age.

Employment injuries.

Babies. The government pays you for having them; the more you have the more money you get.

Child birth, including medical care and hospitalization.

Invalidity—which is defined as "inability to engage in any gainful activity."

Death benefits—that is, life insurance.

Originally included in this proposal was a provision to the effect that all life insurance must be compulsory and subsidized by government, and any insurance would be illegal unless government paid at least 25 percent of the cost of the premiums. This effort at socializing insurance was aimed at putting out of business insurance companies such as we have in the United States.

This convention also contained provisions for socialized medicine, such as they have in England.

Well, now we are getting echoes in the United States.

Our House of Representatives has passed a bill (H. R. 7225) which provides that if at any time after the age of 50 a man becomes totally disabled and is so certified by the government, he can immediately collect the same amount of social-security benefits that he otherwise would get after retirement at age 65. That bill will be up for consideration by the Senate at the next session of the Congress.

Think what that means. To be eligible for total disability, a man must be certified by Government doctors. This means doctors on the Government payroll. This puts doctors in Government, and is the opening step toward socialized medicine.

Now let's take it from the standpoint of insurance. Private insurance companies now protect people against total disability. But now Government comes along and enters that field.

So you have, therefore, in this bill, the opening wedge toward socialized medicine and socialized insurance; and these provisions are lifted out of the ILO Convention on Minimum Standards of Social Security.

For example, the ILO Convention proposes government payments for "invalidity," which it defines as the "inability to engage in any gainful activity." Our bill, H. R. 7225, defines "disability" as the "inability to engage in any substantial gainful activity"—a change of only one word. Our bill states that a person may be ruled disabled as the result of "any medically determinable physical or mental impairment." The ILO uses the phrase "any morbid condition, whatever its cause." We will be hearing more, in this country, about a morbid condition and invalidity.

In 1952 the ILO passed a convention called the Maternity Protection Convention, which provides that:

An employed woman should be given at least 12 weeks off to have her baby, with free medical care and hospitalization.

During this period she would receive from the government, in cash, an amount equal to two-thirds of her pay.

A woman cannot be discharged while on maternity leave.

Interruptions for nursing the baby, and I quote: "In cases where the matter is governed by or in accordance with laws and regulations" are to be counted as working hours and paid for by the company.

I sat in the committee on maternity protection, and at times I couldn't believe my ears. In that committee, representatives from countries all over the world spent an entire half day debating as to whether or not an international law should contain a provision to the effect that a mother should nurse her baby for one hour, during the working day, or for two half hour nursing periods. As I recall it, France held out for two half hours, and Israel held out for one full hour. No conclusion was reached, for the reason, I imagine, that the men on the committee knew little about the subject, and the women on the committee seemed singularly unequipped for the purpose under discussion.

In that committee I got a clear-cut idea as to the relative positions of maternity and paternity in the socialistic utopia.

Apparently, in those golden days, practically all women are supposed to work. Their babies are financed by government benefits; and in due course they bring them to work with them, placing them in government-run nurseries and leaving their machines or typewriters to nurse them on company time. There is no distinction between legitimacy and illegitimacy.

The place of the father in the scheme of things, married or unmarried, is reduced purely to the function of paternity. The state takes over, to a large extent, the functions of the family. It provides against a multitude of contingencies for which, in a free society, the husband and father is supposed to provide.

Under such circumstances, what becomes of the family? What becomes of the home? What is the object of the institution of marriage? What happens to the children, starting life in Government or industrial nurseries? What are the people, save wards of the State?

In 1955 the conference discussed what they termed "welfare facilities for workers." The proposal stated that "the competent authority" (meaning Government) should prepare suggestions for the operations of canteens, feeding equipment, types of meals, balanced diets, food service, and feeding costs. The implication was that Government should take over and supervise all phases of inplant feeding in industrial institutions.

At its 1955 conference the ILO enacted a resolution entitled "Vocational training in agriculture." Never have I seen a document more foreign to the philosophy of the United States.

It assumed, as a basic premise, that the agricultural worker is an employee. It assumed that wages in agriculture are determined on the basis of collective bargaining. And it proposed the setting up of an apprentice system for young farmworkers.

Well, in the United States most of our farmworkers are not employees, they are members of the farmer's family. They don't belong to unions, so the collective-bargaining idea has no application in our country. And as for apprenticeships, about the only way this could be worked out would be for farmers' sons to be apprenticed to their fathers.

Furthermore, embodied in this proposal is a definite pattern of Government domination and control. The general idea is that the Government should take over the vocational training of all youngsters on the farm, in what the ILO calls a systematic and coordinated program.

This program provides that government should provide school textbooks and other educational material, should pass on the qualifications of teacher and examination requirements, should subsidize educational facilities, and make sure that the education and training of young people on the farm should be done by the Government, and not by their parents.

I don't think I need go any further. I could cite many more examples. But I have given you enough to indicate the overall trend of the proposals which the ILO government-labor majority hopes to enact into basic laws which may be followed by other countries all over the world.

And if you think this is not the case, you are very much mistaken. Thus far the ILO has enacted 103 conventions. Of these, Great Britain has ratified 56, France has ratified 73, Belgium has ratified 55, Holland has ratified 42, Argentina has ratified 45.

You will ask, how many ILO conventions have been ratified by the United States? Here is the answer:

Seven conventions have been approved by the Senate and ratified by the President's signature. Most of these deal with conditions of maritime employment and are not socialistic.

Three conventions have been approved by the Senate but not signed by the President, and seven more were sent by Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Truman to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee for action. Several of these involve the threat of the invasion of international laws into our domestic affairs.

Now—why has no further action been taken, with respect to these conventions? And why have the more recent and radical ILO conventions, for which our Government

voted in ILO Conferences, never been submitted to the Senate for consideration, which, under the ILO constitution, our President is supposed to do?

The answer is the Bricker amendment.

With the whole country aroused to the danger of having Socialist measures imposed upon us by the back door of convention ratification, the proponents of such measures have not dared to bring them out on the floor of the Senate.

But in the rest of the world things have gone the other way. A major share of the social, labor, and economic legislation enacted in Europe and in many other parts of the world during the last 20 years has been born in the ILO.

The South American countries and the underdeveloped countries of the Far East have been following the lead of the ILO. They have been told by Socialist Europeans that socialism is the hope of the world, and that the kind of civilization we have in the United States is outmoded and in some mysterious way still lingering along, operating under old-fashioned concepts that are holdovers from the last century.

The fact is that out of the entire world, the United States and Canada are practically the only countries left that are still operating in the main on the basis of the free-competitive system.

Well—so far I have given you the picture of the ILO previous to the time the Russians moved in on us. As I said before, Russia had been out of this picture for a long time, but in 1954 they moved back in in a big way, and brought their satellites along with them.

They precipitated a debate which is still going on in the ILO, a debate which is founded upon a fundamental premise.

From the very beginning the employer delegates to the ILO, who under its constitution are supposed to represent free associations of free employers, contended that the Communist so-called employer delegates could not possibly represent free associations of free employers, because there were no such associations in Communist countries.

Our claim was that the so-called employer delegates from Communist countries were simply government agents, and agents for the Communist Party.

At the 1954 conference the employer delegates from non-Communist nations made a determined effort to get these Communist so-called employer delegates thrown out. We were defeated. At the 1955 conference we tried to keep them off our employer committees, and once more we were defeated.

In 1954 the United States Government supported our position. But in 1955 our Government reversed its stand and supported the Communists. We wound up by having Communist agents placed on the employer groups of the ILO. Let me explain how this works out.

The working committees of the ILO are tripartite; that is, on each committee we are supposed to have representatives of government, employers, and workers. But what happens if we get Communists officially seated as members of employer groups. The result is as preposterous as if the National Association of Manufacturers, or the United States Chamber of Commerce, should accept Communist agents on their boards of directors.

I simply could not face up to this proposition. At the 1954 conference I protested as strongly as possible, but to no avail. At the 1955 conference I withdrew the United States employer delegation from participation in any ILO working committees upon which Communist so-called employers had been seated. I felt that a time had come to make a stand on principle.

Now I wonder whether you realize what the invasion of the ILO by the Russians actually means.

Russia has come back into the ILO as three countries—the U. S. S. R., the Ukraine, and Byelorussia. That is the basis upon which Russia belongs to the United Nations. I do not know yet why Russia represents 3 nations in the United Nations whereas we represent only 1. But that is the situation.

In addition, Russia is now reinforced in the ILO, on a very active basis, by Poland, Bulgaria, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, and Albania. That makes 8 Iron Curtain countries that have a total of 32 votes in the ILO, as compared to 4 votes from the United States. Meanwhile we pay 25 percent of the cost, while the 8 Communist countries pay a total of 14½ percent.

The Communists have got their foot in the door in the ILO, and they are preparing to take it over. Their interminable tirades of oratory at the 1955 session were incredible.

Many nations of the rest of the world are much impressed, and are afraid of the Russians. It seems to me very probable, therefore, that from now on ILO proposals and findings will, without question, go more definitely to the left. The ILO is going to be swamped by Red propaganda.

We were told by a member of the Labor Department, in the last days of the Truman regime, that it was important that the United States pretend, in the ILO to go along with Socialist philosophy, because the Socialists would help us contain the Communists.

Did they? The answer is, they did not. The Communists now have a good chance of taking over not only the propaganda aspect of the ILO, but a good share of its overall operation.

And when you get right down to it—what is the difference between a Communist and a Socialist?

Socialism and communism are rival collectivist systems, competing for followers and for political power. In the ILO each strives for influence, as opposed to the other; but when it comes to matters of basic principle, both of them go right down the same line.

I think the distinction between communism and socialism has been excellently stated by Earl Bunting, former president of the National Association of Manufacturers, who said to me, one day, "Communism is the cruel force required to put socialism into effect."

So we have, in the ILO, a struggle between communism and socialism—and in between the two, our whole system of freedom, our whole system of competitive enterprise, is dropped in the middle, neglected and scorned as something old-fashioned, outmoded, and no longer suited to modern civilization.

So I, for one, am getting pretty sick and tired of a situation which is becoming progressively impossible.

Up until the time the Russians came back into the ILO, I felt that the United States employers were accomplishing something. We had definitely succeeded in having some of the most objectionable provisions of proposed ILO conventions thrown out. We had done far more than that. We had raised such a row against the very principle of conventions enacted as international laws that the ILO has passed only one convention in the last 3 years.

But when the Communists came back in, and were accepted, and we had Communist agents put on employers committees—well, that to me well-nigh spelled the end of the road.

There is one last stand still to be taken. The ILO has appointed a committee to determine whether employer and worker delegates from various countries represent associations of free employers and free workers, or whether they don't. The idea is that the report of this committee might be the basis for formulating a constitutional amendment under which so-called Communist employer and worker delegates could be thrown out. This committee is supposed to make its report at the November meeting of the government body, which I shall attend.

If this committee makes its report in all sincerity on the basis of actual facts, if the ILO governing body takes this proposal seriously and puts the matter on the agenda of the ILO Conference, I think that we in the United States should stick tight and use our utmost influence to further this objective.

But if, on the other hand, things go the other way—and I think they will—if no determined effort is made by the ILO to disqualify the Communist so-called employer and worker delegates—we will be faced with the prospect that the ILO will become just another Communist-dominated organization. And in that case I can say very frankly that I can see no further constructive purpose to be gained by continuing further United States participation in the ILO.

But no matter what we do about the ILO, remember that this is only one of the various arms of the United Nations that are enacting conventions, and seeking thereby to write laws governing internal domestic affairs and impose them upon us by the device of treaty ratification.

We need the constitutional amendment proposed by Senator BRICKER to protect us against this threat to the principle of self-government. I don't want the laws of the United States written for us by representatives of over 60 foreign countries. I say, let's write our own laws, in our own way.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I should like to have printed in the RECORD at this point some comments which have been made by representatives of Communist countries to show that their participation is merely a propaganda ruse on the part of the Communist representatives. I might say that not only did our delegation oppose the entrance of the Communists into ILO conferences and committees, but that, likewise, Italy, France, New Zealand, The Netherlands, Ireland, and the United Kingdom, in expressions from their representatives, also opposed the seating of the so-called employer and employee delegations from Soviet Russia. I should like to give two or three examples of what has been stated at these conferences by delegates from Communist countries, to illustrate to Senators what the representatives of the United States are up against when they sit down with these delegates from Communist countries.

I rather agree with Mr. Meany of the American Federation of Labor–CIO, that he will not sit at a conference table with Communists on matters of this kind. He very expressly stated that in a recent speech.

I now should like to insert in the RECORD some excerpts from speeches made by Communist representatives after they had been seated. One of them, a delegate from the Ukraine, said:

> The trade union organizations of the Ukraine have over 1,800 clubs, 21,000 special meeting halls and aproximately 5,000 libraries, with tens of millions of volumes. The workers have every facility for rest in clubs, palaces, and cultural houses. Factories and workshops are equipped with rest rooms and sports grounds.

The Government delegate from the U. S. S. R. said:

> In the United States, as in other capitalist countries, various forms of forced labor are linked together in a remarkable way. The United States is the country where the capitalists most cruelly exploit their employees by means of the most subtle forms of sweat

labor. In the United States also there are still vestiges of slavery.

The Government delegate from Bulgaria said:

In the capitalist countries, legislation is such that employers can make tremendous profits and at the same time pay the workers—who are the real producers of goods—very low wages, thus condemning them to misery, unemployment and suffering. By contrast, in our country, as well as in the Soviet Union and in the People's Democracies, this problem has been happily solved.

These are all Communist countries from which representatives of labor, so-called, and representatives of business, so-called, have been seated, against the votes of the American representatives.

The next quotation is from the delegate from Czechoslovakia:

The proportion of our industrial production in the total national income increased from 56 percent in 1948 to 70 percent in 1953. During the same period, labor productivity increased 60 percent. On the other hand, the increasing number of strikes in capitalistic countries shows that the workers and their organizations are exhausting themselves in a continual struggle.

The delegate from Bulgaria said:

Political tension and economic instability are one consequence of the policy of preparing for a new war furthered in certain capitalist countries, by circles that are guided solely by their material and egotistical interests.

Mr. President, I could go on and read endlessly quotations from speeches made by delegates from Communist countries who have been seated against the votes of the American delegation.

If the Senate does not adopt the pending amendment, it will be, in effect, saying to our representatives: "There is no use continuing your fight. There is no use for you to stand adamant against these representatives of phony employers and phony employees, or in carrying on the fight you have been waging."

Mr. President, I believe it is essential that the Senate adopt the amendment, and in that way strengthen the hand of our representatives in the ILO, which has now passed from the phase of considering the interests and the welfare of employers and of labor all over the world, to a socialization program and to a consideration of all sorts of governmental functions, passing resolutions, and drafting treaties, and all sorts of contracts for the various countries to enter into, all of which affect not only labor, but the political interests of our country.

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

Mr. BRICKER. Therefore, I ask that the amendment be adopted, to strengthen the hand of our country's representatives, in behalf of free labor and free business. I yield 20 minutes to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, would the Senator be willing, before he yields to the Senator from Virginia, to answer some questions which I have in mind?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LAIRD in the chair). Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. BRICKER. I yield myself an additional 3 minutes, so that I may answer the questions of the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Did I understand the Senator from Ohio to say that the executive agencies of our Government were in favor of his amendment?

Mr. BRICKER. Agencies of our Government?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Mr. BRICKER. I do not know that any of them have been required to express their feelings on the matter. The State Department did, and I believe the Labor Department also did. I have a record here that Mr. Mitchell was opposed to the seating of the Communist delegates. A bill was introduced, but no hearings have been held on it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like to ask whether the administration has taken a stand on the Senator's amendment.

Mr. BRICKER. I cannot say as to that.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like to ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to address an inquiry to the distinguished minority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Ohio yield for that purpose?

Mr. BRICKER. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. May I inquire of the distinguished minority leader whether the administration has taken a stand on the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will say to the distinguished Senator from Illinois that a representative of the State Department, Mr. Francis Wilcox, appeared before the Committee on Foreign Relations and testified in behalf of the measure which is before the Senate. I believe it is fair to say that he would not be in favor of an amendment of the type of that the Senator from Ohio has offered. It is fair to say that at least Mr. Wilcox, representing the State Department—and I have every reason to assume that he was speaking for the State Department—would be in opposition to the amendment.

I would say to the Senator, however, after having made that statement to the Senate, that, so far as the minority leader is concerned, he intends to support the amendment of the Senator from Ohio, on the basis that it does not take the United States out of ILO and does not reduce the contributions we now make to ILO. It does hold in abeyance, until the matter can be thoroughly gone into by the Committee on Foreign Relations—and I hope the ILO itself—what I believe to be an untenable situation under which the Soviet Government and the other Communist governments purport to speak for both a free labor movement and free business in their respective countries, when the fact is that no such movement or business exists in those countries.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Has the executive office taken any position on this amendment?

Mr. KNOWLAND. If it has, I have not been contacted in regard to it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It has not informed the Senator?

Mr. KNOWLAND. It has not informed me.

Mr. DOUGLAS. What is the attitude of the United States Department of Labor?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Again, I have not been contacted, but I would assume——

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

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I yield another minute to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I would assume from the testimony of Mr. Wilcox that the views which he expressed when he appeared represented the views of the Department of State and the Department of Labor.

Mr. DOUGLAS. And, therefore, of the administration?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should think so.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Secretary of Labor was represented.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. BRICKER. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. As I understand, Mr. Wilcox is a representative of the State Department.

Mr. KNOWLAND. He used to be chief of staff of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. LEHMAN. And he appeared before the committee?

Mr. KNOWLAND. He appeared before the committee. Mr. Wilkins from the Department of Labor appeared in support of the resolution which is now before the Senate without the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LEHMAN. That was my understanding, also.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. BRICKER. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. My understanding is that a representative of the Department of Labor contacted my office and expressed his Department's opposition to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER].

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I yield 20 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON].

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the views expressed by the distinguished minority leader who said that in supporting the Bricker amendment we were merely giving the Foreign Relations Committee and the executive branch of the Government a further opportunity to look into the charges which have been made by the business representative of this group, that the Communist members of the ILO have been using that international organization as a front to promulgate ideas and principles which are to the detriment of the United States and of what we call the free world.

Mr. President, I am frankly discouraged over our participation in what might be called a world struggle for the mastery of men's minds, because, in my opinion, in recent years we have been losing both to socialism and to communism. I have seen that particularly illustrated in the work of the Interparliamentary Union of which I am proud to be at the present time the vice president

of the American group, and I am more familiar with how Communists have tried to use that old and honorable peace organization than any other international organization, as a sounding board for communistic propaganda.

The Interparliamentary Union was organized approximately 70 years ago in Geneva, Switzerland, and the United States was a charter member. At that time we were a young Nation, as nations go. We had a population of less than 58 million. While we were doing pretty well financially, we did not at every international gathering say, "Oh, let me pick up the check; I have so much more than you have."

So, Mr. President, when we went into the Interparliamentary Union 70 years ago we entered it on the same basis as did Great Britain, when Britannia was ruling the waves and the British boasted that the sun never set on the British Empire. We entered it on the same basis as did France which at that time had universal military service and far more military power than we had. For a number of years our contribution to that organization was only $10,000 a year. It was based on population. Finally, as we developed and grew, our contribution reached $18,000, and last year it reached $20,000.

The Interparliamentary Union is an organization with some 46 members. It meets every year in a general assembly, and every spring, in the executive council to prepare the agenda for the fall meeting. The charter of the organization provides that it shall be composed of members of free representative parliaments dedicated to the cause of peace and the extension of democratic principles. Of course, when the Interparliamentary Union was formed Russia, under the czars, did not ask to be admitted. It would not have been admitted, but it did not ask, because the czars were not dedicated to the promulgation of democratic principles.

Not until last year did representatives of the Soviet Union ask to be admitted to the Interparliamentary Union. Then, under the skillful leadership of Lord Stangate, the president of the Interparliamentary Union and a member of the Labor Party of Great Britain and a warm friend and admirer of both the Soviet Union and its satellites, and also of Red China, maneuvers were made to enable Soviet Russia and a number of its satellites to become members of the Interparliamentary Union. Later, at a meeting of the executive committee, which is composed of eight members—we have one member at the present time on that committee—in New Delhi last November a proposal was made by a representative of the Communist group that Red China be admitted to the Interparliamentary Union. We were not present, because we did not know the issue was coming up. There was another nation which was not represented and did not know the issue was coming up. There was a 3-to-3 tie vote, and the tie was broken by Lord Stangate in favor of the Communist group.

That is primarily why I accepted the assignment to go to Yugoslavia in the early part of this month as 1 of 2 delegates from the United States, to block, if we could, the motion which has been made in the executive committee that the executive council should vote to accept Red China as a member of a peace organization, mind you, when her hands were still dripping red with the blood of American boys, when she had been declared to be an aggressor in Korea and still maintains a tremendous army in Korea, to which she has no just and legal claim whatever. Our distinguished colleague, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], is the other delegate.

It may have been because of the secret vote—I am not too sure—but we succeeded at that meeting in defeating a motion made by a representative of Poland, on behalf of the Soviet Union, to admit Red China. But the issue undoubtedly will be brought up again when the Interparliamentary Union meets next fall in Bangkok, Thailand.

At that time I am not too certain that Red China will not be admitted; but I am sure that if Red China is admitted then the votes of the big communistic countries, like Russia and China, all having populations far greater than our own—although there is, under the charter, a limitation upon the total vote any nation may have on the basis of population—plus the votes of the so-called neutral countries, like India, which vote against us every time some proposal is made by a Red group against our interests, will cause the free nations of the world to lose complete control over what once was a very fine group of members of Parliament, who would annually meet in a friendly atmosphere, exchange views, and adopt resolutions and proposals designed to promote the peace of the world and the maintenance of democratic institutions.

As I say, Mr. President, I am more familiar with the debates which occur in that group than I am with those which are alleged to occur in an organization like the ILO.

I can say very definitely that the trend in Europe and in Asia is toward more socialism, which, of course, is a first cousin to communism. No nation has ever attempted pure socialism, which means government ownership and control of all instruments of production, excepting the private ownership of homes, farms, and things of that kind. No nation has ever attempted a full scale regime of communism. Communism has been modified even in the Soviet Union, a nation which has gone further, I believe, in that direction than has any other nation.

When the United States stands as a living example of how much more productive a Nation can be under a system of private enterprise than under socialism or communism, it is difficult for me to understand why we are losing the struggle for the minds of men and to influence them to stay free, and to try to convince them that they will be happier and more prosperous if they will not succumb to the lure of Communist propaganda. But I am convinced that we are losing the struggle, because that is the impression I get everytime I meet with a large group of delegates from 30, 40, or 50 nations at a foreign conference.

We made one so-called socialistic experiment in this country when we decided to follow the advice of the wise Benjamin Franklin, who maintained that the only way to obtain cheap postage was to give the Government a monopoly in the handling of first class mail. That was done; and in every year in which the Government has operated the Post Office Department, except two, the Government has gone in the hole. Last year, after having discontinued the twice-daily delivery of mail, to residential sections, thus saving $100 million, and transferring to the Civil Aeronautics Board the subsidy paid to the airlines for the carrying of mail, thus saving another $50 million, the Government went in the hole $450 million. In the next fiscal year, if a postal rate increase is not obtained, the Government will go in the hole about $500 million. There is not a private corporation in this Nation which, if it were given a monopoly on the handling of first-class mail, could not make a big profit, plus securing the additional advantages which would be gained from the handling of second, third, and fourth class mail.

Our Government conducted one other such experiment. During World War I, the leaders of the Nation decided that the Government could not get proper priority in the rail shipments of war materials or in the movement of troops unless the Government took over the railroads. So Congress voted to have the Government take over the railroads. Whom did the Government place in charge of that activity? A very distinguished man. He was no second-rate politician; oh, no. He was a great engineer. He was supposed to be a financial wizard, because later he was named Secretary of the Treasury. Still later, he was a candidate for the Presidency and made a very respectable showing. He was Mr. William G. McAdoo. He became the director general of the railroads. Certainly the Government could not have selected a man who had better qualifications to do a good job. But what happened? In a period when the railroads had unprecedented traffic, the Government went in the hole hand over fist for the 2 years in which it operated the railroads during the war.

All the nations in Europe own and operate their railroads. All of them lose money on their operations, with the possible exception of Switzerland, which is strategically located so as to benefit by the great amount of tourist traffic between Paris and Italy. But all the other nations lose money on their railroad operations. There is not a railroad in all Europe on which the wages paid the workers compare favorably with the wages paid the workers on American railroads. Yet the foreign governments lose money on all their railroad operations.

What were the earnings of our railroads last year? I have just received today some interesting figures on that subject. Last year the American railroads paid $1,081,000,000 in Federal, State franchise, and local property taxes. After paying those taxes, and after setting aside suitable amounts for depreciation, for new rolling stock, and for plant

expansion and improvements, the railroads distributed to their stockholders $421 million.

One would think that because in all the foreign countries, both in Europe and in Asia, the governments own and operate the railroads, they would draw the conclusion from the example of the American railroads alone that there must be some inherent value in our system of private enterprise, and that the Russian propaganda, to the effect that the United States and other capitalistic countries are decadent, and that our private-enterprise system is slavery for the workers, could not possibly be true.

Unfortunately, on the basis of my recent contacts in Yugoslavia with the representatives of 33 nations, I have to report that the definite trend is toward more socialism, where such countries are not actually on the verge of moving toward out-and-out communism. The leaders of the Politburo recognize the advantage they can gain today in stressing the increase of socialism in those countries where they do not want to start a revolution by force, and where the voters would not be willing at this time to install peaceably a Communistic regime.

In his now famous speech of February 14, 1956, the Communist leader, Khrushchev, now visiting in London and elsewhere in Great Britain, and paying tribute to a capitalistic country, made this statement:

> In this connection the question arises of whether it is possible to go over to socialism by using parliamentary means. No such course was open to the Russian Bolsheviks who were the first to effect this transition. Lenin showed us another road—that of the establishment of a republic of Soviets, the only correct road in those historical conditions. Following that course, we achieved a victory of worldwide historical significance.
>
> The right wing bourgeois parties and their governments are suffering bankruptcy with increasing frequency.

Make no mistake about it, Khrushchev is talking about the United States; and he is trying to say the same thing to the countries in Europe, some of which are faced with bankruptcy, but largely because they have already had too much socialism. Listen to this:

> In these circumstances, the working class, by rallying around itself the toiling peasantry, the intelligentsia, all patriotic forces, and resolutely repulsing the opportunist elements who are incapable of giving up the policy of compromise with the capitalists and landlords, is in a position to defeat the reactionary forces opposed to the popular interest——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The 20 minutes of the Senator have expired.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield me 10 additional minutes?

Mr. BRICKER. I yield 10 additional minutes to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Who are the reactionary forces? Those who believe in private enterprise, and according to this speech, they are opposed to the popular interest. I continue to read:

> to capture a stable majority in parliament, and transform the latter from an organ of bourgeois democracy into a genuine instrument of the people's will.
>
> In such an event this institution, traditional in many highly developed capitalist countries, may become an organ of genuine democracy—democracy for the working people.
>
> The winning of a stable parliamentary majority backed by a mass revolutionary movement of the proletariat and of all the working people could create for the working class of a number of capitalist and former colonial countries, conditions needed to secure fundamental social changes.

I skip a part of the statement, and read the following:

> There are cases where certain Socialist parties have gained majorities in parliaments. In some countries there were, and still are, even Socialist governments. However, even then things are restricted to all the small concessions in favor of the workers no socialism is built. It is necessary for the state and the leadership of society to pass over to the working class; the working class must be prepared not only organizationally but also politically and theoretically for the struggle to socialism, so that it may not be satisfied with the crumbs from the capitalist table but will obtain majority, take power into its own hands, and liquidate private ownership of the basic means of production.

That is the current program of the Politburo of Russia and of all of their satellites in every international organization of which they are members, where they cannot infiltrate and build up strong Communist parties as they have in France and Italy. There were more Communists in those countries in 1956 than there were before we started spending in 1948 hundreds of millions of dollars to stem the tide of communism. Where larger Communist parties cannot be built up, they are told to take the next move and try to infiltrate with this program of socialism on the ground that it is the only answer for the working man. If we could get across to them the illustration of our railroads, it ought to tell the tale.

During the recent meeting in Dubrovnik on economic and social matters there was an attack made on our racial policies, and I told the Soviet delegate that there were 14- or 15-million colored people in the United States, most of whom were in Virginia and throughout the South, who had a standard of living higher than existed anywhere in Europe, and the standard of living in Europe is higher than anywhere in Russia or behind the Iron Curtain. I stated that those 14- or 15-million colored people owned more automobiles than did all the people of the Soviet Union combined. Yet they attacked us.

When we discussed foreign aid the Soviet representative in that group said, "You should beware of all foreign aid to which political strings are attached." He was talking about us. We are the only ones who have been giving any foreign aid.

I have no knowledge of what is happening in a propaganda way in other great peace organizations dedicated to the promulgation of democratic principles, but I am sure, from the statement I have read to my colleagues from the speech of Khrushchev at the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union on February 14, 1956, and from what I have heard happens in the United Nations and all the other organizations, the pattern is the same.

Now, in 1945, when we were in a generous mood and helped organize the United Nations, we said, "Let us pay 40 percent of the bill. We have plenty of money." Our share of the cost has since been decreased to some extent. When we went into ILO we said, "Let us have one-fourth of the bill." There are some 60 nations in it, and our share of the cost is $1,750,000. Since that time the assessments of 42 nations have been reduced, while it is proposed to nearly double our cost from $1,750,000 to $3 million.

I have checked the contributions of other nations to the cost of the organization.

Albania pays 0.12 of 1 percent. There are four votes against ours, and our four votes cost us $1,750,000.

Bulgaria pays 0.21 of 1 percent.

Byelorussia, 0.45 of 1 percent.

Czechoslovakia, 0.96 of 1 percent.

Hungary, 0.50 of 1 percent.

Poland, 0.124 percent.

The Ukraine, 1 percent.

The Soviet Union, 10 percent.

Those nations, which have 32 votes, contribute 14½ percent of the cost against our present 25 percent, and against the pending request that our share of the cost be increased to $3 million, which would probably put it close to 40 percent, but for the proposal adopted last Monday that, whatever the amount is now, our share of the cost cannot be more than 33⅓ percent.

I know the hour is growing late, and I know the Senate wants to act on the joint resolution. There are many matters connected with the foreign-aid program I wish I had an opportunity to discuss. I think the time has come for a very serious reappraisal of our foreign-aid program. I know from personal experience that some nations which have been large recipients of our aid are now openly hostile to us. I know there is general dissatisfaction with our foreign-aid, in most Southeastern Asia, with the exception of Pakistan.

So, Mr. President, this is just one phase of our international program where it has been shown that the Soviet Union is nullifying everything that the organization, the ILO, was intended to do for the protection of the workingman throughout the world. Therefore, I feel very strongly constrained to vote for the Bricker amendment, to let the matter stay in status quo, so to speak, until we can have a little better look and get more information as to whether or not we are spending the money of the taxpayers of America for purposes that are against their best interests.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I now yield to the Senator from New Jersey. How much time does the Senator desire?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Six minutes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield 6 minutes to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I rise to oppose the Bricker amendment, but in doing so I wish to make it clear that while every purpose which the Senator from Ohio [Mr.

BRICKER] has in offering the amendment has my hearty approval, it seems to me it would be wrong to adopt the approach he suggests to accomplish his purposes.

On Monday last I made a brief statement on this subject, and I emphasized the fact—and I think we are all agreed—that we are not trying to destroy the ILO. We are not trying to bring it to a conclusion. The Senator from Ohio himself has said he is for the ILO, and he simply wants to limit our contribution this year to $1,750,000, unless the condition which he has put in the amendment is complied with, namely, nonpermission for the representatives of industry and labor in Russia to vote, because they do not actually represent their respective groups.

I am entirely in sympathy with the position which the Senator from Ohio has taken, but, as I have some knowledge of the history of the ILO, know the importance of that organization, and recognize the fact that up to the present, at least, the United States and the Western Powers can be said to be "on top of the situation," I hesitate to put any restrictions on our representatives at the present time in the form of monetary limitation.

It seems to me that in voting for the pending joint resolution and in voting against the Bricker amendment, we shall really be giving a vote of confidence in our delegates to the ILO, based upon what they have done there, and what they are trying to do now.

As the Senator from Ohio has pointed out, our delegates to the ILO have opposed the seating of some of the delegates from other countries, but have been overruled. The same is true in the case of the parent organization, the United Nations, where I once served as a delegate. In both the ILO and the United Nations, our delegates have sometimes been overruled; but that has not brought about a refusal on our part to contribute further to those organizations. Of course, the question of contributions has always been an important one.

On Monday, the Senate adopted the amendment providing that the payments by the United States to the FAO and to the ILO shall not exceed 33⅓ percent of the total assessed budgets of those organizations.

It is my understanding that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] wishes to reconsider that amendment. However, I am not now discussing that matter. Instead, I am discussing the amendment of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], which, if adopted, would have the effect of saying to our delegates: "You are prohibited from negotiating a settlement as to what the United States' contribution will be this year, unless these Soviet delegates and satellite delegates are not seated."

Mr. President, as I stated on Monday last, in the course of my remarks in the Senate Chamber:

It has been said that we are outvoted in the ILO by the Communists. Eight Soviet bloc countries are members of the ILO, and they have 4 votes apiece, or a total of 32 votes. The United States also has 4 votes—2 for our Government delegates and 1 each for our employer and worker delegates. But besides the Soviet bloc and the United States, there are 62 other members of the ILO, also with 4 votes each. Of the 284 votes in the ILO, the Soviet bloc has 32, and the free world has 252.

In other words, today we and our allies are not outvoted by the Soviet bloc. I agree that we should oppose the seating of delegates who do not really represent the groups they are supposed to represent. On the other hand, in registering our disapproval of such delegates, I do not think we should go to the extent of saying, "We will not pay our contribution to the organization unless what we request is done." For us to take that position would, it seems to me, be of doubtful wisdom from a psychological viewpoint, for in that event we would practically be saying that we were determined to control the organization, whereas, of course, we desire to maintain our position of strength with our allies, particularly with the Asian countries, who work with us in this field.

Therefore, Mr. President, I feel constrained to oppose the amendment of the Senator from Ohio, because I think the approach it proposes is the wrong one for us to adopt.

Mr. President, let me say there could hardly be controversy within the United States over the objective of this amendment, which is to deny seats in the ILO Conference to delegates purporting to represent employers and workers in Soviet bloc countries. Because there are no free employers and free workers in those countries, these delegates are, in fact, government delegates. There is no doubt that that is correct.

This poses a very real problem for the ILO; but the amendment of the Senator from Ohio adopts, in my opinion, the wrong approach to solving the problem. The amendment provides that if these spurious Soviet employer and worker delegates are seated, the United States contribution to the ILO in the succeeding year cannot exceed the present ceiling of $1,750,000. Obviously, Mr. President, such a limitation would prevent our representatives or delegates from having any leeway for negotiation. Instead, they would be bound by that limitation.

It has already been established that the United States' assessment in the ILO—and I understand that our delegates participated in arriving at that assessment—probably will exceed this ceiling. Suppose that, notwithstanding the amendment of the Senator from Ohio, the ILO Conference this year does seat Soviet employer and worker delegates. The result, under the amendment, would be to embarrass the United States and to impair our position in the ILO, with corresponding benefit to the Soviets.

Mr. President, I am not sure whether the constitution of the ILO provides that the delegates of a country which does not pay its agreed-upon assessment will be barred from voting. I rather think there is such a rule, but I cannot state that dogmatically. However, if such a rule does exist, of course our delegates would be barred from voting if the United States' new assessment were not paid.

As was pointed out in the debate on Monday, the ILO is taking steps to deal with the problem of Soviet employer and worker representation. It is probably unrealistic, however, to expect a definitive solution this year.

What is really needed—as George P. Delaney, the United States worker delegate, has pointed out—is an amendment to the ILO constitution, so that employer and worker delegates may not be handpicked by totalitarian governments. That is a process which will require some time to carry out. But in the meantime, the United States position in the ILO should not be prejudiced by action such as that proposed in the pending amendment. Such action might well be interpreted by some of the non-Communist nations in the ILO as a unilateral attempt on the part of the United States to dictate to the organization. It might, therefore, produce results contrary to those intended, and might leave us without the moral strength we have at the present time.

Mr. President, in view of the fact that the administration has brought to my attention their belief that the joint resolution now before us should be passed without the pending amendment, and because of the reasons I have just outlined, I feel compelled to oppose the amendment of the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, for the information of those who look to the RECORD for guidance, the portion of the report of the committee on the pending measure commencing on page 3 with the heading "5. Executive Branch Comments," so it will be very clear that this proposal is sponsored by the State Department and by the administration—which certainly includes the President—and also by the Department of Labor. I think there is no question about their position in regard to the amendment itself.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the report (No.1172) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

5. EXECUTIVE BRANCH COMMENTS

It is anticipated that, due to a combination of circumstances, United States assessments for the regular budgets of the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) and the International Labor Organization (ILO) will increase in the next year or two. The authorizing legislation, as amended for United States participation in each of these organizations sets the maximum amount which may be appropriated annually for the regular budgets of the organizations. The existing statutory limit in the case of the Food and Agriculture Organization is $2 million, and of the International Labor Organization, $1,750,000.

In neither of the two organizations does the United States assessment for calendar year 1955 (financed from fiscal year 1956 appropriations) exceed the respective statutory ceiling, and the ILO ceiling will not be breached in calendar 1956. However, it is the best estimate of the Department of State and

of the other United States agencies concerned that, due to anticipated decisions of the policy determining bodies of the two organizations in regard to their scales of assessment and the size of their regular budgets, the assessments on the United States for calendar year 1956 in the FAO, and for calendar 1957 in the ILO, will be very near to, or in excess of, the existing ceiling figures.

It is proposed, therefore, that Public Law 174, 79th Congress, and Public Law 843, 80th Congress, as amended by Public Law 806, 81st Congress, be further amended to increase the authorization of the amounts which may be appropriated to meet annual contributions of the United States to the regular budgets of these 2 organizations to $3 million, respectively.

United States participation in the Food and Agriculture Organization was authorized by the above-cited Public Law 174 of the 79th Congress, as amended by Public Law 806 of the 81st Congress after review and approval by both Houses of Congress. As a part of the enabling legislation, the 79th Congress placed a ceiling of $1,250,000 on the amount which might be appropriated for the United States contribution to the Food and Agriculture Organization in any 1 year. When the FAO undertook larger responsibilities which called for a larger contribution from the United States in 1950, the Congress inquired into the Organization's program and development, and determined that an increase in the ceiling was justified and in the United States interest. In the light of the known circumstances at the time, a ceiling of $2 million was established.

Total FAO assessments on all members for calendar year 1955 amount to $5,890,000. The United States share for 1955 is 30 percent, or a gross assessment of $1,767,000. Because of a nonrecurring credit from the working capital fund, the net United States contribution for calendar 1955 is reduced to $1,527,624. There is every indication that at the next session of the FAO Conference in November 1955 both the United States percentage share and the total amount of the budget will be increased for 1956 and 1957. For some time, there has been increasing pressure from other members of the organization to conform the FAO scale of assessments to the United Nations scale, an action which would increase the United States share to 33⅓ percent as in the United Nations. At the FAO Conference in November 1953, the United States, after a major effort, succeeded in averting an increase for 1954 and 1955 above the existing 30 percent. At the same time, however, the conference directed that a study be made of all factors in the calculation of the scale with a view to revising the scale for 1956 and 1957. This study was conducted by a special FAO working group in March 1955. The position taken by the United States in this working group was the result of lengthy consultation among the various agencies of the executive branch. In line with this position, and in order to avoid a recommendation by the working group to conform the FAO scale to the United Nations scale in one step in 1956, the United States indicated to the group that this Government would not oppose an increase in the United States assessment to 31½ percent for calendar years 1956 and 1957, but that a further increase to 33⅓ percent would have to be delayed until 1958. These increases assume the continuance of FAO membership at substantially its present size. The United States emphasized that it would expect to share in any significant percentage reduction occasioned by the adherence of new members. The working group adopted a recommendation along these lines which was approved by the FAO Council in June for final action by the conference at its session in November.

Representatives of the United States have made it abundantly clear in the FAO that, under existing statutory authorization, United States annual contributions to the regular FAO budget are limited to $2 million and that, as a result, the United States cannot support a budget which will result in a United States assessment in excess of that figure.

However, it is the view of the Department of State and the Department of Agriculture that the activities of the Food and Agriculture Organization in helping to improve the methods of production and distribution of agricultural products and to increase the standard of living of rural people have been of great value in terms of United States policies, and that certain of these activities should be expanded. Attention is called, for example, to the work the FAO is carrying on to assist countries in analyzing their agricultural production programs in the interests of promoting selective expansion of products in areas of need to help meet nutritional deficiencies, and at the same time to help decrease the problems arising from surpluses of products already available in adequate supply. To this end, the FAO is helping individual governments to develop agricultural extension services, and has promoted regional consultations such as those recently held in Latin America and the Near East on problems of selective expansion. It is believed that the present statutory limitation of $2 million will be a handicap to the United States at the FAO Conference in November and in future years, and will weaken the influence of the United States in guiding the future development of this organization. The proposed increase in the ceiling to $3 million would avoid a possible situation in calendar 1956 in which the United States might be unable to meet its full assessment, and beyond that point it would provide for foreseeable future requirements.

In the case of the International Labor Organization, United States participation dates from 1934, first under authority of Public Resolution 43, of the 73d Congress, and since 1948 under authority of Public Law 843 of the 80th Congress, as amended by Public Law 806 of the 81st Congress. As a part of the legislation in 1948, the 80th Congress placed a ceiling of $1,091,739 on the amount which may be appropriated for the United States contribution to the International Labor Organization for any one year. In 1950, at the same time that the statutory ceilings in regard to the Food and Agriculture Organization and certain other international organizations were reviewed, the Congress determined that an increase in the ILO ceiling was justified and in the United States interest. In the light of known circumstances at that time, the Congress increased the ceiling to $1,750,000.

Since 1950, there have been significant developments in the ILO program which have increased the costs of the Organization. Four ILO operational field offices have been established on a regional basis to permit more effective assistance to governments in meeting problems in such fields as manpower utilization, industrial safety, administration of labor standards, social security, etc. In addition, the ILO has been instrumental in exposing violations of basic rights of labor, particularly in Iron Curtain countries, and in promoting, and strengthening democratic institutions among workers. Jointly with the United Nations, the ILO has carried on a worldwide investigation of the use of forced labor for purposes of political coercion or for the fulfillment of the economic plans of a State. This investigation has done much to dispel the Soviet fiction of the "workers paradise" in the minds of those whom the Soviets are most anxious to influence. In regard to freedom of association, the ILO has brought to public attention specific, documented cases of governmental control or domination of worker organizations in a number of countries for political purposes. At the same time, careful screening procedures are employed to weed out allegations which are propagandistic, malicious, and unsubstantiated.

Total ILO assessments on all members for calendar year 1955 amounted to $6,990,913. The United States share for 1955 is 25 percent, or a gross assessment of $1,747,729. This amount is reduced by certain credits to $1,633,855. For calendar 1956, the Labor Conference in June 1955, approved total assessments of $7,395,729. The gross assessment on the United States (at 25 percent) will be $1,848,933. When available credits have been taken into account, the United States contribution for calendar 1956 will be $1,638,861. A contribution of this size, although close to the existing statutory ceiling of $1,750,000, will not breach the ceiling. However, the ILO governing body in November 1955 will consider a proposal put forward by Canada to revise the ILO scale of assessments and bring it into conformity with the United Nations scale in three steps in calendar years 1957, 1958, and 1959. Such an adjustment would increase the United States percentage share above the present 25-percent level, and would result in breaching the statutory ceiling, possibly by the calendar year 1957.

If the present ceiling of $1,750,000 remains, the United States will have little or no flexibility for negotiation, particularly as regards the assessment scale when this issue is considered by the Governing Body in November. The Department of State and the Department of Labor believe that the United States would be in a better position to obtain a reasonable solution on this issue, and on other financial and substantive issues, if this Government were not forced to take a completely negative stand on these matters. The proposed increase in the statutory ceiling to $3 million would provide the flexibility which is required.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I should also like to call attention to the fact that in the basic law in the case of the ILO, I do not believe there is any mention of the so-called free labor movement or of participation in it—which seems to be the basis of the objection of the Senator from Ohio—or of participation in it by delegates from the Soviet Union.

I may say that I am very sympathetic to many of the expressions and views of the Senator from Ohio; but I think it would be impractical for us to attempt to proceed by means of his amendment, especially in view of the attitude of the administration, which has the responsibility for carrying on this program and for the participation of our delegates in the deliberations of these groups.

In this connection, let me call attention to article III, paragraph 5, of the constitution of the ILO, which reads as follows:

> The Members undertake to nominate nongovernment delegates and advisers chosen in agreement with the industrial organizations, if such organizations exist, which are most representative of employers or work people, as the case may be, in their respective countries.

That language would indicate that it was anticipated that perhaps in some countries such organizations would not exist, and there would not be any real organizations of either laborers or industrial groups.

However, in any case I think that on the floor of the Senate we should not undertake to deal with the characteristics of the Government of every participant in either this organization or any other organization. If we were to attempt to

do so, we would be undertaking an impossible job. Many other governments which participate in the ILO have more or less a degree of socialism or statism or more or less democracy, in the sense in which we understand that term. If we attempt to evaluate the purity of the democracy of each of them, I think we shall be undertaking an impossible task.

If we are to participate at all in this organization, we must not do anything which would render our membership in it ineffective. I, myself, do not believe we should leave the organization; but that is neither here nor there. The administration thinks our membership in this organization is valuable, and I do not quarrel with that position. If, on the other hand, the administration were to recommend that the United States withdraw, I am not sure that I would object to such action.

However, the point is that, in my opinion, the pending amendment is not a practical one; and therefore, I intend to oppose it. So long as we are in the organization, I do not think this is a workable provision. Therefore, I must oppose it.

I intend to offer an amendment which, if adopted, would restrict moneywise our participation to the present percentage, which is 25 percent. I do not believe—and I so stated in the committee—in increasing our percentage of the payment for the support of the ILO in the future. Regardless of the amount its members may be willing to pay for it, inasmuch as our share is and has been 25 percent, I believe it should not be increased. I object to increasing it to 33⅓ percent, which is what will occur if we do not adopt such an amendment.

The same is true of the FAO. I believe that the effect of not adopting the amendment which I shall offer would be that, in principle, we would be accepting the responsibility for paying a third of the cost of all the international organizations. I object to that. I think we should very reasonably look forward to the time when we can reduce our percentage, even in the United Nations, below what it is now. It is now a third. I think it could well be reduced to 25 percent.

We joined these organizations when most of the world, other than ourselves, was in a very bad financial condition. There has been a great improvement with respect to most of the other members, and I think we should properly look toward a gradual reduction in the amount we pay for the support of these organizations. So in that sense my own amendment is, to a degree, in accord with the amendment of the Senator from Ohio, at least so far as the amount of money involved is concerned. It would restrict it to 25 percent.

From an administrative standpoint, if we are to be in the organization at all, I do not think we can undertake to evaluate to exactly what degree the various members are free from Government domination.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, are there any further calls for time on this side of the aisle?

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, I should like about 5 minutes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Is the Senator for or against the pending amendment?

Mr. POTTER. I am opposed to the amendment.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, last year I was selected as a delegate to represent the Senate at the ILO Conference. I am thoroughly in accord with the objectives set forth in the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] with respect to the percentage of our contribution to the ILO.

The ILO was established on a tripartite basis, 1 portion representing government, 1 representing management, and 1 representing labor. We recognize the fact that with respect to the Communist countries, there is no free representation from management and there is no free representation from labor. Management, labor, and government operate in unison, primarily to foster the philosophy and ideology of the Communist government.

It is my position that the Congress, in dealing with an issue of this kind, should deal with it on the basis of whether or not we are to continue our membership in the ILO. That should be the decision of the Congress. If it should be our national policy to cease our membership in the ILO, that is one problem. But if we are to continue as a member of the International Labor Organization, our hands should not be tied, and we should take full advantage of our membership to sell the American way of life, to sell free enterprise, to sell our American system of government.

The question before us now is neither black nor white. We should stick to the main issue involved. It is my feeling that if we are to continue our membership the adoption of the Bricker amendment would put us in the position of saying to the rest of the world: "We are reluctant partners. We are members, but we are not happy about it. We are going to cut down our efforts in this field, and we are not going to utilize this forum to the best advantage."

There may be serious question as to the desirability of continuing our membership in the ILO; but that should be the main issue. We should not adopt such an amendment as the one which is pending, which would continue our membership but would say to the other members of the International Labor Organization: "We are doing it most reluctantly." We would lose our influence within the international organization.

There are other countries which are members of the ILO, with respect to which very serious questions could be raised as to whether their delegates represent either free labor or free management. For example, consider our good friend, the country of West Germany. There is serious question as to whether the labor representatives from West Germany, or the management representatives from West Germany represent free labor or free management.

Consider the case of our good friend, Great Britain. It was interesting to note at the conference that the Government, management, and labor representatives from the great country of Great Britain acted in unison. We know that there are basic differences of opinion between management, government, and labor in various countries; but at the ILO their national interest was made paramount to the interest of either labor or management.

What disturbed me at the conference which I observed was the fact that we had no national policy, represented by the three parts of our tripartite group. Our Government representatives assumed one posture. Many times our labor representatives would assume another posture, and our management representatives would assume a third.

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

Mr. POTTER. I yield.

Mr. BRICKER. Is that not exactly the reason for the tripartite arrangement?

Mr. POTTER. So far as technical matters under discussion are concerned, I would say yes, that we certainly expect to have individual expressions from the representatives of management, labor, and Government. However, when it comes to national policy, we find that the United States has constantly been put into an embarrassing position, and that the leadership of the Western World has been assumed by the British Empire, because its delegation has worked in unison to promote the national interest of the British Empire.

That does not mean that in technical matters there must be agreement. However, on questions of national policy, there is no difference between them. That is not true of our own delegation to the ILO. I hope that in the future the United States, as it participates in this program, will either assume its responsibility and utilize to full advantage this forum, or withdraw entirely from it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY in the chair). The time of the Senator from Michigan has expired.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I rise to support the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER]. The amendment does not take the United States out of the ILO. It does not reduce the amount which we contribute to ILO. On the arguments which have been made, I submit a very strong case has been made that Congress should maintain the status quo so far as this country is concerned. Congress, through the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate and the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House, should have an opportunity to go into the subject and to take testimony from those who have been closely observing the situation and the recent developments.

Mr. President, had it not been for the fact that some Senators on the Committee on Appropriations and on other committees, and Representatives on

committees of the House had insisted on a maximum amount of 33⅓ percent as the contribution of this country for the United Nations Organization itself, we would today be paying an amount greatly in excess of that.

I believe that Congress, under our constitutional system, must always keep control of the purse strings. It is entirely proper that the amount of the contribution be maintained as it is until Congress can be satisfied as to what the facts are in the case.

The Senator from Ohio has pointed out that this is the first time the Congress has had an opportunity to pass upon the very fundamental question whether its intent in participating in an organization created presumably to represent, on a tripartite basis, government, free employers, and free labor, has been abused by the seating of Communist delegates, who not only vote the government vote but also vote what are supposed to be the votes of free labor and of free business.

Under those circumstances it would be putting the stamp of approval of Congress on such an abuse of intent in establishing an international labor organization.

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

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I yield 2 additional minutes to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Under the circumstances I do not believe that the amendment in any way handicaps the Government of the United States. It serves notice on the entire world that we are still operating under our constitutional system, under which Congress functions as a coordinate, not as a subordinate, branch of the Government. It demonstrates to the world that under our constitutional system no group, be it the executive branch of our Government or a delegation to an international organization—the United Nations itself or any other organization—has a right, in effect, to appropriate funds out of the Treasury without the affirmative approval of Congress.

It is very important that that be demonstrated in a world in which so many people have lost their freedom and in which representative governments have been destroyed.

The Soviet Union, to be sure, has what is called a supreme Soviet, a parliamentary system. However, does any Member of the Senate or anyone else in the United States believe that it is a free, representative parliamentary body? Of course not. Russia does not have such a system any more than the Nazis had it in Nazi Germany. The mere use of the term does not prove the facts. Under those circumstances it would be a violation of the basic moral principles upon which the ILO was supposed to rest for us now to say, merely because the Soviet Union has won a temporary victory, that the Soviet Union in fact does have free labor and free business.

For those reasons I shall support the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I have just had an opportunity to read the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio. I sympathize with the argument just made by the minority leader. However, as I read the amendment, it seems to me it would be wholly unenforceable. Let me read the amendment:

Provided, however, That no sums in excess of $1,750,000 shall be appropriated to defray the expenses of the International Labor Organization for any calendar year after the calendar year 1956, if during the preceding calendar year delegates allegedly—

Not actually, but allegedly—

allegedly representing employers and employees in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics or in any nation dominated by the foreign government controlling the world Communist movement were permitted to vote in the International Labor Conference or in other meetings held under the auspices of the International Labor Organization.

What authority will say that delegates allegedly represent employers and employees in a country which is dominated by the foreign government controlling the world Communist movement? What authority will determine that to be a fact? If a satellite country is to be found as being dominated by another country, who is to find that to be the fact? The resolution does not find it.

Where is that fact to be proven? The resolution does not prove it. Who is to enforce it? What court will do it? Will the United Nations do it? Will we do it? Will the State Department do it? How could anyone enforce a resolution of this kind?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I believe I understand the objective of the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio. However, I should like to go a little further than the Senator from Wyoming has gone. I should like to ask what comprises domination of a foreign government, and who determines whether such country is dominated? Does it mean economic domination? Does it mean political domination? What does it mean?

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

Mr. AIKEN. I have only 1 minute.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I will yield an additional minute to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Would the Government of Ceylon be considered to be under Communist domination? Would the Government of Egypt be considered to be under Communist domination? Would the Government of East Germany be considered to be under the Communist domination? What countries can be considered to be under Communist domination? Would Canada be considered under Communist domination because she is dependent upon Communist countries to take a big share of her wheat surplus?

In other words, what constitutes domination, and who determines whether a nation is being dominated?

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, if the Senator from Vermont will yield——

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. BRICKER. The wording is the exact wording contained in the Immigration Law. It was copied from that law; and there has been no difficulty interpreting that law.

The Soviet bloc in the International Labor Organization has been assessed for the following percentage contributions:

Together, Albania, Bulgaria, Byelorussia, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, Ukraine, and the Soviet Union contribute approximately 14½ percent, as compared with 25 percent for the United States, at this time, and 33⅓ percent under the amendment adopted last week. They have 32 votes. We have 4 votes.

Mr. AIKEN. Is there any certainty that the directive would be followed?

Mr. BRICKER. It is not a directive to the International Labor Organization.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY].

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the objective of the Senator from Ohio has merit, since it is recognized by Members of the Senate that worker delegates and so-called industrial delegates from Soviet bloc countries are undoubtedly to be spokesmen for the Soviet bloc governments, but I think the amendment indicates a kind of a sense of insecurity and fear on our part. Are we saying that a delegate from a free trade union in the United States or a free delegate from an industrial establishment in the United States is incapable of dealing with or arguing with delegates from the Soviet bloc? Are we willing to testify by resolution to that effect?

Furthermore, I think it may be very advantageous to the United States of America to come into the open and argue with Soviet bloc delegates, particularly as the argument may affect representatives from industry, labor, and government, from so-called neutral countries and from our friends around the world in the other free countries. Very frankly, Mr. President, I should hate to think that we in America were less confident of our position than, let us say, is Great Britain or any one of the other 60 countries. I personally feel that any time we have an opportunity to join issue on any matter of politics, economics, culture, or social welfare with delegates from the Soviet bloc countries, we should accept it not only as a challenge but as an opportunity. We have never lost an argument in the United Nations. When it came to arguing with the Soviet bloc we won the argument by vote.

This seems to me to be an opportunity. I, for one, am tired of ducking these fellows. I would rather engage the enemy——

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Is it still permissible to offer an amendment to the pending amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It would be in order.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. What is the rule as to time if an amendment is offered?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There may be an hour's debate on the amendment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I should like a little more time in which to offer an amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. How much time does the Senator desire?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I should like to have 3 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I should like to address my statement to the author of the amendment, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER].

Mr. President, of course, as a lawyer, the Senator from Ohio knows that the mere allegation that a person has done a certain thing is not proof that he has done it. I assume the intent of the amendment is to place a limitation upon the amount to be expended if persons who are actually Communists and who are representing employers or employees, are permitted to vote by the Soviet Union or by a satellite nation. But that is not what the amendment provides. It refers only to those who are alleged to represent such employers and employees. It refers to countries dominated by the Communist government. As the Senator from Vermont has said, nothing in the amendment states by whom the fact of domination shall be found.

I may say to the Senator from Ohio that his amendment could be amended so as to avoid this lack of clarity if, on page 2, the word "were" were stricken out and the following language substituted: "are found by the State Department to have been."

Then we would have an agency of the United States Government making a finding, and there could be no doubt about it.

As the amendment now stands, it is utterly unenforceable and would not attain the objective which the Senator seeks.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. BRICKER. I would not agree that it is unenforceable any more than are the immigration laws.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It is like saying, "I copied an unenforceable law and I am presenting another unenforceable law."

Mr. BRICKER. The amendment is a directive to the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. How is the committee to find out who are involved?

Mr. BRICKER. Everyone knows who they are. I read them into the RECORD a few moments ago. They never came in until last year. They had never been members of the ILO until 1954. The Government representatives were willing to accept them; but to say they represent free labor and free business in those countries is a most absurd allegation, because we know that free labor and free business do not exist there.

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

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 5 additional minutes from the time on the resolution itself.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I thank the Senator from California.

I ask the Senator from Ohio if he will explain to the Senate by whom he intends the allegation to be made. The language used in lines 7 and 8, on page 1, is as follows:

> If during the preceding calendar year delegates allegedly representing employers and employees—

And so forth. How is the allegation to be set forth?

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator read his amendment again?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. On page 2, line 2, strike out the word "were" and insert thereafter "are found by the State Department to have been", so that the sentence will read, beginning with the word "if" in line 7 on page 1:

> If during the preceding calendar year delegates allegedly representing employers and employees in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics or in any nation dominated by foreign governments controlling the world Communist movement are found by the State Department to have been permitted to vote.

And so forth. I think that would accomplish what the Senator seeks to do.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, as the author of the amendment I accept the amendment suggested by the Senator from Wyoming. I think he has a good point, and I appreciate the fact that it does clear up the meaning of my amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if there is no request for time on this side of the aisle I am prepared to yield back the remainder of my time on condition that those in favor of the amendment yield back their time.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I yield back our time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, have the yeas and nays been ordered on the amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. They have been ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Do I understand correctly that the yeas and nays have been ordered on the Bricker amendment, as modified?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is correct.

Mr. KNOWLAND. And has all time for debate expired?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, before the time expires, I should like——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays having been ordered, the clerk will call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, all time for debate has expired, but I ask unanimous consent——

Mr. MURRAY. I was promised by the majority leader——

Mr. KNOWLAND. I am about to make a unanimous-consent request that the distinguished Senator from Montana be granted 1 minute in which to make a statement. Would that be sufficient?

Mr. MURRAY. I should like to have 2 minutes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Montana may have 2 minutes in which to make a statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Montana is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I desire to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article entitled "A Catholic Attitude Toward the ILO," which was published in the magazine America, a Catholic review of the week. The article discusses the problem of the ILO. Before having it appear in its entirety, I should like to read a part of the article:

> Now that the NAM and the United States Chamber of Commerce have nominated an employer delegation to the 1956 convention of the International Labor Organization, the controversy over continued United States membership in that U. N. agency loses some of its urgency. Nevertheless, the statement issued on April 5 by the Catholic Association for International Peace is still a timely as well as an enlightening, document.

Further, the article continues:

> In addition to the ordinary vexations which seem to spring up wherever Communists offer their collaboration, the Soviet request for membership in ILO created a very special problem not found in any other U. N. agency. The ILO happens to be organized on tripartite lines. In addition to government representatives, each nation's delegation includes representatives of free organizations of workers and employers. In all ILO decision making, these worker and employer spokesmen enjoy complete independence. Their votes are not controlled in any way by government representatives.

The article goes on further to say:

> Noting that the Communist bloc controls no more than 32 of the potential 280 votes in an ILO conference, and therefore is in no position to dominate that organization, the CAIP contends that to withdraw from it "would play directly into the hands of the Communists." If the United States delegation were absent from Geneva, it says, the Kremlin and its satellites "could more easily use the ILO as a sounding board for their own propaganda." The CAIP also calls attention to the possibility that the Kremlin may have joined the ILO solely in order to wreck it.
>
> Before Catholics take a stand on this issue, they ought to be aware that last January a French Jesuit, Rev. Joseph M. Joblin, was appointed to the ILO staff. This appoint-

ment was made, the CAIP observed, "with the advice and consent of the holy see." Evidently the holy father, who only 2 years ago spoke of the ILO in highly laudatory terms, is persuaded that, despite Communist obstructionism, this U. N. agency can still add to its rich accomplishments for social justice.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

A CATHOLIC ATTITUDE TOWARD THE ILO

Now that the NAM and the United States Chamber of Commerce have nominated an employer delegation to the 1956 convention of the International Labor Organization, the controversy over continued United States membership in that U. N. agency loses some of its urgency. Nevertheless, the statement issued on April 5 by the Catholic Association for International Peace is still a timely, as well as an enlightening, document.

The dispute with which it deals was touched off nearly 2 years ago when the Soviet Union finally decided to participate in ILO affairs. This meant, of course, that not only the Soviet Union but also Bulgaria, Poland, Hungary, Albania, and Czechoslovakia, along with Byelorussia and the Ukraine, would henceforth be present at ILO gatherings in Geneva.

In addition to the ordinary vexations which seem to spring up wherever Communists offer their collaboration, the Soviet request for membership in ILO created a very special problem not found in any other U. N. agency. The ILO happens to be organized on tripartite lines. In addition to Government representatives, each nation's delegation includes representatives of free organizations of workers and employers. In all ILO decision-making, these worker and employer spokesmen enjoy complete independence. Their votes are not controlled in any way by Government representatives. It goes without saying that the worker and employer delegates are understandably very jealous of their independence.

It was only to be expected, then, that many of them would oppose granting membership to Communist countries. How, except by a sort of legal fraud, could Communist employer and worker representatives be fitted into the ILO tripartite framework? They obviously would not be able to speak for free organizations of labor and industry, since such organizations are unknown in their countries. They would be in fact, whatever their name, merely additional members of official government delegations. Though this argument was strongly urged 2 years ago at Geneva, the ILO voted to seat the Communist employer and worker delegates.

QUIT OR FIGHT?

Since that time some American employers have been arguing that the United States ought to show its disapproval of this development by quitting the ILO and withdrawing its substantial financial support. The CAIP disagrees. Noting that the Communist bloc controls no more than 32 of the potential 280 votes in an ILO conference, and therefore is in no position to dominate that organization, the CAIP contends that to withdraw from it "would play directly into the hands of the Communists." If the United States delegation were absent from Geneva, it says, the Kremlin and its satellites "could the more easily use the ILO as a sounding board for their own propaganda." The CAIP also calls attention to the possibility that the Kremlin may have joined the ILO solely in order to wreck it.

Before Catholics take a stand on this issue, they ought to be aware that last January a French Jesuit, Rev. Joseph M. Joblin, was appointed to the ILO staff. This appointment was made, the CAIP observes, "with the advice and consent of the Holy See." Evidently the holy father, who only 2 years ago spoke of the ILO in highly laudatory terms, is persuaded that, despite Communist obstructionism, this U. N. agency can still add to its rich accomplishments for social justice.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask for the regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment, as modified, offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], which will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, line 5, it is proposed to change the period to a comma and insert the following: "and by inserting before the semicolon at the end of such subsection a colon and the following: *'Provided, however*, That no sums in excess of $1,750,000 shall be appropriated to defray the expenses of the International Labor Organization for any calendar year after the calendar year 1956, if during the preceding calendar year delegates allegedly representing employers and employees in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics or in any nation dominated by the foreign government controlling the world Communist movement are found by the State Department to have been permitted to vote in the International Labor Conference or in other meetings held under the auspices of the International Labor Organization'."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SCOTT], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] is absent because of a death in his family.

On this vote, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is paired with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SCOTT]. If present and voting the Senator from Virgina would vote "yea," and the Senator from North Carolina would vote "nay."

I further announce that if present and voting, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] would vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] is detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] would each vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 43, nays 40, as follows:

YEAS—43

Barrett	Ellender	Purtell
Beall	Flanders	Robertson
Bender	Frear	Russell
Bennett	Goldwater	Saltonstall
Bricker	Hruska	Schoeppel
Bridges	Jenner	Smith, Maine
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Stennis
Capehart	Knowland	Thye
Carlson	Malone	Watkins
Case, S. Dak.	Martin, Iowa	Welker
Cotton	Martin, Pa.	Williams
Curtis	McClellan	Wofford
Dirksen	Millikin	Young
Duff	Mundt	
Dworshak	Payne	

NAYS—40

Aiken	Hayden	Mansfield
Allott	Hennings	McNamara
Anderson	Holland	Morse
Barkley	Humphrey	Murray
Bible	Jackson	Neely
Bush	Johnson, Tex.	Neuberger
Case, N. J.	Kennedy	O'Mahoney
Chavez	Kerr	Pastore
Clements	Kuchel	Potter
Douglas	Laird	Smith, N. J.
Ervin	Langer	Sparkman
Fulbright	Lehman	Symington
Gore	Long	
Green	Magnuson	

NOT VOTING—13

Byrd	Hill	Scott
Daniel	Ives	Smathers
Eastland	Kefauver	Wiley
George	McCarthy	
Hickenlooper	Monroney	

So Mr. BRICKER's amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, may I inquire how I was recorded on the vote just taken?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois was recorded as voting in the negative.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at this time I may proceed for approximately 4 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, ample time is available for debate on the joint resolution itself. So I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Illinois.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from Texas.

Mr. President, the vote just taken was an extraordinary one. The administration has requested the passage of the pending joint resolution; and, as the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], very honorably stated, the administration is definitely opposed to the amendment on which the Senate voted a moment ago.

I desire to commend the Senator from California for the characteristic frankness and honesty he displayed in this matter and in stating that the amendment was opposed by the administration. He did not attempt, as is so often done, to cover up.

I have made a tentative tabulation of the votes cast on the amendment, and it shows that all Members on the Republican side of the aisle, with the exception of six, voted for the amendment and

against the position of the administration; and that all Members on the Democratic side of the aisle, with the exception of a few, voted against the amendment, and for the program of the administration. So it has been a Republican victory but an administration defeat.

The vote raises some very real points. It shows the fact that in the case of vital questions dealing with foreign policy, the President finds his chief support on this side of the aisle, rather than on the Republican side of the aisle.

Mr. President, we on the Democratic side of the aisle know what will happen to us. We know perfectly well that when we return to our constituencies, we shall be attacked by the various Republican committees, including probably the Republican National Committee, for the vote we have cast just now. If the experience of the past is any guide, the administration will denounce us in a few days (when they think people have forgotten) as being noncooperative; and high officials of the administration will take the stump and will denounce us in our States for the vote we have cast, and which they will say shows we are "soft" on communism. I hope the speeches made by leading Republicans during the last 2 days indicate a change in tactics and possibly a change of heart, but I am not certain that is the case.

In any event, Mr. President, I wish to make it perfectly clear that I think the administration acted in accordance with what it believed to be in the best interests of the United States; and I cast my vote as I did because I felt the administration knew more about the situation than we in the Senate do, in view of the somewhat clouded condition. I think they are afraid that we may be expelled from the ILO for nonpayment of dues, and that the Bricker amendment will create in the ILO a vacuum which the Communist countries will exploit.

Mr. President, it is very interesting to observe that a majority of the Members on the other side of the aisle do not believe in the foreign policy of this administration, and will take advantage of every opportunity to defeat it. That is what I have been saying for a long time, Mr. President. I think the country should know what the facts are and what the vote was.

Mr. FULBRIGHT and Mr. KUCHEL addressed the Chair.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President——

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield 2 minutes to me? I must leave in a short time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Very well, Mr. President; I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Arkansas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, on Monday the Senate adopted an amendment which was submitted by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD]. At this time I desire to offer an amendment. However, I am informed by the Parliamentarian that before my amendment can be considered, it will be necessary for the Senate to reconsider its action in adopting, on Monday, the amendment of the Senator from Montana.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the action or vote of the Senate, taken on Monday, whereby the amendment of the Senator from Montana was adopted be reconsidered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator send to the desk, and have read, the amendment he desires to submit? I think that should be done for the information of the Senate.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, in a moment I shall request that the amendment be read by the clerk. In the meantime, I can explain my amendment. All my amendment will do is retain the United States contribution at 25 percent in the case of the ILO, and at 31½ percent in the case of the FAO—in other words, the present percentages of our contributions.

I have a very simple reason for submitting this amendment: I see no reason for establishing more or less permanently a 33⅓ percent contribution by the United States to all international organizations. At the present time we are contributing 25 percent of the budget of the ILO, and I see no reason for increasing it; I refer to the percentage, as distinguished from the number of ballots. That is my position. The Senator from California will remember that I took the same position in the committee. In other words, it is my position that the fact that we are contributing 33⅓ percent of the budget of the United Nations does not mean that we should contribute in the same percentage to the budgets of all other international organizations. My position is that in a case in which our contribution now is 25 percent, it should remain at that percentage, rather than be increased to 33⅓. In short, I do not believe that all the contributions we make to international organizations should be on the basis of 33⅓ percent.

Mr. KNOWLAND. In other words, I understand that the Senator from Arkansas desires to offer a substitute for the amendment of the Senator from Montana.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The amendment of the Senator from Montana provided for a maximum ceiling of 33⅓ percent, which is in general conformity with our other contributions to the United Nations.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. No; I was going to point out that not all our contributions are on the basis of 33⅓ percent, and I object to having all of them increased to 33⅓ percent.

I believe that if my amendment is adopted, it will be possible for us to take the position that gradually our contributions to these organizations should be decreased.

At the time when we first contributed to these organizations, many other countries were in difficult financial circumstances. But as other countries are better able to contribute to the organizations, I think our contributions should be decreased. For instance, only recently 17 new members, I believe, were admitted. Under these circumstances, why should not our contribution be decreased?

I am perfectly willing to have the United States contribute its fair share. However, if in connection with the pending joint resolution we adopt an amendment calling for a 33⅓ percent contribution on the part of the United States, it seems to me we shall be indicating that, as a policy, we intend to have the United States contribute 33⅓ percent to the budgets of all international organizations.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question, if the Senator from Arkansas will yield to me.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Certainly.

Mr. BUSH. Did the Senator from Arkansas submit his amendment to the committee?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I did, but I was outvoted.

Mr. BUSH. The Senator from Arkansas was outvoted in the committee, was he?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes.

My position is that I object to having the percentage of the contribution of the United States increased. If the work of the ILO is so important—and our representatives agree that it is—and if the overall budget of the ILO should be increased, I have no objection to having that done, provided our contribution is not increased.

My amendment will merely prevent increasing the ceiling on our contribution to 33⅓ percent.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, if the Senator from Arkansas does not object, and inasmuch as certain Members are not now on the floor, I desire to suggest the absence of a quorum, before we proceed further in connection with the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Very well.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I have just discussed the question with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], who was temporarily absent from the Chamber. We have no objection to the request of the Senator from Arkansas for reconsideration of the amendment of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], which was agreed to on Monday, which established a limitation of 33⅓ percent, in order that the Senator from Arkansas may offer his amendment to that section.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment heretofore offered by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] and agreed to on Monday as section 2 of the bill is reconsidered.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, after line 5, it is proposed to insert the following:

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the percentage contribution of the United States to the total annual budget of the Food and Agriculture Organization shall not exceed 31.5 percent and to the International Labor Organization shall not exceed 25 percent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT].

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes. Really, I have already explained the amendment. I do not know that I need to repeat the explanation.

All my amendment would do would be to retain the present percentage. One of the principal objections I have to the amendment agreed to on Monday is that I am sure it would create the impression that we were accepting, as a principle, responsibility for payment of 33⅓ percent of the cost of every international organization.

At the present time there is a considerable variation in percentages of contribution by the United States to international organizations. I read the percentages for the major international organizations:

United Nations, 33⅓ percent; the Food and Agriculture Organization contribution will be 31½ percent, under my amendment; International Civil Aviation Organization, 32.60 percent; International Labor Organization, 25 percent; International Telecommunications Union, 8.99 percent; UNESCO, 33⅓ percent; Universal Postal Union, 4.36 percent; World Health Organization, 33⅓ percent; World Meteorological Organization, 11.45 percent.

There is a considerable variation. I think the inevitable result of leaving in the joint resolution the amendment adopted on Monday would be to indicate acceptance of the principle that we should pay a third of the cost of all such organizations.

I think the proper objective of our Government should be gradually to decrease our participation, at least down to approximately 25 percent. Considering the great number of nations which are members of these organizations, I think 33⅓ percent is an unduly large amount as a permanent percentage for us to contribute to all such organizations. I think the adoption of my amendment would have the effect of at least preserving the present situation and allowing freedom of negotiation in the future, to try to decrease the percentage we now bear in the United Nations, for example. On the other hand, to the opposite effect would be acceptance by our Government of a permanent 33⅓ percent contribution. That is the issue which is involved.

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

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. I compliment the Senator for his objective. We have been trying, through appropriations, to reach this objective for some time. I am glad the Senator from Arkansas has the courage, good sense, and judgment to submit a proposal of this kind, because that is certainly the direction in which we should go, instead of building up greater expense to the American taxpayers and the American Government, which has been the trend for many years.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thank the Senator for his observation.

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

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. As the Senator from Arkansas understands the situation respecting our commitments, I take it he does not believe that his amendment would involve any embarrassment to our Government, or cause us to go back on any commitments we may have made heretofore in this connection.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It is my present belief that it would not require the violation of any commitments we have made. We were told in the committee by representatives of the Department that they were embarrassed because other members of the ILO made the argument that "you pay one-third of the cost of the United Nations. Why should you not pay one-third of the cost of the ILO?"

I can see no persuasive argument why we should do so. There have been changes in the economic condition of other members. They should bear a larger percentage. It is my definite belief that during the past several years there has been relative improvement in the capacity of other members to pay. Going back 10 years, we were the only ones who were well off. At that time we paid a larger percentage than a third. We started paying nearly 50 percent in connection with the United Nations. We gradually worked that down to a third.

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

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

The argument was advanced to our representatives, "You pay a third of the cost of the United Nations. Why should you not pay a third of the cost of the ILO and the FAO?" To me, that is not a persuasive argument. Broadly speaking, it is a valid argument to base distribution of the burden upon capacity to pay; but I do not think that argument was sustained before the committee.

Mr. BUSH. I thank the Senator for answering my question so fully. I intend to support his amendment.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not wish to mislead the Senator. My amendment would place no dollar limitation on the amount. I do not wish to limit the dollar amount, if this activity is so important that all the other members are willing to pay a part.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to say, in connection with what the Senator from Arkansas said to the Senator from Connecticut, that we on the Appropriations Committee—and I have been on the subcommittee with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] for a number of years—have been trying to cut back these appropriations. It has been our clear understanding, particularly with the State Department, that in the case of the United Nations Organization the Department will make no firm commitments until Congress makes the appropriations. That has been one of our difficulties in years gone by, that they would make a commitment in December and then come to us in May and try to get us to confirm their commitment. I believe it is clear that they will now not make any firm commitment, and that any limitations we place in the bill will not make us break any agreement.

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

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I was not on the floor during all the remarks of the Senator from Arkansas. I am not quite sure what his amendment would do. Yesterday a substitute amendment offered, I believe, by the Senator from Louisiana [ELLENDER] was agreed to by the Senate. How is that amendment affected by the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The amendment is offered as a substitute for the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana on Monday. I believe it was adopted on Monday afternoon. I was not on the floor of the Senate that day. I was not a party to it. I understand it was in the nature of an agreement between the Senator from Louisiana and other Senators, and that it provided for a ceiling of 33⅓ percent on our contribution.

Before the Senator from New York came into the chamber I said that I believe if we let that amendment of the Senator from Louisiana stand, it will be interpreted as an acceptance by the Government of a 33⅓-percent contribution by the United States to all international organizations.

I do not wish to accept such a principle. I believe we have been contributing 25 percent of the ILO funds for many years. I have heard no persuasive argument made to increase our percentage contribution. The other members have not become worse off, certainly, and we have not become relatively so much better off that we ought to increase our contribution. In other words, I object to the acceptance of the principle that we are going to contribute a third of all the funds of all the international organizations. That is what I believe we would be doing under the Ellender amendment.

Mr. LEHMAN. Is it not a fact that the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana had two parts; that one part increased the percentage of the total amount of the budget of the ILO, to be paid by the United States, and the other decreased the amount that was authorized in resolution 97, which proposed to strike out the figure of $1,750,000 and to insert in lieu thereof the figure of $3 million? I believe the two provisions were contained in the same amendment.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I have been told that it was the Mansfield amendment, not the Ellender amendment which was adopted. I will say this to the Senator from New York. The only effect of my amendment is to put a ceiling on the percentage. It contains no dollar amount.

If the other members of the ILO or of the FOA are willing to increase their total contributions of dollars, our contribution would go up also. This is not any assurance that the dollar amount would be set at any particular level. But it is an assurance that the percentage would not be greater than 25 percent.

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

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I believe for the RECORD I should also state, as the Senator from Arkansas has stated, that it was not the Ellender amendment which was voted on Monday. The distinguished Senator from Louisiana had an amendment pending at the desk. When the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] indicated that he had an amendment to offer, the Senator from Louisiana, as I recall it, withdrew his amendment, and agreed to the amendment of the Senator from Montana, which I believe was adopted without any opposition at that point. That amendment was offered by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], not the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER].

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct. I say to the Senator from New York that the only difference between the two is that the amendment of the Senator from Montana provided a ceiling of 33⅓ percent, which is an increased ceiling. The present ceiling of the ILO is 25 percent. The ceiling which has been tentatively agreed to for FOA is 31½ percent.

My amendment would place a ceiling on the percentage, not on the dollar amount. That is the effect of my amendment.

Mr. LEHMAN. I thank the Senator for explaining his amendment. However, I hope the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas will not prevail.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LONG in the chair). Does a Senator in control of time yield some time to the Senator from New York?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, we are dealing with an organization which I consider to be one of the great international organizations of the world today. We have before us a report from the State Department, which I have no doubt reflects the point of view of the United States. It describes some of the very important work that has been done by the ILO. It is almost fulsome in its praise of the organization.

We have done enough harm to the ILO already. The other day we refused to increase the authorized amount as recommended by the State Department and, I assume, by the President of the United States. Today, in the face of the position taken by the President and by the State Department—and I admit I do not always agree with them, but in this particular case I believe they are absolutely right—we have placed a further handicap in the way of the success of this great organization by adopting the Bricker amendment.

Either we will wholeheartedly seek to hold up our end of the very important work being done by the ILO, or we will handicap it and make it impotent. I am not willing to do that. I am convinced that this organization is not only worthwhile, but is extremely important.

I repeat what I have said before. A part of the report of the State Department describing the activities of the ILO states that, in addition to permitting more effective assistance to governments in meeting problems in such fields as manpower utilization, industrial safety, administration of labor standards, social security, and so forth, the "ILO has been instrumental in exposing violations of basic rights of labor, particularly in Iron Curtain countries, and in promoting and strengthening democratic institutions among workers. Jointly with the United Nations, the ILO has carried on a worldwide investigation of the use of forced labor for purposes of political coercion or for the fulfillment of the economic plans of a State. This investigation has done much to dispel the Soviet fiction of the "workers paradise" in the minds of those whom the Soviets are most anxious to influence. In regard to freedom of association, the ILO has brought to public attention specific, documented cases of governmental control or domination of worker organizations in a number of countries for political purposes. At the same time, careful screening procedures are employed to weed out allegations which are propagandistic, malicious, and unsubstantiated."

I realize, as has been pointed out by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], that it is a myth to consider the Soviet representatives of employers and employees as freemen. They are not. They do not represent labor. They do not represent industry. They represent the Soviet Government. I realize that to be a fact. I decry that fact. I hope the time will come when that situation will be cured.

However, in the meantime, the ILO has functioned effectively and very usefully in spite of that fact. The organization has functioned for the benefit of labor and industry in this country. It has functioned, in my opinion, for the benefit of all the free nations of the world.

Today in the ILO the number of votes to which the Soviet countries are entitled is 32, as against the total number of member nations in ILO of more than 250. Certainly in view of that great disparity we have nothing to fear. But if we fail strongly to support ILO we have a great deal to lose.

Mr. LEHMAN. May I have 2 more minutes?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield 2 more minutes to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I am anxious to have nothing done that will further weaken the ILO. I am afraid we may give the impression that this country is not wholeheartedly behind the ILO, and I am afraid that by our action today we have again indicated that we are willing to take unilateral rather than collective action. Because of those things I very much hope the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas will not prevail.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I should like to have 5 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I hope the amendment will not be agreed to. It was offered in the committee and was rejected. I appreciate the persistence of the Senator from Arkansas in the matter, but I do not quite understand it. Outside the United Nations itself, I regard the International Labor Organization as one of the most important and effective international organizations now in existence. Theoretically, the organization itself has the power to allocate the percentage of contributions from the different nations which are members of it. Here we propose unilaterally to reduce our contribution for the sake of saving a few dollars.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think the Senator misunderstands my amendment. The amendment which was adopted on Monday set a new ceiling which was not adopted by the committee.

Mr. BARKLEY. I understand that, but the Senator is offering an amendment which would reduce the amount carried in the resolution which is now before the Senate.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It would reduce as a matter of principle the amount carried in the amendment which was adopted on Monday.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, that was on a different basis. What I am talking about is the unwisdom of the Senate of the United States acting unilaterally to reduce the amount recommended by the administration in the resolution as it was offered to the committee and which was reported by the committee.

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

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator from Kentucky is correct. The amendment adopted last Monday reduced the dollar amount requested by the administration and was considered to be a reasonable compromise. It was stated in the amendment which was adopted by the Senate that contributions by this country should not exceed 33⅓ percent, and it was specifically stated during the course of debate that it was up to the Committee on Foreign Relations, so far as might be possible, and especially the Committee on Appropriations, to see that appropriations were kept down.

If the Fulbright amendment is adopted—and I wish to say that the junior Senator from Arkansas has been very consistent over the years—it will mean, in my opinion, although I do not think it is the Senator's intent, by any means, that the amount will be reduced still further and the objectives which the administration has in mind insofar as the ILO is concerned will not be met.

Mr. BARKLEY. I thank the Senator from Montana for his observation.

The Soviet Union and other members of the Soviet bloc are in full membership in the ILO, and employer and em-

ployee representation is now admitted. In the face of that we propose to whittle down our contribution to this great international organization which I think has done and is doing a great work in the international field in regard to labor. So I hope, Mr. President, that the amendment will be rejected. I shall vote against it.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield for a question?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. The Senator has stated that the amendment would whittle down our contribution. It is not intended to whittle it down at all.

Mr. BARKLEY. It would whittle it down from what the administration has asked for and what is contained in the resolution.

Mr. BUSH. Not necessarily. It provides for $3 million.

Mr. BARKLEY. If the amendment offered is adopted, the top limit will not be $3 million.

Mr. BUSH. The amendment seeks only to establish a limit of 25 percent.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, the top limit will be 25 percent, and not $3 million as asked for by the administration.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas. [Putting the question.] The Chair is in doubt.

On a division the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment of the Senator from Montana, as amended, is agreed to.

The resolution is open to further amendment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I am prepared to yield back my time on the joint resolution.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield back our time, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has been yielded back, and the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 97) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the following laws of the United States are hereby amended in the following particulars:

(a) Public Law 174, 79th Congress, as amended by section 1 (b) of Public Law 806, 81st Congress, is hereby further amended by striking out the figure "$2 million" in section 2 thereof and inserting in lieu thereof the figure "$3 million";

(b) Public Law 843, 80th Congress, as amended by section 1 (e) of Public Law 806, 81st Congress, is hereby further amended by striking out the figure "$1,750,000" in subsection (a) of section 2 thereof and inserting in lieu thereof the figure "$3 million," and by inserting before the semicolon at the end of such subsection a colon and the following: *"Provided, however,* That no sums in excess of $1,750,000 shall be appropriated to defray the expenses of the International Labor Organization for any calendar year after the calendar year 1956, if during the preceding calendar year delegates allegedly representing employers and employees in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics or in any nation dominated by the foreign government controlling the world Communist movement are found by the State Department to have been permitted to vote in the International Labor Conference or in other meetings held under the auspices of the International Labor Organization."

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the percentage contribution of the United States to the total annual budget of the Food and Agriculture Organization shall not exceed 31.5 percent and to the International Labor Organization shall not exceed 25 percent.

RATES CHARGED TO PUBLIC BODIES AND COOPERATIVES FOR FEDERALLY GENERATED ELECTRIC POWER

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

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas withhold his suggestion?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Certainly.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, on the call of the calender earlier today, Order No. 1783, Senate bill 3338, a bill relating to rates charged to public bodies and cooperatives for electric power generated at Federal projects, was postponed until later in the day. I ask unanimous consent that that bill may now be considered by the Senate.

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

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I respectfully suggest to the distinguished Senator that a number of bills were passed over solely because the reports on them were not available. The bill in which the Senator is interested happened to be in that category.

Mr. KERR. The Senator is correct.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I understand there will be some discussion of the Senator's bill. The majority leader is not present at this time. I had hoped that we might call the calendar of bills to which there is no objection, and then bring up by motion the bill in which the Senator from Oklahoma has an interest. I think there are some bills which will go through without any discussion at all. I hope the Senator will permit us to proceed in that order. If we can, I think we can save time.

Mr. KERR. I understood there would not be any discussion on Senate bill 3338.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I have been informed that there will be some discussion on that bill, although I do not know how much.

Mr. KERR. I have no objection to the bill going over until the other measures have been called.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I shall cooperate with the Senator. I thought we might dispose of some measures which have been held on the calendar for the reason stated by me.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1783, Senate bill 3338.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 3338) relating to rates charged to public bodies and cooperatives for electric power generated at Federal projects.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, is the Senator from Oklahoma willing to have a quorum call, so that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] may be present?

Mr. KERR. I join in the request that there be a quorum call.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

INCREASE IN PENALTIES APPLICABLE TO SEDITIOUS CONSPIRACY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1787, H. R. 2854, until the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] can be present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Calendar No. 1787, H. R. 2854, will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 2854) to amend title 18 of the United States Code, so as to increase the penalties applicable to seditious conspriacy, advocating overthrow of Government, and conspiracy to advocate overthrow of Government.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment on page 2, line 6, after the word "shall," to strike out "be ineligible for employment by the United States or any department or agency thereof, for the 5 years next following his conviction" and insert "be disqualified from holding any office of honor, trust or profit under the United States."

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement with reference to the bill.

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

Existing law provides maximum penalties for the following crimes: Seditious conspiracy, $5,000 fine or 6 years imprisonment or both; advocating overthrow of the Government, $10,000 fine or 10 years imprisonment, or both; conspiracy to commit offenses relating to advocating overthrow of the Government, $10,000 or imprisonment for 5 years, or both.

Government criminal records disclose that a prisoner with a record of good conduct need serve but two-thirds of his total sentence. Such short servitude—a little over 3 years in this case—is entirely inadequate to deter activities of persons conspiring to overthrow the Government of the United States.

The purpose of this bill is to amend title 18, United States Code, so as to make all penalties for the above crimes more uniform, more deterrent to subversive activities of

any nature and also to add to existing law a conspiracy provision with increased penalties pertaining to the offense of advocating overthrow of the United States Government. The penalties would be $20,000 fine or 20 years imprisonment, or both.

The committee has amended the bill in one particular: namely, on page 2, in line 6, immediately after the word "shall," strike the remainder of the sentence through line 8 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "be disqualified from holding any office of honor, trust or profit under the United States."

The purpose of this amendment is to bring this provision into closer accord with the gravity of the offense. Such crimes as bribery, graft, multilation of records, etc., also disqualify a convicted person from holding any office of honor, trust or profit under the United States (18 U. S. C. 202, 1901, 2071).

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

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The bill was read the third time and passed.

CONVEYANCE BY QUITCLAIM DEED OF CERTAIN REAL PROPERTY TO THE FAIRVIEW CEMETERY ASSOCIATION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1794, Senate bill 2144.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 2144) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey by quitclaim deed certain real property of the United States to the Fairview Cemetery Association.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Texas?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with an amendment on page 1, line 4, after the word "deed", to strike out "without consideration" and insert "at its fair market value as determined by the Secretary of the Interior", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to convey by quitclaim deed, at its fair market value as determined by the Secretary of the Interior, to the Fairview Cemetery Association, Inc., Wahpeton, N. Dak., all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the following-described land, together with all improvements thereon, situated in the county of Richland, State of North Dakota: North half of the southeast quarter of the southeast quarter of section 6, township 132 north, range 47 west, fifth principal meridian, comprising 20 acres.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The lands involved in the bill comprise a 20-acre tract of acquired lands in Richland County, N. Dak., presently administered by the Bureau of Indian Affairs. The Government has no present need for the land and does not object to its conveyance to the association.

In view of the fact that the association is a private organization and would utilize the lands, if acquired, for private purposes, or would sell the lands as cemetery lots to private individuals, the committee agrees with the Department of the Interior that the conveyance to the association should not be without consideration.

The report from the Department of the Interior states, in part, as follows:

S. 2144 would direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey by quitclaim deed, without consideration, all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a 20-acre tract of acquired lands in Richland County, N. Dak., to the Fairview Cemetery Association, Inc., of Wahpeton, N. Dak. These lands are at present being administered by the Bureau of Indian Affairs of this Department. We have no need for the tract at this time, and would have no objection to the conveyance of the tract to the cemetery association. However, we do not, on general princples, favor the outright donation of federally owned land to a private organization, and, in this case, it is assumed that the cemetery association will sell cemetery lots to other parties. We, therefore, recommend that the conveyance be made upon the payment of the fair market value as determined by the Secretary of the Interior. To accomplish this end, the words "without consideration" at line 4 should be deleted and the words "at its fair market value as determined by the Secretary of the Interior" be inserted in lieu thereof.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the submission of this report to your committee.

Sincerely yours,

WESLEY A. D'EWART,
Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LONG in the chair). The present occupant of the chair wishes to explain that the committee amendment requires that the cemetery pay the fair market value of the property, in order to purchase it from the Government.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, if the present occupant of the chair will permit me to say so, I wish to extend to him, as the floor leader of the bill, my sincere compliments for making certain that, once again, a bill which comes to the floor of the Senate will obtain for the taxpayers of the United States the fair market value for the taxpayers' property which is being conveyed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair thanks the Senator from Oregon.

The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

RATES CHARGED FOR ELECTRIC POWER GENERATED AT FEDERAL PROJECTS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1783, S. 3338; and I call the attention of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] to the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 3338) relating to rates charged to public bodies and cooperatives for electric power generated at Federal projects.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Works with an amendment, on page 2, after line 2, to insert:

SEC. 2. The provisions of the first section of this act shall not apply to any charge made at a rate established specifically by any contract entered into by the Federal Government prior to February 28, 1956.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That for a period of 18 months after January 1, 1956, the Secretary of the Interior shall not, in the disposion of electric power and energy generated at projects under the control of the Federal Government (or any department or agency thereof), make any charge for any such power and energy furnished to any public body or cooperative at any rate in excess of the rate charged on February 27, 1956, for electric power and energy furnished by him to such public body or cooperative.

SEC. 2. The provisions of the first section of this act shall not apply to any charge made at a rate established specifically by any contract entered into by the Federal Government prior to February 28, 1956.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

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

Mr. KERR. Mr. President jointly with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], who prepared the bill in committee and reported it, I offer an amendment as disclosed on a copy of the bill which I send to the desk, and ask to have it read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 1, line 7, it is proposed to strike out "make any charge for any such power and energy furnished to any public body or cooperative at any rate in excess of the rate charged on February 27, 1956," and insert in lieu thereof the following: "to any public body or cooperative charge any rates applicable to any class of service in excess of the rates in effect for such class of service on February 27, 1956."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, before discussing the tenor and the exact phraseology of the amendment, I call the attention of the Senate to the fact that the entire subject was discussed very thoroughly in connection with the proposed increase of rates for the Southwestern Power Administration. The revision of rates which was discussed this morning by the Senator from Oklahoma was, in reality, pursuant to an order entered by the Federal Power Commission

in 1947, at which time interim rates were fixed for the Southwestern Power Administration. In part the order reads as follows:

an interim rate schedule to remain in effect only until such time as further study and experience indicate the desirability for revision, but for not more than 6 years.

The date of the Federal Power Commission order was February 1947. Six years have long since come and gone, and several attempts have been made to get the necessary increase in rates, as has been indicated. In each instance, there were several extensions of the period. No order has been entered to supplement the interim rates. The action on the part of the Secretary of the Interior, as he testified, was pursuant to the law as it now exists. He had no other alternative than to do what he did.

The further fact is that there has always been in the consciousness and in the knowledge of all the contracting parties the idea that there would be a revision of the rates. It was clearly indicated that there should be, because the cost at the time of the authorization to which I have referred, which occurred in 1947, was estimated at about $200 million in connection with 7 of the integrated projects of the SPA, whereas the total construction cost estimated by the Corps of Engineers in 1954 was $357 million, an increase of approximately $157 million. Obviously, there was experience during the intervening years which showed that an increase in rates was necessary.

So the principal subject and the principal point to be considered by the SPA lay in two areas: One, the formula by which the cost would be increased, and, secondly, the amount of the increase which would be computed.

It is fair to point out that the report on the bill which came to us only about 2 hours ago, includes a letter from Assistant Secretary of the Interior Fred G. Aandahl, and the letter is dated only yesterday. In the letter the position is taken that the administration and the Department of the Interior oppose the bill. However, they say, before the bill is passed they would like to call attention to the fact that the phraseology therein is inadequate, is very unclear, and would be difficult to construe.

They point out, for example, that the phraseology of the original bill refers to a single rate which was in effect on February 27, 1956, and that that rate should be frozen. In his letter, Secretary Aandahl points out that electric power and energy is not sold pursuant to a single rate, but is sold pursuant to a schedule of rates.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. HRUSKA. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Since the Senator has been discussing the letter of Assistant Secretary Aandahl, I wonder if it would not be advisable to have printed in the RECORD at this point in his remarks the entire letter.

Mr. HRUSKA. I ask unanimous consent to have the letter printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LONG in the chair). Is there objection?

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

Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Chairman, Committee on Public Works, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR CHAVEZ: You have requested the views of this Department on S. 3338, relating to rates charged to public bodies and cooperatives for electric power generated at Federal projects.

While the effect of S. 3338 in certain particulars is not clear, the bill generally would operate to freeze at their present levels and until July 1, 1957, the rates charged public bodies and cooperatives for federally generated power marketed by the Department of the Interior.

This Department cannot recommend that S. 3338 be enacted.

In marketing electric power and energy from its own installations and from projects of the Corps of Engineers, this Department acts through a variety of constituent agencies and pursuant to a number of statutes. The Bonneville, Southwestern, and Southeastern Power Administrations and the Bureaus of Reclamation and Indian Affairs all exercise power marketing responsibilities. Governing statutes include those specifically applicable to the marketing of power from the Bonneville, Fort Peck, Boulder Canyon, Eklutna, and Falcon projects, the Reclamation Project Act of 1939, statutes relating to Indian irrigation projects, and section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944. As to the Bonneville, Fort Peck, Eklutna, and Falcon projects and projects governed by section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944, power rates promulgated by this Department are subject to confirmation and approval by the Federal Power Commission.

While there are, of course, variations in detail among the statutes above referred to, there is under them a common responsibility to secure the return to the United States of an appropriate share of project costs through revenues from the sale of power. If adequate levels of power rates are not maintained, that responsibility cannot be met.

For the period during which it would be effective, S. 3338 would deprive the United States of an essential means of properly administering the Federal power projects to which it would be applicable. With the exception of power marketed through the Southwestern Power Administration, hereinafter discussed, this Department does not now foresee for an extended period including that covered by S. 3338 a necessity for a general rise in rate levels. Nevertheless, the principle contained in S. 3338 is so inconsistent with concepts of sound administration that its enactment cannot be regarded as desirable public policy. And especially is this so since S. 3338 would not only preclude timely action in the event circumstances not now foreseen were to require it but would also preclude technical improvements and adjustments in rate schedules having the incidental effect of raising particular charges even though overall rate levels were to remain unaffected.

S. 3338 is undoubtedly prompted by the increase in rates now being considered by this Department for the Southwestern Power Administration (SPA) power marketing area. It has long been apparent that a general rise in SPA rates is inevitable if the Federal investment in power producing and transmitting facilities is to be returned on the basis generally applicable to other Federal power developments administered by this Department. The generally accepted basis for the establishment of power rates except where the Congress otherwise provides, is the return, in addition to operation, maintenance, and replacement costs, of the power investment over a period of 50 years at an interest rate approximating 2½ percent.

The existing SPA rates (rate schedule A) have from their inception been intended only for temporary and interim application, a fact known to all purchasers of SPA energy. The rate schedule was confirmed and approved by the Federal Power Commission on February 13, 1947 (docket IT-5971), as "an interim rate schedule to remain in effect only until such time as further study and experience indicate the desirability for revision, but for not more than 6 years * * *." From February 13, 1953, the expiration of the original 6-year period of approval, until December 31, 1954, successive short extensions were granted, and on January 5, 1955, the Federal Power Commission extended schedule A until new rate schedules are approved by the Commission.

That existing rates are not sufficient to accomplish an adequate return is due to a combination of factors among them being rising construction costs, the revision of cost allocations, increases in annual operation and maintenance costs, and the increase in costs resulting from the operation of the so-called lease-option contracts with several generation and transmission cooperatives in the Oklahoma and Missouri areas.

After several years of study, the Federal Power Commission was requested, on December 29, 1954, to confirm and approve an increase in schedule A to the level then considered necessary in order to accomplish return of the Government's investment under the generally accepted standards. However, the reactivation of the lease contracts with the G and T cooperatives, provided for in the Departmental Appropriation Act for fiscal year 1956, further increased costs necessitating restudy and revision of the December 1954 proposals. The Commission accordingly was requested to withhold action on the submittal then before it. Studies had progressed to the point where this Department was prepared to propose specific revisions in the 1954 submittal for approval and confirmation by the Federal Power Commission when the Subcommittee on Flood Control, Rivers, and Harbors of the Committee on Public Works instituted a series of hearings upon the proposed rate increase.

A summary comparison of original and current estimates of cost and other data for the projects for which SPA is the marketing agent clearly demonstrates the necessity for an increase in power rates.

For the seven integrated projects in the system (Denison, Norfolk, Bull Shoals, Fort Gibson, Tenkiller Ferry, Blakely Mountains, Table Rock) total cost at time of authorization was estimated at $199.8 million, of which $109.2 million was allocated to power according to the SPA estimate. At the time of filing of rate schodule A in 1946, total estimated cost had risen to $234.8 million, with $111.2 million allocated to power according to the SPA estimate. In 1953 the Corps of Engineers and SPA each made allocation studies. The corps estimated total cost at $42.4 million, with $216.4 million allocated to power, and SPA used a total cost of $337.9 million, with $160.3 million allocated to power. In 1954, following the agreement among FPC, the Department of the Army, and this Department as to cost allocation methods for application to all water development projects, the corps estimated total construction cost at $357.6 million, with $200.2 million allocated to power.

Several significant points are to be noted. First, the estimated total construction cost has risen 79 percent above the original estimate. Second, while dollarwise the allocation to power has increased 83.3 percent over the original SPA estimate, the percentage of

total cost allocated to power under the current estimate (56 percent) is approximately the same as the percentage prevailing at the time of authorization (54.7 percent) and it is only slightly higher than the percentage prevailing at the time of the filing of rate schedule A (47.4 percent). Third, the substantial increase in construction costs has not been accompanied by any significant increase in the estimate of annual available primary energy, this having been 1,362 million kilowatt-hours at the time of filing of rate schedule A in 1946 and currently stands at 1,376 million kilowatt-hours. Fourth, although the estimate of installed capacity has increased from 426,000 kilowatts at the time of authorization to 674,000 kilowatts under current estimates, with a rise in the estimate of average annual energy from 1,430 million kilowatt-hours at the time of authorization to 1,970 million kilowatt-hours, the contribution to the revenue picture of this increase is minor since the increase represents almost entirely nonfirm energy.

Except for the Denison and Norfork projects for which the allocations to power are based upon incremental costs by virtue of the provisions of authorizing documents, current cost allocations for the integrated projects are arrived at by the separable costs-remaining benefits method. This is the method recommended for general application by the interagency agreement on cost allocation methods and it was also recommended by the Subcommittee to Study Civil Works of the House Committee on Public Works (the so-called Jones committee) in its report to the 82d Congress. This method entails an allocation of joint costs among the several purposes served in such a way that each purpose shares equitably in the savings resulting from the combining of the purposes in the multiple-purpose development.

As above indicated the current allocation of costs by that method is $200.2 million. If only separable costs were to be allocated to power, that is if there were to be allocated to power only the difference between the cost of constructing the projects with and without power as a purpose, the cost allocation would be reduced by less than $19 million to a total of $181.4 million. This would decrease revenue requirements by only $0.00032 (three-tenths of a mill) per kilowatt-hour on all primary energy sales. It is apparent, therefore, that the adoption of the separable costs-remaining benefits method of allocations is not a substantial factor contributing to the need for increased revenue. The principal factor contributing to the need for increased revenue is the substantial increase that has come about in construction on operating costs unaccompanied by a comparable increase in available primary energy.

The rate increase proposed by this Department is the minimum considered necessary to accomplish return of the Government's investment allocated to power in 50 years at 2½ percent interest, the generally accepted standard for the establishment of power rates.

We are firmly of the view that it would be unwise to defer further the application of the rate-establishing procedures of section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944. Extended deferment of consideration of a revision in rates can only result in the end, if the standards of ratemaking applicable generally to Federal projects are to apply, in a necessity for an increase above the level that would be sufficient were action to be taken at this time. Further delay would, therefore, in our view constitute a disservice to the very public bodies and cooperatives S. 3338 is intended to aid.

At the outset of this report it was stated that operation of S. 3338 in certain particulars is not clear. The bill refers to the rate charged on February 27, 1956, to a public body or cooperative for electric service furnished that public body or cooperative.

Charges for electric power and energy are commonly computed not upon the basis of a single rate but upon the basis of rate schedules applicable to particular classes of service. Thus, ordinarily there will be one rate schedule for firm power service and others for other classes such as dump or secondary service and irrigation pumping. Particularly in the case of firm power service the rate schedule will consist of a number of rates, the applicability of each of which will depend upon such factors as the amount of energy taken by the customer in a given month, the customer's load factor, his highest monthly demand, etc.

From the use in S. 3338 of the singular rate, the reference to the rate charged rather than to the rate schedule applicable, and the absence of a reference to classes of service it is not clear whether in the event of its enactment charges could be computed, during its effective period, on the basis of the schedule of rates applicable on February 27, 1956, to the particular class, quantity and character of service received by the customer during each monthly billing period. If the bill is not to be so read it would preclude proper charges based upon variations in such factors as the customer's load factor and upon changes in the class of service being taken. It would also, in that event, continue in effect certain rate schedules or rate schedule provisions that would otherwise by their terms have expired within that period, for example, rate ceilings applicable temporarily in new service areas and experimental rates all of which would otherwise expire by their own terms within the period of the bill's applicability. Other examples of the uncertainty that S. 3338 would bring about in the computation of charges may be found in those cases where the monthly charge is dependent in whole or part upon some factor of actual monthly variable cost as in the case of certain dump energy rates which are established at a specified percentage of fuel costs and in other instances in which the customer's charges are in part premised upon actual, monthly operating expenses.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there would be no objection to the submission of this report to your committee.

Sincerely yours,

FRED G. AANDAHL,
Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I should like to ask him if the amendment which has just been offered clarifies at least that part of the objection which was raised by the Assistant Secretary.

Mr. HRUSKA. Yes; it does clarify that part of the situation.

Continuing with the reason for the criticism in the first place, it is pointed out in the Secretary's letter that the applicability of any portion of a rate schedule as of any particular day or as of any particular month would depend upon the amount of energy taken by the customer in a given month, the load factor, the highest monthly demand, the class of power, and so on.

The purpose of the amendment which was proposed and read into the RECORD is to accommodate that thought and make clear the construction of the bill, so that it will apply to the schedule of rates and the particular rate which will flow therefrom, rather than to a single rate, which is, of course, not a practical application of the term.

HOUSING FOR ESSENTIAL CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES OF THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I am informed there are other Senators who would like to be present when the bill now under discussion is considered. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of calendar No. 1796, S. 3515. One Senator wants a quorum call. Another Senator has asked for time to get here. Meanwhile, the Senate can proceed to consider bills to which there is no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title, for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 3515) to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, to assist in the provision of housing for essential civilian employees of the Armed Forces.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Texas?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That title VIII of the National Housing Act, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new section as follows:

"SEC. 809. (a) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this title and in addition to mortgages insured under section 803, the Commissioner may insure any mortgage under this section which meets the eligibility requirements set forth in section 203 (b) of this act: *Provided,* That a mortgage insured under this section shall have been executed by a mortgagor who at the time of insurance is the owner of the property and either occupies the property or certifies that his failure to do so is the result of a change in his employment by the Armed Forces or a contractor thereof and to whom the Secretary or his designee has issued a certificate indicating that such person requires housing and is at the date of the certificate a civilian employee at a research and development installation of one of the Armed Forces of the United States or a contractor thereof and is considered by the Armed Forces to be an essential, nontemporary employee at such date. Such certificate shall be conclusive evidence to the Commissioner of the employment status of the mortgagor and of the mortgagor's need for housing.

"(b) No mortgage shall be insured under this section unless the Secretary or his designee shall have certified to the Commissioner that the housing is necessary to provide adequate housing for such civilians employed in connection with such a research and development installation and that there is no present intention to substantially curtail the number of such civilian personnel assigned or to be assigned to such installation. Such certification shall be conclusive evidence to the Commissioner of the need for such housing but if the Commissioner determines that insurance of mortgages on such housing is not an acceptable risk, he may require the Secretary to guarantee the Armed Services Housing Mortgage Insurance Fund from loss with respect to mortgages insured pursuant to this section. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to provide for payment to meet losses arising from such guaranty.

"(c) The Commissioner may accept any mortgage for insurance under this section

without regard to any requirement in any other section of this act that the project or property be economically sound or an acceptable risk.

"(d) Any mortgagee under a mortgage insured under this section is entitled to the benefits of insurance as provided in section 204 (a) with respect to mortgages insured under section 203.

"(e) The provisions of subsections (b), (c), (d), (e), (f), (g), (h), and (j) of section 204 shall apply to mortgages insured under this section except that as applicable to those mortgages: (1) all references to the 'Fund' or 'Mutual Mortgage Insurance Fund' shall refer to the 'Armed Services Housing Mortgage Insurance Fund' and (2) all references to section 203 shall refer to this section.

"(f) The provisions of sections 801, 802, 803 (c), 803 (i), 803 (j), 804 (a), 804 (b), and 807 and the provisions of section 803 (a) relating to the aggregate amount of all mortgages insured and the expiration date of the Commissioner's authority to insure under this title, shall be applicable to mortgages insured under this section."

The amendment was agreed to.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a part of the general statement contained in the report on the bill be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

GENERAL STATEMENT

This bill would add a new section 809 to title VIII of the National Housing Act, as amended, to provide mortgage insurance on homes to be owned by private individuals who are essential civilian employees of the armed services, or employees of contractors of the armed services, at research and development installations. Mortgage terms available under the bill are the same as those available under section 203 of the National Housing Act, the FHA's regular program of mortgage insurance for sales housing.

In order to qualify for insurance under the proposed new section, an individual would be required to hold a certificate issued by the Secretary of Defense which certifies that (1) he requires housing, (2) he is, on the date of the certificate, a civilian employed at a research and development installation of one of the armed services of the United States, or an employee of a contractor of the armed services, and (3) he is considered by the armed services to be an essential, nontemporary, employee at such date.

SALE OF TIMBER WITHIN THE TONGASS NATIONAL FOREST, ALASKA

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Order No. 1797, S. 2517.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the bill by title, for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 2517) to amend subsection 3 (a) of the act approved August 8, 1947, to authorize the sale of timber within the Tongass National Forest, Alaska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous consent request of the Senator from Texas?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (a) of section 3 of the act approved August 8, 1947 (61 Stat. 920), is hereby amended by striking out the period at the end of said subsection and inserting in lieu thereof a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That all receipts heretofore and hereafter received from the sale of such timber shall be subject to the provisions of the act of May 23, 1908 (35 Stat. 260), as amended, and the act of March 4, 1913 (37 Stat. 843), as amended. If any claims of possessory rights to lands or timber within the exterior boundaries of the Tongass National Forest are determined to be valid, the Territory of Alaska shall pay to the United States 25 percent of the moneys required to satisfy such claims: *Provided*, That the Territory shall not be required to pay to the United States any amount in excess of the total amount received by the Territory from the United States pursuant to the act of March 23, 1908: *Provided further*, That such payments by the Territory to the United States shall, to the extent possible, be effected by deductions from the amounts otherwise payable to the Territory pursuant to such act."

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the RECORD a brief statement with reference to the bill as contained in the report on the bill.

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

S. 2517 would authorize payment of 25 percent of the revenues from the Tongass National Forest in Alaska to the Territorial government of Alaska for gravely needed schools and roads in the Territory. The Department of Agriculture would receive 10 percent of the revenues for roads and trails in the national forest.

Such payments would be made under Federal laws of long standing that are applicable to all States and Alaska in which national forests have been established. Alaska would not receive any benefits that the States do not now enjoy. In fact, the Territorial schools are now being deprived of benefits they would now be enjoying were it not for the specific provision of the Tongass National Forest Act which requires that all revenues be held in escrow.

COMPENSATION OF SUPREME COURT JUSTICES AND CIRCUIT COURT JUDGES OF HAWAII

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1799, H. R. 7058.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title, for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 7058) to amend the act of May 29, 1928 (45 Stat. 997) in respect to the compensation of supreme court justices and circuit court judges.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Texas?

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement in explanation of the bill contained in the report.

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

H. R. 7058 would increase the part paid by the Federal Government of the total annual salaries of the supreme and circuit court judges of the Territory of Hawaii by amendment to the act of May 29, 1928 (45 Stat. 997).

All of the judges that would be affected by the bill, 15 in number, are appointed by the President and are confirmed by the Senate. Under the Organic Act of Hawaii, all must be residents of Hawaii.

The present annual salaries were established by act of Congress in 1928. By act of the Territorial Legislature of May 22, 1945—1945 Session Laws of Hawaii, page 357—the salaries payable to these justices by the United States were supplemented from funds of the Territory to the extent of $3,000 per annum. In 1951 the Territorial Legislature increased the supplemental compensation to $4,500 per annum—1951 Session Laws of Hawaii, page 637. Thus, the total annual compensation now received by the chief justice of the supreme court is $15,000; for the associate justices, $14,500; $12,000 for the justices of the first circuit; and $11,500 for the justices of the remaining circuits.

The changes in the salary scales that enactment of H. R. 7058 would bring about are: chief justice, Supreme Court of Hawaii, $17,500; associate justices, Supreme Court of Hawaii, $17,000; circuit judges, all circuits, $15,000.

AUTHORIZATION FOR TERRITORY OF ALASKA TO INCUR INDEBTEDNESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1801, H. R. 4781.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title, for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 4781) to authorize the Territory of Alaska to incur indebtedness, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Texas?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with amendments, on page 2, line 7, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$12,500,000" and insert "$20,000,000"; and on page 5, after line 17, to insert:

SEC. 7. The Territory of Alaska is authorized and empowered, notwithstanding any provision of the Organic Act or any other act of Congress to the contrary, to guarantee payment of bonds issued by municipalities, school districts, and public-utility districts in Alaska for constructing, altering, equipping, or acquiring public improvements of the nature for which the Territory may issue bonds in an aggregate amount which shall not at any one time exceed the sum by which the principal amount of Territorial bonds and certificates of indebtedness then outstanding under this act is less than $20,000,000. The authority to guarantee bonds of such subdivisions shall be exercised in a manner prescribed in section 2 of this act.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, may we have a brief explanation of the bill?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, this is a House bill, and its purpose is to authorize the Territory of Alaska to issue bonds and other instruments of indebtedness to obtain funds for public purposes. Under the committee amendments, the Territory is authorized also to guarantee bonds issued by municipalities, and school and public utility districts for specified purposes.

All borrowing authorized by the bill would be on the responsibility of the Territory of Alaska, and under laws to be enacted by the Territorial legislature, the members of which are elected by the people of Alaska. The credit of the Federal Government is in no way involved.

Maximum indebtedness under the authorization of H. R. 4781 may not exceed $20 million at any time.

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

The amendments were agreed to.

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.

PAYMENT OF GRATUITY TO RENA V. PELLEGRINI

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1804, Senate Resolution 243.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title, for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 243) to pay a gratuity to Rena V. Pellegrini.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Texas?

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

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the United States Senate lost a valued and trusted servant in the untimely passing on January 14, 1956, of Frank Pellegrini, chief counsel of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Today, through adoption of Senate Resolution 243, we have the opportunity, in small measure, to give a belated "thank you," perhaps not to Frank, but to Mrs. Pellegrini, and the two sons who survive him. We wish them well, and undoubtedly this resolution will express in more tangible terms our sentiment.

In addition, Mr. President, I ask that there be printed in the RECORD at this point a resolution which was adopted by unanimous vote of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at an executive session on January 25, 1956.

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

Whereas the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has learned with profound sorrow of the death of its chief counsel, Frank Pellegrini; and

Whereas Frank Pellegrini had been outstanding in organizing and handling the affairs of this committee, conducting its hearings with impartiality, so that despite the press of business, all had a fair and equal chance to be heard; and

Whereas the instantaneous nationwide expression of deep sympathy from the transportation, communications, maritime, fisheries, and other industries with which he worked are indications of the regard in which he was held; and

Whereas Frank Pellegrini was a man of the greatest integrity, brilliant intellect, and devoted himself with a whole heart to the public interest in the discharge of the duties of this committee; and

Whereas Frank Pellegrini, the individual, was of such a caliber as to command the deepest respect and at the same time the greatest personal loyalty of staff members as well as Senators, of comparable staff in the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, and the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee as well as Representatives with whom he worked; and

Whereas there developed between Frank Pellegrini and the individual members of this committee, of both parties, a close personal bond of friendship which transcended the day-to-day business of the committee: Now, therefore be it

Resolved, That individually and as a committee we express to his widow and two children our sincere sympathy in their bereavement, in partial consolement and assure them of our great respect for their husband and father who has been our wonderful friend and sympathetic fellow worker.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to Senate Resolution 243.

The resolution was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Rena V. Pellegrini, widow of Frank Pellegrini, an employee of the Senate at the time of his death, a sum equal to 11½ months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

PAYMENT OF GRATUITY TO RUTH M. HAEFNER

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1805, Senate Resolution 244.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 244) to pay a gratuity to Ruth M. Haefner.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Texas?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Ruth M. Haefner, daughter of Florence R. McKeever, an employee of the Senate at the time of her death, a sum equal to 1 year's compensation at the rate she was receiving by law at the time of her death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT ON JUVENILE DELINQUENCY AMONG INDIANS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1808, Senate Resolution 239.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title, for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 239) to print for the use of the Judiciary Committee additional copies of the subcommittee report on juvenile delinquency among the Indians.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Texas?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary not more than 2,000 additional copies of the report No. 1483, 84th Congress, of the Committee on the Judiciary to the Senate on its study of juvenile delinquency in the United States.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF SENATE REPORT 1734 ON WELFARE AND PENSION FUNDS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1809, Senate Resolution 238.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 238) authorizing the printing of additional copies of Senate Report 1734 on welfare and pension funds.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Texas?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with an amendment in line 1, after the word "printed", to strike out "3,500" and insert "3,230," so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That there be printed 3,230 additional copies of Senate Report 1734, a report on welfare and pension funds, for the use of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

ABOLISHMENT OF THE VERENDRYE NATIONAL MONUMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Calendar No. 1811, House bill 1774.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LONG in the chair). The bill will be read by title, for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 1774) to abolish the Verendrye National Monument, and to provide for its continued

public use by the State of North Dakota for a State historic site, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1774) to abolish the Verendrye National Monument, and to provide for its continued public use by the State of North Dakota for a State historic site, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with an amendment on page 1, line 6, after the word "thereon", to strike out "subject to existing permits" and insert "subject to the reservation to the United States of the right to flood such lands in connection with the operation and maintenance of the Garrison Dam and Reservoir project."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief statement regarding the bill, because I think we can quickly reach agreement on it.

As I understand, the committee wishes to have the property disposed of in accordance with provisions of the Surplus Property Act. I have no objection to having that done. However, the bill in its present form will not do that.

I should like to suggest that the amendment which I understand the present occupant of the Chair, the distinguished junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], is willing to accept be submitted; and as a matter of courtesy I shall offer it for him, if he will permit me to do so. If the amendment is adopted by the Senate, I shall not have any objection to the bill; I never object to having property disposed of in accordance with the provisions of the Surplus Property Act.

However, in its present form the bill does not provide for that. Therefore, I would have to object to the bill, unless the amendment were agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Let the Chair inquire whether the Senator from Oregon has the amendment before him now. The Chair is not certain that the amendment has yet been prepared.

Mr. MORSE. No, Mr. President; I do not have the amendment before me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Then let the Chair suggest that the bill be passed over temporarily.

Mr. MORSE. Very well, Mr. President; I ask that the bill be passed over temporarily.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bill will be passed over temporarily.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR FILING REPORT BY THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AUDITORIUM COMMISSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Calendar No. 1812, House bill 8957.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be read by title, for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 8957) to extend the time within which the District of Columbia Auditorium Commission may submit its report and recommendations with respect to the civic auditorium to be constructed in the District of Columbia.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the bill merely extends the time within which the District of Columbia Auditorium Commission, which is made up of some very fine persons, may submit its report and recommendations with repect to the civic auditorium to be constructed in the District of Columbia.

The purpose of the bill is to—

First. Extend the time within which the District of Columbia Auditorium Commission may submit its report and recommendations to the President and to the Congress with respect to the civic auditorium to be constructed in the District of Columbia, from February 1, 1956, to January 31, 1957.

Second. To change the designation from "civic auditorium" to "national civic auditorium."

Third. To authorize the appropriation of such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of the act of July 1, 1955—Public Law 128, 84th Congress—in addition to the $25,000 authorized by that act.

Public Law 128, approved July 1, 1955, established a commission known as the District of Columbia Auditorium Commission for the purpose of formulating plans for the design, location, financing, and construction in the District of Columbia of a civic auditorium, including an Inaugural Hall of Presidents and a music, fine arts, and mass communications center.

Mr. President, I think we are unusually fortunate in having some very prominent persons of very high caliber serve on the Commission. They believe they need additional time in which to submit their report and recommendations. So I hope the bill will be passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas for the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 8957) to extend the time within which the District of Columbia Auditorium Commission may submit its report and recommendations with respect to the civic auditorium to be constructed in the District of Columbia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill (H. R. 8957) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1780, House bill 9390, making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes. My purpose is to have this bill made the unfinished business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas?

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me inquire as to the situation in the case of Calendar No. 1783, Senate bill 3338.

RATES CHARGED FOR ELECTRIC POWER GENERATED AT FEDERAL PROJECTS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume the consideration of Calendar No. 1783, Senate bill 3338.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas?

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3338) relating to rates charged to public bodies and cooperatives for electric power generated at Federal projects.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I wish to express appreciation to the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] for clarifying the language of the bill by what he has had to say about the amendment which he and I jointly submitted.

I call attention to the fact that the purpose of the amendment is to make the bill effective to carry out its general purpose, namely, to prevent the changing of any rates or schedule of rates to the rural electric cooperatives and other public bodies for the period from January 1, 1956, to June 30, 1957.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas?

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3338) relating to rates charged to public bodies and cooperatives for electric power generated at Federal projects.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], on behalf of himself and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA].

The amendment was agreed to, as follows:

On page 1, in line 7, after the word "thereof" and the parentheses, to strike out ", make any charge for any such power and energy furnished to any public body or cooperative at any rate in excess of the rate charged on February 27, 1956," and insert: "to any public body or cooperative, charge any rates applicable to any class of service in excess of the rates in effect for such class of service on February 27, 1956."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 3338) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for a period of 18 months after January 1, 1956, the Secretary of the Interior shall not, in the disposition of

electric power and energy generated at projects under the control of the Federal Government (or any department or agency thereof) to any public body or cooperative, charge any rates applicable to any class of service in excess of the rates in effect for such class of service on February 27, 1956; for electric power and energy furnished by him to such public body or cooperative.

SEC. 2. The provisions of the first section of this act shall not apply to any charge made at a rate established specifically by any contract entered into by the Federal Government prior to February 28, 1956.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, today the Senate has completed action on 3 treaties, 2 conference reports, and 48 bills. We convened at an early hour, and we shall conclude our session today earlier than we had anticipated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Let the Chair state that the request of the Senator from Texas to have the Senate proceed to consider the appropriation bill for the Department of the Interior was not agreed to, because before the request was acted upon, request was made to have the Senate consider another bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I requested unanimous consent, and I thought my request was granted.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to ask a question in regard to that matter.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR APPROPRIATIONS, 1957

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I renew my request—which I thought had been agreed to—that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1780, House bill 9390, making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957. It is my intention to have this measure made the unfinished business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection——

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object; certainly I would not object to consideration of the Interior Department appropriation bill—I wish to ask the Senator from Texas 1 or 2 questions in regard to this matter.

I think the RECORD should show whether it is true that when the Senator from Texas requests consideration of the Department of the Interior Appropriation bill, he requests consideration of a bill involving a considerable number of appropriation matters which affect projects in the States of a number of Senators. Is not that true?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Certainly it is true, and it is particularly true in the case of the Senator's State of Oregon and in the case of the entire section of the country in which the Senator from Oregon is so vitally interested, namely, the Pacific Northwest. The bill contains appropriations in the amount of approximately half a billion dollars—to be exact, $433,851,000—for the Department of the Interior and related agencies.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, let me inquire whether I am correct in understanding that not only does the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], the majority leader, propose to have the Interior Department appropriation bill taken up by the Senate on Monday—and of course I would not suggest that, in order to meet the personal convenience of any Member of the Senate, the bill not be considered then—but that the probability is that next week the so-called bank holding company bill will be brought up on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, let me say to the distinguished Senator from Oregon that on yesterday the majority leader announced that the Interior Department appropriation bill could be brought up this week. However, in order to give ample time, so that all Members could thoroughly study the report on the bill, and since some Members insisted that the full 3 days provided by the rule be allowed, we thought we would allow an extra day, and not have the Senate take up the bill before Monday. We expect to have the Interior Department appropriation bill followed by the bank holding company bill sometime during next week.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from Texas that I wish the RECORD to show that I have a whole series of amendments to offer to the bank holding company bill. I am in favor of the passage of a bank holding company bill, but I am also in favor of the passage of a nondiscriminatory bank holding company bill. I do not wish to have the Senate pass a bank holding company bill which will single out certain holding companies and will act in a discriminatory fashion in regard to them, and will exempt other holding companies. I shall have more to say about that matter when the bill comes before the Senate.

I make this comment at this time, for the RECORD: Unwittingly and unintentionally, and certainly not by design, the majority leader, in arranging the work of the Senate, has placed me in a position in which other Senators frequently find themselves—namely, a position in which a Senator has to make a choice between remaining in Washington, in attendance on the Senate, and protecting, according to his sights, the best interests of his constituents, or keeping some previous engagements. I wish to state for the RECORD that although I was planning to leave the city on a 6 o'clock plane, for Oregon, the announcement that the Interior Department appropriation bill will be before the Senate on Monday, leaves me no choice but to remain and perform my senatorial duties here on Monday. Furthermore, the announcement that the bank holding company bill will in all probability be brought before the Senate next week likewise leaves me with no choice but to remain here and present my arguments and my amendments on that bill.

Because it is very easy for all of us to be subject to unfair criticism, I make this statement for the RECORD, under my reservation of the right to object, because I think my remaining in Washington will cause some comment in my own State and will cause great inconvenience to various organizations and persons who expected me to be there next week, either to make speeches of introduction or to make the major speeches at various meetings.

I have made my statement. I assure the majority leader that now, as always, I will cooperate with him in expediting the business of the Senate, without any delay to meet the personal convenience of any Member of the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I appreciate the consideration of the Senator, and his understanding of the situation confronting the leadership.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 9390, the Interior Department appropriation bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 9390) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments.

AUTHORIZATION TO COMMITTEES TO FILE REPORTS DURING RECESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that committees be authorized to file reports during the recess of the Senate following today's session.

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

CONDITION OF THE CALENDAR

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, as I have previously stated, today the Senate has disposed of 3 treaties, 2 conference reports, and 48 bills. Only 19 bills remain on the calendar. Some of them are awaiting the drafting of amendments, such as the one in which the distinguished occupant of the chair [Mr. LONG] is interested.

I hope that the recess of the Senate until Monday will allow full opportunity for us to utilize the next few days in an attempt to get from the committees any proposed legislation they now have under consideration which might be reported.

I do not know of any period of time since I have been a Member of the Senate when there have been so few bills on the calendar. I intend to address a letter—which is already in preparation—to each chairman of a committee, urging him to make every effort to have reported to the Senate from his committee at as early a date as possible, every bill which has received consideration by the committee.

The Senate staff and its employees have made a very fine record during the first 3 months of the session. If the committees can report to the Senate proposed legislation we can arrange to have it handled on the floor of the Senate. It is difficult for us to consider measures in the form of amendments which have not been considered in committee, so I hope committees will give thorough consideration to the bills which are pending be-

fore them, and report as many of them as they feel justified in reporting, based upon the merits of the bills.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY DELEGATION OF DELAWARE WOMEN

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, today is an important day in the history of the District of Columbia. One hundred and fifty fine women from the State of Delaware are visiting the Nation's Capital. I am very sorry that more Senators are not present in the Chamber. In addition, there was some difficulty in transportation within the city limits. However, with the permission of the Chair, I should like to present to the Senate and to the other visitors in the galleries a small but very important segment of the group of 150 ladies from Delaware.

Included in the group is our one lady member of the Delaware Legislature.

[The visitors rose and were greeted with hearty applause.]

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

Mr. FREAR. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I wish the distinguished group of visitors from the State of Delaware to feel certain that they have both a bipartisan welcome and a welcome from the other side of the continent. I join with the Senator from Delaware in extending the welcome of the Senate.

Mr. FREAR. I thank the distinguished minority leader. This group is a bipartisan group.

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

Mr. FREAR. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should like to associate myself with this most harmonious presentation of and welcome to the charming ladies from Delaware. They are every bit as charming as the ladies from Minnesota; and when they are that charming, they are at the top of the charm ladder.

Mr. FREAR. I am obliged to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota for his statement.

THE NEW SOVIET CHALLENGE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, one of the lesser known features of the new Soviet challenge is the intensified "redefection" campaign which the Kremlin is now sponsoring. According to an official of the International Rescue Committee the Soviet Government is now paying close to $100,000 per person to persuade escapees from the Iron Curtain to return to the Communist fold. According to a nine-man emergency Commission headed by William J. Donovan, no lure has been overlooked by the new Soviet leadership in their intensified drive to recapture refugees from Communist tyranny: the promise of better jobs, schooling for young people, guaranteed amnesty, and sentimental letters from families behind the Iron Curtain urging the escapee to return.

I point out that Mr. William J. Donovan is indeed a man of great competence and expert knowledge in these matters of counterintelligence. His record of information, knowledge, and experience with respect to the Soviet Union and its programs is second to none.

Mr. President, within the last 2 weeks an interesting article has appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald, written by Claiborne Pell, entitled "Redefection Drive Uses Honey or Steel." Mr. Pell is a former State Department officer who is presently Director of the International Rescue Committee and a member of the Donovan Emergency Commission. I ask unanimous consent that his article be inserted at this point in my remarks.

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

Communist nations, led by Russia, are spreading a new Red dragnet throughout the free world in an intensified campaign to repossess refugees who have fled Iron Curtain countries.

Amnesty decrees, appeals by radio and special newspapers, personal interviews and letters which find their way even to refugees in the United States are being used.

The aim of this latest Soviet weapon: "Redefection."

Threats, bribery, thefts, kidnapings and even murders have been employed in some European areas of high refugee concentration.

So far, the campaign has resulted in the return home of hardly 1,000 refugees a year. A rough estimate of the cost to the Communists would be in the neighborhood of $100,000 a head.

The effect of the increasing tempo of the redefection campaign on the anti-Communist refugees has been profound, however. Suspicion and distrust have been sown in refugee communities everywhere.

Headquarters for this Red roundup is in an office building at 65 Behrenstrasse, East Berlin, just around the corner from the gleaming new Soviet Embassy. There Gen. Nikolai F. Mihailov conducts the campaign. It is there that the propaganda newspaper, For Return to the Homeland, receives its editorial direction.

Munich, Frankfurt and various refugee camps in Germany are particular targets of the costly For Return to the Homeland, with its liberal use of color and eye-catching photographs, and of regular radio broadcasts from East Germany. The Communists play upon the emotions of the refugee with tape recordings of appeals by one member of a family still behind the Iron Curtain to another who has escaped.

Since names are frequently mentioned, these radio appeals get a wide audience in refugee camps. The apprehension of the refugee for his loved ones often is increased by the fact that the announcer usually knows the exact address of his listeners and cites such intimate facts as the color of a particular refugee's suit.

The Reds have resorted to violence in many places. Dr. A. R. Trushnovich, who was head of the Russian Rescue Committee in West Berlin, was abducted. Dr. Abdurakhman Fatalibeyli, section editor of Radio Liberation in Munich, was murdered. In the past year eight thefts of list of names and addresses of refugees were reported in Frankfurt.

In certain camps, Communist agents bring pressure on refugees not to continue with their application for American visas.

It was found that individuals were being beaten up in one camp for Bulgarian refugees in Greece for contacting the United States consulate. Others were being bribed to ignore summonses from the American consulate in connection with processing of visa applications.

Still, refugees are redefecting at a rate of only about three a day throughout the world, but the effects of the campaign can't be measured in those terms. Its real danger is the fear and suspicion it spreads among all refugees.

If one refugee redefects, his fellows know that he will be grilled for the name of everyone he met and about everything he did in the West.

The tentacles of the Communist campaign have now spread to the United States. Refugees in this country are being wooed with letters directed personally to them at their new American homes.

If the refugee moves, say from New York to Washington, often within 2 or 3 days his change of address will be known to the Communist embassy or legation which claims him. So far, however, violence has not been employed in this country.

In general, the campaign is most effective in the European sanctuaries where the refugee first alights after crossing the curtain. In such camps the Soviet or satellite agents use a gentler method of persuasion, the personal interview.

At the Zirndorf camp outside Nuernberg, a former Russian circus bear trainer I met was interviewed by a Soviet official flown from Moscow to bring pressure upon him. The interview, at which the Germans insisted that a representative of the United Nations Commissioner for Refugees be present, was fruitless. The refugee had only agreed to it to head off Russian charges that he was being prevented from seeing officials of his onetime homeland.

One of the many difficulties refugees face in West Germany is that legal status and working papers are given only to those who can establish that they would have been persecuted or imprisoned for political reasons if they had remained under Communist rule.

This policy stems from the widely held opinion in West Germany that if all individuals opposing the Communist puppet regime in East Germany were given sanctuary, there would be a mass exodus; East Germany would be emptied of its anti-Communists and the reunification of Germany would be further postponed.

Despite all obstacles, however, 500 to 1,000 East Germans stream into Berlin's Marienfelde Refugee Emergency Reception Camp every day. They escape simply by walking across the sector border in Berlin and surrendering themselves.

If a refugee passes the West Berlin screening he spends a couple of months in a camp being processed. Then, if finally accepted, he is efficiently resettled in some part of West Germany.

If the refugee is not accepted as having fled for bona fide political reasons, however, he is condemned to a sort of shadow life, since papers permitting freedom of movement are withheld. These so-called unrecognized refugees usually end up working at cut-rate wages. Some enter the black market or other illegal activities and some return to East Germany.

Non-German refugees from Russia and the satellite countries also turn up in Austria or West Germany. They may apply for emigration visas, but after a year or two in a refugee camp, awaiting processing, they may decide to settle down in Germany, whose language they have learned by that time.

The most pathetic refugees in Europe today are the so-called hard-core ones, of whom there are some 70,000 in West Germany. Usually for reasons of health or age these are not eligible for emigration to the Western Hemisphere. Often they have also been rejected for integration into the German economy. Some have been in camps or dependent upon public assistance for 10 years. This group provides a particularly fertile ground for Communist redefection propaganda.

But the eligible refugee desiring to go to the United States faces a hard row of his own. First, he must fulfill requirements of the United States Refugee Relief Act, which requires detailed evidence of good conduct for the past 2 years.

If the refugee has just crossed the border, obviously such evidence is almost unobtainable. And by the time he establishes a 2-year good behavior record in camp, he may have developed a spot on his lungs or some other health defect.

The Scandinavian countries are helping to solve the problem of "hard core" refugees by accepting some who are in bad physical condition. Denmark, for instance, recently took 100 persons with active tuberculosis and placed them in Danish sanitariums. Their families were given employment, food, and lodging nearby.

Fortunately, there are ways of combating the Communist redefection campaign. The most important would be to speed up processing of the refugee on his way to the United States.

The 2-year individual history requirement could be loosened administratively along the lines of President Eisenhower's recent recommendations to Congress. The tuberculosis ban could be limited to refugees with active, contagious cases rather than cover everyone with a spot on the lungs.

(Representative WALTER, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, last week introduced a bill to allow tubercular refugees to enter the United States under certain conditions. Sometimes refugee families with one tubercular member elect to stay abroad rather than be separated, it was explained. Walter's bill would authorize the Public Health Service to determine the extent of the individual's illness and, when necessary, send him to a sanitarium.)

Civic and church organizations in the Free World could adopt individual refugees. National and local governments could issue proclamations assuring refugees of a warm welcome.

A general campaign by the Government, the pulpit, the editorial page, and the radio station could raise the refugee from his present status of second-class citizen to that of a temporarily immobilized soldier of democracy in the cold war against communism.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, during the past few days it has also become clear, Mr. President, that when the more persuasive "lures" fail, the Soviet leadership does not hesitate to use the old Communist trademarks of threats, reprisals against relatives, blackmail, terrorism, and even abduction on American soil. An astounding lead article appears in the April 23, 1956, issue of Newsweek magazine on pages 21–23. Apparently the administration is not as alert as it might be in hamstringing the operation of Soviet agents right here in our own midst. The Newsweek article recounts the shocking story of how five refugee Russian seamen were forced to return to the Soviet Union with the connivance of Soviet diplomats and under the direction of the head of Russia's United Nations delegation. I ask unanimous consent that the article I have just referred to be inserted at this point in my remarks.

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

NATIONAL AFFAIRS: A DIPLOMATIC KIDNAPPING ON UNITED STATES SOIL

The five refugee Soviet sailors who took off for Finland from Idlewild Airport in New York early this month en route to the U. S. S. R. were, in effect, kidnapped by Soviet secret police.

No United States Government or local law agency did anything to prevent the kidnapping even though two, the Central Intelligence Agency and the Immigration Bureau, knew something of what was going on. The CIA did give protection to a sixth sailor when he asked for it and he escaped abduction.

The Immigration Service seemed almost to put itself out to make things easy for the abductors.

The Service authorized the sailors' departure after a routine 7-minute hearing to which no American, other than an inspector stationed at Idlewild and an interpreter, was admitted.

Among those excluded from the hearing were representatives of the Church World Service, an agency of the National Council of Churches, which sponsored the sailors.

The evidence indicates that the Soviet agents worked with or under Arkady A. Sobolev, chief of the Soviet delegation at the United Nations.

During the 4 days immediately preceding the arrival of the sailors at Idlewild, they were lured by a combination of persuasion and threats to the headquarters of the Soviet U. N. delegation on Park Avenue. when they finally cracked and agreed to return to Russia, they were whisked off to the Immigration hearing in a cavalcade of eight Soviet-owned automobiles, filled with agents. After the hearing, as they waited for their plane, they were surrounded by 20 agents, who kept them from speaking to their American friends.

The friends of the five young men said they had no intention of returning to the Soviet Union up to the time Soviet agents started closing in on them. Indeed, two of them told friends only a few days before they disappeared that it would be suicide for them to go back. One of them had planned to be married the Sunday after he vanished.

The extent to which they were subjected to physical pressure was suggested by a bloody shirt left behind in the quarters of one of the sailors.

All the sailors were shown letters and photographs from friends and relatives in the U. S. S. R. to back up the arguments for their repatriation made to them by Soviet agents. The threat was implied, if not openly made, that these hostages in the Soviet Union would be punished unless the boys cooperated with their abductors.

The boys did cooperate, at least to the extent of saying at the Idlewild hearing that they wanted to go home. According to the Immigration Service, the inspector who conducted the hearing failed to see anything unusual about their behavior. The Immigration Service declined to identify either this inspector or his interpreter. The Service's spokesman added that the inspector could have done nothing in any case because there is no law authorizing the Government to interfere with the exist of aliens from this country.

FRACAS

An Immigration Service spokesman said: "There was no way of detaining the defectors without provoking an international fracas. If there was any possibility of a kidnapping taking place, Church World Service, the defectors, or their friends should have notified the FBI, the proper police authority. Based on what we knew, there was nothing we could do."

The Immigration Service, like the FBI, is a part of the Justice Department.

Exactly how the five were lured to the Park Avenue headquarters of the Soviet U. N. delegation is not entirely clear. Their former neighbors are afraid to talk freely because they dread the power of the MVD. One witness claims he was told by Government agents not to discuss the case. The Russian communities in and around New York City are terrorized.

"But this is America," a Newsweek reporter told one of the witnesses. "You are safe enough here."

"Were those boys safe enough here?" he asked. "What good did it do them to be in America?"

The 5 sailors with 2 Soviet police escorts were flown to Finland aboard a Scandinavian Airlines plane. (This line has recently been authorized by the Soviet Union to fly a regular service from Helsinki to Moscow.) Officials of the line decline to say who paid for the tickets, but it was learned that the tickets had been ordered by Soviet officials through a travel agency.

The whole operation of rounding up the refugees and spiriting them out of the country was conducted with military precision and obviously was carefully organized. A small army of agents was used.

The victims were Valentin Lukashkov, 25; Alexander Shirin, 26; Michael Shishin, 25; Viktor Ryabenko, 23; and Nikolai Vaganov, 23. They were part of the crew of the Soviet tanker, *Tuapse*, which was captured by the Nationalist Chinese in June 1954, while en route to Shanghai carrying a cargo of kerosene for the Chinese Reds. The crew was temporarily interned on Formosa and then given the choice of returning to the Soviet Union or remaining in the free world. Of the 20 crewmen who asked for asylum in the United States, 9 got it.

TAILED

From the time they arrived in New York in October 1955, the nine were hounded by Soviet agents trying to persuade them to go back home (Newsweek, December 26, 1955). They were bombarded with letters from home but refused to be impressed with these communications because they all seemed spurious. The sailors said their families weren't literate enough to write such persuasive and well-composed letters.

Of 6 who were in New York when the Soviet secret police went to work on them in earnest, only 1 escaped them. The other three are living outside the New York area and their addresses are being kept secret.

The refugee who planned to get married is Lukashkov. His fiancee, Nina Somons, a pretty, 24-year-old Russian girl who arrived in this country 5 years ago and now is a part-time teacher of English, said the ceremony was to have taken place in the same Russian Orthodox Church where he recently had been baptized. Nina was brokenhearted. She said she was sure Lukashkov never left this country of his own free will.

Olga and Tania Sirovatko, sisters who had double-dated Shirin and Shishin a week before they enplaned, were equally sure that their friends had no thought of returning to the Soviet Union. The girls said these two sailors had made plans for their future in America and were happy about their prospects.

Return: Ryabenko and Vaganov, who lived together in Paterson, N. J., had discussed with their landlords changes in Soviet Russia brought about by the anti-Stalinist line the Kremlin is now pursuing. They had both made it clear that they had no idea of going home.

The sailors had recently told the Church World Service that four of the crewmen of the *Tuapse*, left behind in Formosa, now wanted to come to the United States. They had expressed the hope that their four comrades might join them.

Shirin, who worked in a New York factory, complained to his employers on Wednesday, three days before he departed for Russia, that a Soviet agent had bothered him at the factory.

Tass reported the departure of the five seamen from New York. It was the first time the Soviet press had admitted that any of the *Tuapse* crewmen were in the United States. It explained that some of them had

been "sent" to America when their mates chose repatriation. The Tass report blandly added:

"The five men requested the Soviet Embassy in the United States to help them return home. On April 7, the Russian colony in New York gave them a warm send-off."

ONE HUNDRED AND TWENTY FATEFUL HOURS FOR FIVE

Here, chronologically, is what happened to the five who are now back in Russia during the few days it took Soviet agents to herd them aboard a Europe-bound plane:

Tuesday, April 3: Shishin communicated somehow with Soviet officials and volunteered to go back to Russia or was persuaded to consent. From then on he was used as bait to catch the other four. Shishin was the only one of the refugee sailors with a wife in the Soviet Union.

Wednesday, April 4: Shishin tried to persuade Shirin and Lukashkov, who had been living with him at 500 Riverside Drive, to go back with him. They refused. That night Soviet agents also tried to persuade them but without success.

Meanwhile, two Soviet agents called on Viktor Soloviev, 20, who lived at the George Washington Hotel and who had talked with Lukashkov and Shirin and knew they still were determined not to return. Soloviev's callers woke him up at 11:30 p. m., and made a strong argument for his return. He was jostled but wasn't taken by force when he made it clear that he'd call for help.

Thursday, April 5: That morning Shishin, Lukashkov, and Shirin left International House for Columbia University, where they were to take the final examination in an English course they had just completed. When it was over Shishin disappeared. He went or was taken to the Soviet delegation's building on Park Avenue.

Two agents called on Ryabenko and Vaganov at their boarding house in Paterson, N. J. They carried bottles of liquor into the house. At 7 a. m. the two sailors got into the agents' car. Later, the landlady found Ryabenko's shirt, which she said was blood-stained. Frightened, she washed it.

Friday, April 6: At 1 o'clock that morning, Lukashkov, Shirin, and Soloviev met at International House and talked about their plight until 5 a. m. They decided to defy the Soviet agents. Soloviev then returned to the hotel.

At 6:30 a. m. he tried to reach his two friends at International House by telephone but was told by the operator: "Something has happened . . . I don't know."

Later that day Soloviev reported what had happened to the Church World Service and asked for protection. The service in turn reported to the CIA. Soloviev told Newsweek days later that he still lived in terror of abduction.

The Immigration Service was notified by the Russians that they intended to fly the refugees out of Idlewild the following day. They said they had a document signed by all five of the sailors stating their willingness to return home.

Jan Van Hoogstratten, the Church World Service worker who had been in effect the guardian of the sailors since they arrived in this country, asked the Immigration Service to conduct a hearing.

Saturday, April 7: The 8-car Russian parade arrived at Idlewild at 3:30 p. m. The 20 agents looked like a mob with the five sailors at its core. The hearing started at 3:45 p. m. It was over in less than 10 minutes. The five sailors and their guards took off on schedule at 4 p. m.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I think the appropriate officials of our Government owe an explanation to the Senate and to the country if the account contained in Newsweek magazine of this diplomatic kidnaping is accurate.

It would be all to the good for American public opinion if this article were verified by the State Department or our intelligence agencies, or appropriately refuted, if it contains any misstatements of fact or any allegations which may be proved untrue.

Mr. President, I now desire to refer to another subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota has the floor.

ATOMIC POWER PROJECT IN MINNESOTA

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I have just been informed that the Atomic Energy Commission has authorized negotiations with the Rural Electric Cooperative Power Association at Elk River, Minn., for a contract to design and develop an atomic power reactor developing 22,000 kilowatts of electric power. This is an historic occasion, and I am proud, as every Minnesotan is, that Minnesota has been chosen among the first peacetime power projects. This is a historic event—not only for Minnesota, and for the great cooperative movement, but also for the whole Nation.

Minnesota has scored a tremendous first. But far more important are the implications for cheaper electric power for the entire Nation. At long last, we seem to be moving into the long-promised era of peaceful atomic energy. Nothing demonstrates this to me so vividly as this decision, belated as it is, and after long delay, to support the development of an atomic power reactor in a small Midwestern community. We are at last on the threshold of the new era—the era of the peaceful use of the atom, or nuclear energy.

I want the RECORD to show that from time to time representatives of the Rural Electric Cooperative Power Association have met with the officials of the Atomic Energy Commission in regard to this very project. Also from time to time the Minnesota congressional delegation—both my senior colleague [Mr. THYE] and myself, and Members of the House of Representatives—have met with the Atomic Energy Commission, urging that this action be taken. About a month ago I had reason to believe that this action was in the offing, and I am delighted now to have my expectation confirmed within the past hour or so. Negotiations have been authorized, and it is now quite evident that the power project will soon be underway.

Mr. President, 3 years ago in the Senate, at the time the distinguished junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] was handling the bill containing the appropriation for the Rural Electric Administration, I asked whether under that appropriation it would be possible for an atomic reactor to be built under the auspices of the REA. We discussed the subject for some time on the floor of the Senate. It was the view of the chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from North Dakota, that such an atomic reactor could be constructed under the appropriations provided to the Rural Electric Administration.

Subsequently, the matter was clarified in some detail in the next year's appropriation bill and in the discussion of the REA authorizations.

Now the Atomic Energy Commission, in cooperation with REA, has made possible the first peacetime atomic reactor plant for a rural electric cooperative. I am singularly delighted and happy that this has taken place in the State of Minnesota. It bodes well for the future.

Mr. President, I desire now to turn my attention to another subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota still has the floor.

THE SOIL-BANK PROGRAM

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, today something very important happened in the House of Representatives on another subject. I have in my hand a number of news items from the news ticker, both from the United Press and from the Associated Press, relating to an action which was taken in the Committee on Appropriations in the House of Representatives. The first item reads as follows:

The House Appropriations Committee, moving speedily on the heels of the farm bill veto, today voted $1.2 billion to President Eisenhower to put the soil-bank farm plan into effect immediately.

Another item reads:

Chairman CLARENCE CANNON, Democrat, of Missouri, said the money would enable Agriculture Secretary Benson to put into effect under existing laws exactly the same soil-bank plan that had been contemplated in the farm bill vetoed by President Eisenhower.

Representative JAMIE L. WHITTEN, Democrat, of Mississippi, chairman of a subcommittee that drafted the money bill at an unannounced session this morning, said there was one exception to this.

WHITTEN said as far as he knows, Benson will not be able to make advance payments to farmers this year, for soil-bank commitments for the next year.

Democrats had bitterly assailed this feature of the administration's plans as an effort to buy the votes of farmers in the 1956 presidential and congressional elections.

I should like to read from the report of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, as reported by the Associated Press and the United Press:

CANNON said he hopes to call up the money bill in the House next week.

The Democratic-controlled committee took advantage of the opportunity to renew its frequent criticism of the Agriculture Department. In its report to the House the committee said:

"The committee doubts that the soil bank plan will do all that the President claims for it, so far as reducing surpluses is concerned. In its opinion, present surpluses are the result of the failure of the Department of Agriculture to sell commodities in world trade for the present charter of the Commodity Credit Corporation. To support this view, the committee need only point to the fact that in recent months practically all commodities which have been offered for sale competitively in world trade through normal channels have been sold for dollars.

"Neither does the committee believe that such program can ever be a substitute for price or income which farmers must have if they are to share fully in national prosperity. The committee does believe that such a program, if properly administered, can be of some help to American farmers under present conditions. * * *

"Since the President has vetoed H. R. 12, which would have restored the historical relationship between the farmer's price and the cost of what he must buy, and would have fixed price supports at 90 percent of the farmer's comparative purchasing power during the period 1909–14, some alternative action must be taken by Congress. The action proposed herein appears to be the most feasible way of providing some immediate relief for the farm problem."

Furthermore, I should like to have it noted in the RECORD that Democratic leader JOHN W. MCCORMACK announced later that the soil-bank appropriation would be called up in the House next week, possibly as early as Wednesday.

The reason I mention this is that, as the ticker items reveal, the committee has stated that the provisions of the existing soil-conservation law authorize a soil-bank program.

Another news item states:

The committee cited provisions of the existing soil-conservation law as authority for the soil-bank program It said it was surprised to find President Eisenhower asking for a soil-bank law since this authority had existed since 1935 and since the President, during 3 years of declining farm income, had made no request for funds to implement it.

"Notwithstanding the failure of the President and the Secretary of Agriculture to use such existing authority, and despite the fact that they have not seen fit to request the necessary funds, the committee feels that the appropriation proposed in the accompanying bill should be given immediate consideration by Congress," the committee said in its report to the House.

Yesterday, Mr. President, in the Senate I referred—at pages 6493 and 6494 of the RECORD of April 18—to the act of 1935, known as the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act. I called the attention of the Senate to sections 1 through 6, and to sections 7 and 8. At that time I said:

Sections 1 to 6 have been on the statute books since April 27, 1935.

They give the Secretary of Agriculture sweeping powers to carry out intensive conservation efforts, including specific provisions for changes in the use of land.

Then I went on to point out:

Section 6 authorizes to be appropriated for the purposes of this act "such sums as Congress may from time to time determine to be necessary." Not even a limitation. Yet, has Secretary Benson or President Eisenhower ever asked for such appropriations?

I was summarizing this law in laymen's language, and I said:

In layman's language, what does that law provide? It specifically authorizes payments to farmers for changes in land use, so as to avoid the exploitation or wasteful use of land resources for production unneeded for domestic consumption. That is what the soil-bank program will do. That is its whole purpose.

Note, however, that the language is permissive, not mandatory. I say that anyone who reads the language of the Conservation Act and the Domestic Allotment Act, with amendments up to date, going back to as early as 1935, will find in them all the authority which is necessary for effective soil conservation or a soil-conservation reserve program.

When my own soil-bank bill was introduced, my purpose was to direct the Secretary to carry out such a program, in view of his failure to take such action on his own initiative. If the Secretary wanted such a program, if the President wanted such a program, why was it not included in this year's budget under authority which now exists?

The Committee on Appropriations of the House has gone into this matter very meticulously. The members of that committee, by an overwhelming vote of 36 to 7, went on record as saying that the authority already exists. Appropriations have now been voted by the committee.

I merely bring this point up because 2 weeks ago today, when Presidential Assistant Sherman Adams was making comment in the press about the delay on the soil bank, namely, to the effect that if the soil bank provisions were not written into law now they would possibly be inoperative, due to the fact that farmers were engaged in planting, the junior Senator from Minnesota issued a statement to the press and said there was ample authority under existing law, and called it to the attention of the President and the Secretary of Agriculture. I wish to say quite frankly that my statement has been ignored. There has been no effort made on the part of the administration to look into that authority and to come to grips with the problem and to present a program.

This morning in the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, the Secretary of Agriculture was asked about this subject by the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], and in colloquy between the Senator and the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Agriculture apparently took exception to the judgment of the Senator from Louisiana, and said he did not believe that he could inaugurate such a program.

Benson insisted, "We have looked into it, and we cannot put the soil bank into operation without legislation."

Benson's statement came in testimony today before the Senate Agriculture Committee. He said Agriculture Department attorneys had studied existing law thoroughly and concluded it does not contain authority for the soil-bank plan the administration sponsors.

Senator ALLEN J. ELLENDER, Democrat, of Louisiana, the committee chairman, disagreed.

"All you need is funds * * * you could get it next week," he said.

ELLENDER warned the Secretary he would open the way for another bitter farm-policy battle if he insisted on a new farm bill including only the soil-bank provisions.

"You can't ask for what you want and not expect others to ask for what they want," the Senator said.

"If we put any farm bill through this year, you can depend on this—a lot of the provisions will be distasteful to you," ELLENDER added.

ELLENDER said he was "too busy" to order immediate hearings on the GOP soil-bank bill introduced yesterday. He told reporters he might call hearings later this year.

Mr. President, I have read the full story as reported. I wish to say that I happen to know that a study of this legislation, the act of 1935, has been made in the Department of Agriculture.

Furthermore, any who have been associated with the Department in the past know that the authority is inclusive, and is sufficiently broad to permit the Secretary to enter upon a program known as the soil bank, in all its features. The only limitation has been upon farmers. The House is about to appropriate $1,200,000,000, which is exactly the amount of money provided in the Senate and House conference report for both the acreage reserve and the conservation reserve programs.

I wish to commend the members of the House committee for this quick and positive action. If we in the Senate will move with the same dispatch we can make the money available to the Department within a few days, and the soil-bank program can go into operation, because a good deal of planting has not been done. Furthermore, some of the planting could not be touched, anyway, this year—winter wheat, for example. Some of the wheat is planted in the fall, and, obviously, could not have been affected by any soil-bank bill which could have been passed in either January, February, or March of 1956.

I think, Mr. President, my colleagues understood that advance payments are usually open to all kinds of abuses and criticism by the public——

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. First of all, I think it is desirable that the Appropriations Committees of the two Houses should give consideration—and I hope they will give favorable consideration—to an appropriation to support the soil bank program. I think that is necessary, whether the procedure be followed of merely having an appropriation item, or, perhaps, the more sound procedure of also having specific legislative authority.

People may differ as to whether the present authority is ample; certainly there are some differences of opinion in that regard. But apparently earlier this year the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, as he has pointed out in the Senate on several occasions, introduced a soil bank proposal. It may have been last year that he introduced it. The Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] yesterday pointed out that as a Member of the House 2 years ago he had introduced a soil bank bill. The distinguished group of Senators who serve on the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry at least felt there was considerable merit to providing legislative authority in the so-called agricultural bill which was recently passed by both Houses and vetoed by the President.

So it seems that there was a considerable body of thought that if not absolutely essential, certainly it would be desirable to have some specific legislation in this regard. In any event, the legislative authority of the Senate and the House, if, in their judgment, they determine to proceed in that way, will of course have to be supported subse-

quently by appropriations in support of the authorization legislation.

I hope that rather than possibly getting into a situation involving the General Accounting Office, or some legal action being taken questioning the Secretary's authority, those who are interested in solving the problem and in having a soil bank will not only support the appropriation which may be necessary, but will also support authorization legislation.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the minority leader's words are both clear-cut and constructive. I think, however, that if my colleague will examine the RECORD as I have done, he will note that on the day of the introduction of the so-called soil-bank bill, the conservation and acreage reserve bill, it had one express purpose, namely, to make soil bank and conservation and acreage reserve mandatory, to direct the Secretary rather than leaving it permissive.

Furthermore, if we examine the RECORD in relation to the objections of the Department to soil-bank bills both in the Senate and the House, it will be noted that from time to time the Department recognized that it already had great authority in this particular area.

I think it is always right and proper to admit one's own limitations and lack of knowledge. The truth is that many of us had not studied the act of 1935 as carefully as we should have done. I came to the study of that act after the Assistant to the President, Mr. Adams, had made a rather personal attack, stating that some us, including the junior Senator from Minnesota, had been responsible for delay in the passage of the farm bill. Under necessity one is able to do considerable work. So, looking through the law and going back through the whole conservation legislation, I came across the sections in the act of 1935 to which I have referred. I have discussed these sections with lawyers of competence in the field of agriculture.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield further?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I might say that neither the Senator from Minnesota nor the minority leader is an attorney, and my observation over several years has been that even eminent attorneys can sometimes disagree. I even find that in the Supreme Court of the United States, which is our greatest tribunal, every once in a while a 5-to-4 decision is handed down, which must indicate that even able lawyers disagree as to the exact meaning of the law.

So, while the Senator from Minnesota may have been advised, and the persons with whom he advised may have had the finest legal ability, that is no assurance that some other legal counsel might advise someone else that there is no statutory authority. All I am saying is that if there is a will to enact legislation, and to button it down so that there can be no valid question, it would seem to me that the constructive way of proceeding would be to have both authorization legislation and an appropriation.

It is true, and I think the Senator has made it very clear in his remarks, that even those who placed the appropriation in the bill in the committee pointed out that it did not cover the point of advance payments. It may be that a valid argument can be made by those who think that is not a sound procedure, but it would seem to me that that feature could very well be debated and discussed on the floor of the House and the Senate as a matter of national policy.

Nevertheless, I would not want to rest merely on the advice of a limited number of lawyers and then find after Congress had acted that some legal action was taken or some opinion rendered which would throw the whole thing in doubt.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from California. He is one of the most able proponents of the administration's point of view on many matters, and is one of its most able and conscientious defenders.

However, I should like to note again for the RECORD sections 1 to 6 and sections 7 and 8 as I have cited them on pages 6493 and 6494 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The language appears to me to be rather explicit. It says:

To cooperate or enter into agreements with, or to furnish financial or other aid to, any agency, governmental or otherwise, or any person, subject to such conditions as he (the Secretary) may deem necessary, for the purposes of this act.

Section 6 authorizes to be appropriated for the purposes of this act "such sums as Congress may from time to time determine to be necessary."

Section 7 provides:

It is hereby declared to be the policy of this act also to secure, and the purposes of this act shall also include—

(1) preservation and improvement of soil fertility:

(2) promotion of the economic use and conservation of land;

(3) diminution of exploitation and wasteful and unscientific use of national soil resources;

I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the text, to the bottom of the page, be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

"(5) reestablishment, at as rapid a rate as the Secretary of Agriculture determines to be practicable and in the general public interest, of the ratio between the purchasing power of the net income per person on farms and that of the income per person not on farms that prevailed during the 5-year period August 1909-July 1914, inclusive, as determined from statistics available in the United States Department of Agriculture, and the maintenance of such ratio."

Section 8 (a) of the act makes clear this authority exists in force until the end of this year.

Section 8 (b) says:

"Subject to the limitations provided in subsection (a) of this section, the Secretary shall have power to carry out the purposes specified in clauses (1), (2), (3), (4), and (5) of section 7 (a) by making payments or grants of other aid to agricultural producers, including tenants and sharecroppers, in amounts determined by the Secretary to be fair and reasonable in connection with the effectuation of such purposes during the year with respect to which such payments or grants are made, and measured by (1) their treatment or use of their land, or a part thereof, for soil restoration, soil conservation, or the prevention of erosion; (2) changes in the use of their land; (3) their equitable share, as determined by the Secretary, or the normal national production of any commodity or commodities required for domestic consumption; or (4) their equitable share, as determined by the Secretary, of the national production of any commodity or commodities required for domestic consumption and exports adjusted to reflect the extent to which their utilization of cropland on the farm conforms to farming practices which the Secretary determines will best effectuate the purposes specified in section 7 (a); of (5) any combination of the above."

A NEW START IN ARMAMENTS CONTROL

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Armament Control: A New Start?" published in the Nation magazine for March 17, 1956.

The editorial discusses the progress which had been made up to that time by the Senate Special Subcommittee on Disarmament.

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

Within the past few weeks there have been two important moves toward the international control of armaments. One, President Eisenhower's letter of March 1 to Marshal Bulganin hit the front pages all over the world. The other, the start of a serious study of disarmament by a special Senate subcommittee headed by HUBERT HUMPHREY of Minnesota, has been noted on the back pages when it has been noted at all.

The President's letter is an encouraging sign of a new interest and flexibility on the part of our own Government in his central problem of the contemporary world. Yet of the two, the Senate study may well have the greater and more lasting effect. Much prominence has been given to the President's new proposal to consider excluding the future production of fissionable materials from weapons stockpiles. But when Admiral Strauss appeared before the Senate disarmament subcommittee on March 7, he took pains to point out that this proposal was conditional upon the prior adoption and satisfactory operation of the Eisenhower "open skies" inspection plan. A good many of our free-world allies have indicated privately, and a few publicly, their belief that the Soviets will never accept inspection in advance of agreement on substantive measures of arms control.

The Senate disarmament subcommittee, authorized last July, began its public hearings on January 25 with Harold Stassen, the President's Special Assistant on Disarmament. The Senate caucus room was largely vacant and the Nation's press carried hardly a line about it. Somewhat more notice was given to Secretary Dulles' appearance for 2 hours on February 29; but the press coverage was based primarily on a routine State Department release rather than upon the Secretary's more revealing and significant answers to extensive questioning. Chairman Strauss of the Atomic Energy Commission, and Senator FLANDERS, accompanied by Col. Richard S. Leghorn, testified on March 7; but the admiral, unlike Secretary Dulles, ducked many of the most penetrating questions or put them off to a secret session.

Although technically only a special subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations

Committee, this is no ordinary subcommittee. By deliberate design its membership includes, in addition to Chairman HUMPHREY, 5 other members of the Foreign Relations Committee, 4 members of the Armed Services Committee, and 2 members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. Such membership insures that all important aspects of the subject will be covered—international relations, military, and atomic energy. It is already apparent from the first two hearings that the subcommittee, and particularly Chairman HUMPHREY, are not looking for headlines, but neither are they shying from an examination of the important central problems in this area.

As a Nation we have been drifting along since the U. N.'s "majority plan" for atomic-energy control was evolved in September 1947, distracted by day-to-day developments in the international field and unconsciously hoping that if the problem of atomic control were ignored it might go away. But far from disappearing, this problem has become more and more unmanageable as stocks of fissionable materials for bombs have grown in this country, the U. S. S. R., and Great Britain. The destructive power of these stocks of fissionables has been multiplied by a factor of at least 100 and probably closer to 1,000 by the development of the fission-fusion-fission bomb. The scientific correspondent of the Manchester Guardian has estimated within the past month that the accumulated stockpiles are now sufficient in Great Britain for 2,000 to 4,000 bombs, in Russia for 10,000, and in the United States for 35,000. That these estimates are not unreasonable is suggested by the recent United States announcement that 40,000 kilograms of U-235 would be made available over a period of time for atomic-power development. That is enough for 8,000 bombs at the 5-kilograms-per-bomb figure used by the Guardian.

In their testimony Mr. Stassen and Mr. Dulles both stressed the point that all previous United States positions on armaments control were formally "reserved"—in other words withdrawn—at the U. N. discussions last September, when it was shown that no effective technical method is now known for accounting fully for all past production of fissionable materials. Thus at the moment the United States has no arms-control plan of any kind before the U. N. President Eisenhower's "open skies" proposal of last July is only a scheme for a warning device; it includes no plan for reduction of armaments, atomic or otherwise. The present administration deserves some credit for bringing this question of accounting for past production into the open, even though, as Senator HUMPHREY pointed out on March 7, it was done 2½ years after the administration came into office and the problem has been known to exist at least since the Soviets tested their first atomic bomb in September 1949. The problem has been present in its crucial form ever since this country exploded the first hydrogen bomb in November 1952, since it was then demonstrated that the destructive power of fissionable stocks must be recalculated by a factor of at least 100.

Senator HUMPHREY urged Secretary Dulles to develop and present a complete new arms-control plan adapted to the present situation, and the Secretary admitted that this finally might be done. Indeed he went further to indicate—as Mr. Stassen has also done on other occasions—the form that such a plan would have to take: The limitation and control of carriers of fission and fusion weapons, primarily planes and missiles. The Secretary gave no indication, however, that any such proposal was in the immediate offing, and the realistic prospect—despite the President's March 1 letter to Marshal Bulganin—is another more-or-less futile session of the five-power disarmament subcommittee of the U. N., which is to resume its meetings in London on March 19.

The Senate Disarmament Subcommittee has announced that, after hearing Secretary of Defense Wilson, it will hear nongovernmental witnesses in Washington and subsequently in the field. Various university scientists and technicians have been invited to submit their views. The country will certainly benefit from these hearings—at the very least by bringing the essential facts on the subject out from behind the foggy curtains of the Atomic Energy Commission and the Pentagon, and perhaps by prodding officialdom into doing what Mr. Stassen was appointed to do a year ago—develop a comprehensive United States plan for arms control.

GENERATION OF ELECTRICITY IN MINNESOTA BY ATOMIC ENERGY

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I was indeed most happy this afternoon to receive from the Atomic Energy Commission, in an official news release, a notice that the AEC had authorized nuclear powerplant negotiations with two electric cooperatives in Minnesota and Michigan. The Elk River Rural Power Cooperative of Elk River, Minn., submitted one of the two proposals which were accepted.

I live in a rural community not having electricity at the time the REA Act was passed. I hailed the coming of rural electrification, and was instrumental in helping our local county associations to create and develop a rural electrification association. I have watched the development of the REA over the years, and have found that the farmers' REA associations in the States have enjoyed the many benefits of rural electrification.

I watched the development of the plant at Elk River, Minn., to generate electricity by steam power and to serve the REA's in the Northwest. With that background, I could fully understand and appreciate what electricity meant to the rural communities of the Nation, especially since I have watched the development of the power unit at Elk River.

Then atomic energy, with its great source of heat, was made known to man. Heat, of course, will generate or create steam, and I realized that the new type of energy promised much to us who were landlocked, so to speak, in the central part of the United States, especially in a State such as Minnesota, which does not have rapid water or a source of hydroelectric power. We realized that the heat source of atomic energy afforded us the means to obtain the power which was needed to create electricity within the State.

As a member of the Committee on Appropriations, I worked on this matter with my colleagues on the committee, and we were successful in getting an appropriation which would permit the Atomic Energy Commission to do research and to enter into such a project as the Commission has now approved or authorized for Elk River. Only in that manner could we have speeded the day when atomic energy would be used commercially; only by authorizing the Atomic Energy Commission to proceed with such projects could we have been certain that atomic power would be used in the commercial field.

As early as June 14, 1955, the Elk River Cooperative Association submitted a proposal. I broke the story to the Minnesota newspapers on June 25, 1955, and I also arranged with the AEC to have the Elk River Cooperative officials come to Washington to present their proposal.

On September 21, 1955, I arranged a second meeting in Washington for the Elk River officials to discuss with the Atomic Energy Commission and its technicians the possibility of developing such a project at Elk River.

On September 21, 1955, we experienced the disappointment of having the proposal rejected.

I felt that the Atomic Energy Commission should make a complete restudy of the Elk River plant. I explained to the Commission that the REA association managed that plant, and stated that Mr. Ed Wolters, of Elk River, was not only an excellent business manager of the plant, but also was an expert in the field of rural electrification. I wanted the Atomic Energy Commission to become acquainted with the facilities which existed in Minnesota. So I invited the Commission to come to Minnesota. I said that only in that manner could the Commission become acquainted with what our State had to offer. I said further that I could not conceive of a proposal which had more merit than the proposal which the Elk River plant had submitted to the Atomic Energy Commission, namely, to offer their facilities and also to offer the statewide REA association of farmers as a body or a nucleus through which they could work in the establishment of a pilot plant in the commercial field or for the commercial use of atomic energy.

Fortunately, we were able to impress the Atomic Energy Commission to such an extent that on October 18 and 19, 1955, technicians and administrative experts from the Atomic Energy Commission visited Minnesota. Comdr. Lewis H. Roddis, of the AEC, and his assistants visited the Elk River plant, where they met with the REA officials.

Then they came to my senatorial office in St. Paul, where we had a full session with the REA officials and the technicians and administrative experts of the Atomic Energy Commission.

The proposal which had been filed by the Elk River cooperative was reexamined by the Atomic Energy Commission.

I found it necessary to arrange for a conference in Washington on January 11, 1956, of representatives of the Atomic Energy Commission and REA officials of Minnesota. The conference proved to be most profitable and fruitful. At that meeting we began negotiations with the Atomic Energy Commission, and the negotiations have been continued from day to day over the months, in an endeavor to have the Atomic Energy Commission officials make a complete study of the proposal made by the Elk River cooperative.

The receipt this afternoon of an official notice from the Atomic Energy Commission that the Commission has approved

the Elk River proposal makes this one of the most gratifying days of my service in the Senate.

If atomic energy will accomplish what we all hope and can expect of it, it will mean a source of power—cheap power—in the areas of the United States which are too far distant from either the natural gas fields or the coal fields or possible hydroelectric projects really to have a source of cheap power which could be used by heavy industries. Here is a new source of power which promises to make it possible for the central areas of the United States to have heavy industry and large industrial plant development.

I am absolutely confident that the Rural Electrification Administration in Washington will move quickly to approve the loan application for the Elk River power plant, so construction can move forward. This will require an estimated loan of $6 million. Two million nine hundred thousand dollars would be used for transmission lines and substations and planning facilities. Three million one hundred thousand dollars would be used for generating purposes.

Mr. President, there were those who did not believe this was going to become a reality. There were those who last fall had a tendency, more or less, to say, "It is only a political gesture. They keep saying we are going to get it, all for the purpose of trying to break into the news headlines."

Even when such attempts were made to minimize my efforts and endeavors, I never lost sight of what it would mean to commerce and the United States generally if a pilot plant could be developed for the purpose of investigating the generation of electricity by the use of atomic energy.

For the reasons I have stated, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, the official release by the United States Atomic Energy Commission which was made public today.

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

AEC AUTHORIZES NUCLEAR POWERPLANT NEGOTIATIONS WITH MINNESOTA AND MICHIGAN ELECTRIC COOPERATIVES

Willard F. Libby, acting Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, today announced that the Commission has approved in principle, as a basis for negotiations, the nuclear powerplant proposals of the Rural Cooperative Power Association of Elk River, Minn., and the Wolverine Electric Cooperative of Big Rapids, Mich. The proposals were among seven made in response to the second invitation of the Commission under its power demonstration-reactor program, calling for development, design, construction, and operation of plants with capacities within the 5,000 to 40,000 kilowatt range.

The Commission action opens the way for negotiations which will determine the kind of assistance to be given the cooperatives and will establish the cost limits of this assistance. Contracts for the assistance will be contingent on approval of Rural Electrification Administration loans requested by the cooperatives.

In accepting the proposals as basis for negotiation the Commission determined that the types of plants contemplated are technically feasible, that they represent desirable extensions of development work now underway or planned, and would make important contributions to the power reactor art.

Both cooperatives proposed that the Commission finance and retain title to the reactor portion of the plant. The Rural Cooperative Power Association proposed a closed cycle boiling water reactor plant with an electrical capacity of 22,000 kilowatts. The cooperative would assume capital costs totaling $2,450,000, including the value of the site. The Commission is asked to contribute a maximum of $6,860,000 for the development, design, and construction of the reactor and postconstruction research and development work. The Commission is also asked to waive the use charge for the fissionable material which will fuel the reactor.

The Wolverine Electric Cooperative proposed an aqueous homogeneous reactor plant with an electrical capacity of 5,000 to 10,000 kilowatts. This group would assume capital costs totaling $1,088,000, including the value of the site. The Commission is requested to contribute a maximum of $3,788,000 for development, design, and construction of the reactor.

The five other proposals which were made in response to the Commission's invitation are still being evaluated by the Commission staff. They are:

1. Chugach Electric Association, Anchorage, Alaska, and Nuclear Development Corporation of America, White Plains, N. Y.: a sodium-cooled, heavy water moderated plant of 10,000 electrical kilowatts capacity;

2. City of Holyoke Gas and Electric Department, Holyoke, Mass.: a gas-cooled reactor with closed-cycle gas turbine of 15,000 electrical kilowatts capacity;

3. City of Orlando, Fla.: a liquid metal fuel reactor of 25,000 to 40,000 electrical kilowatts capacity;

4. City of Piqua, Ohio: an organic moderated reactor plant of 12,500 electrical kilowatts capacity;

5. University of Florida, Gainesville, Fla.: a pressurized light water reactor plant of 2,000 electrical kilowatts capacity.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I hold in my hand some newspaper articles. I have one which appeared in the Minneapolis Star of October 20, 1955. The headline reads "THYE Vows To Help Elk River Get A-Plant."

I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the body of the RECORD at this point.

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

Senator EDWARD J. THYE, Republican, of Minnesota, said Wednesday he is "confident and determined" that an atomic powerplant will be built at Elk River, Minn.

He used the word "determined," he emphasized, as a member of the United States Senate Appropriations Committee which has a great deal to say about funds for the Atomic Energy Commission (AEC).

THYE made the statement following a closed-door conference with top representatives and technicians of the AEC, and Rural Cooperative Power Association of Elk River and seven municipalities.

"Minnesota has iron ore and skilled workmen. It will have the St. Lawrence Seaway. But it is at a competitive disadvantage with States which have fast waters and coalfields for cheap power," THYE said.

"Maybe power generated by atomic energy is the answer. I shall never rest until we have solved the problems of putting this energy to commercial use.

"I am confident the Elk River plant will be a possibility in the very near future—say, 1½ years—and I am confident this will give us the energy to make industrial expansion possible in this State."

Four AEC representatives came out of the conference with a carefully worded statement which deplored the unfortunate impression that the first Elk River Co-op proposal had been rejected. This was incorrect, they said, and so was the inference from it that the whole project was dead.

They said the co-op, which serves a dozen Minnesota counties, had merely been asked to resubmit its proposal with minor modifications.

This would qualify it as a small-scale experimental nuclear powerplant for which an application deadline had been set by the AEC for February 1, 1956.

The four will take their recommendations—which they did not reveal—back to the AEC.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I have another article from the Minneapolis Morning Tribune of Friday, September 16, 1955. The headline reads, "Strauss Asked To Visit State, Discuss Plant." The article was written by Charles Bailey. I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the body of the RECORD.

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

WASHINGTON.—Lewis L. Strauss, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission (AEC), was invited to come to Minnesota Thursday after he sent Senator EDWARD J. THYE, Republican, of Minnesota, a letter listing reasons why the AEC might not approve an atomic-powered electric plant in the State.

THYE extended a telegraphic invitation to Strauss to come to Minnesota in October to visit the site of the proposed plant and discuss it with local groups.

Strauss pointed out two major questions which he said had to be answered before AEC could decide whether to provide funds for building a pilot atom generator for Elk River Rural Electric Cooperative.

"1. Is it in the national interest for the AEC to assume all the financial risk involved in building a reactor for the sole use of any single rural cooperative power association?

"Subsidiary to this question would be the further question that since available funds do not suffice for the construction of reactors for every municipality and cooperative desiring one, how can the Commission select one without discriminating against all the others?

"2. Could and should the criteria for loans by REA to rural electric cooperative associations be modified to permit REA to make loans for construction and operation of experimental atomic reactors * * *?"

Strauss said these questions "will be answered in due course."

Strauss offered to meet with some of the Elk River representatives who came to Washington earlier this year and met with AEC officials and the Minnesota congressional delegation.

THYE said he thought "we could not expect a more encouraging report at this time" from the AEC head.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, in the Minenapolis Tribune of October 13, 1955, there appeared an article the headline of which reads "AEC Official To Study Elk River As A-Plant Site." I ask unanimous consent to have that article printed in the body of the RECORD.

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

A top official of the Atomic Energy Commission (AEC) will visit Minnesota next

week to look into the possibility of an atomic powerplant at Elk River, Minn., Senator THYE, Republican, Minnesota, announced Wednesday.

Comdr. Louis Roddis, manager and acting director of the AEC's reaction division, will spend 2 days in the State.

Tuesday he will survey the Elk River cooperative facility and Wednesday he will confer in St. Paul with THYE and officials of the Elk River Rural Power Association.

"This latest development makes me extremely optimistic about the possibilities of establishing an atomic power pilot plant at Elk River," THYE said.

The site had been dropped from consideration as the first Rural Electrification Administration (REA) atomic pilot plant when it was found the REA could not legally assume the financial risk involved in the conversion to atomic energy.

THYE said the AEC has agreed to reconsider this action. He expressed hope the rural power agency would be willing to assume the risk.

The alternative to REA financing is private development, but THYE said he believes a cooperative should handle the program.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, recently, on April 17, there appaeared in the Minneapolis Star and Tribune an article by Jack Wilson, Minneapolis Tribune staff correspondent, the heading of which reads "THYE Says AEC To Approve State A-Power Plant." I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the body of the RECORD.

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

WASHINGTON.—Senator THYE, Republican, Minnesota, said Monday he had been assured that the Atomic Energy Commission (AEC) will approve construction of the Nation's first small atomic-power plant at Elk River, Minn.

The Rural Cooperative Power Association of Elk River has proposed building a 22,000-kilowatt station to be financed jointly by the co-op, the AEC and the Rural Electrification Administration (REA).

AEC's acceptance of the co-op's proposal is expected to be announced officially within 48 hours.

The REA loan for construction of the conventional generating facilities depends on AEC approval of the proposal for the nuclear reactor which would furnish steam for the plant.

The Elk River Co-op applied last summer for a $2,985,000 AEC advance to finance the atomic-steam section of the plant and $1,785,000 REA loan for the electric generating equipment.

Total cost of the plant was estimated then at about $5,410,000. That proposal was rejected by the AEC with a suggestion that it be revised and resubmitted.

The new proposal, filed in January, asks for about the same amounts but was modified in some technical details.

REA Administrator Ancher Nelsen said approval of the REA loan could be expected as soon as AEC accepts the Elk River plan.

Under the cooperative's proposal, it would operate the nuclear reactor and buy steam from it to run electric generators for a period of 5 years, after which the coop would negotiate with the AEC for purchase of the reactor.

Six other proposals for construction of similar small powereplants have been received by the AEC.

It is understood that only two, including the Elk River project, will be approved by the Commission.

One reason the AEC is reported to be favorable to the Elk River plant is that the project represents a new development in this field and would be the first of its type ever attempted.

This is one of the requirements set up by the Commission for the use of Federal funds in such projects—the development of general knoweldge in the field.

The Elk River co-op's proposal is based on the contention that power costs in the Elk River area are unusually high because of the cost of shipping fuel for conventional plants.

The atomic powerplant could produce electricity approximately as cheaply as it can be produced by conventional means and possibly more cheaply.

The engineers who designed the Elk River plant represent American Machine and Foundry Co.

THE AMERICAN BICYCLE INDUSTRY

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, over a period of years I did some work in behalf of the bicycle industry, because of the large bicycle plants in my State. We did secure some relief through the escape clause in the Trade Agreements Act. In connection with what is happening in the industry today, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a report by the bicycle industry relating to bicycle imports and their volume.

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

AMERICAN BIKE INDUSTRY'S REPORT TO UNITED STATES CONGRESS

BIKE IMPORT PATTERN IS DISQUIETING

Seven months have passed since the President applied the "escape clause" and raised the bike tariff to protect the American bicycle industry. While domestic producers hesitate to assess the results with any degree of finality at this stage, foreign bike makers seem not to be as hesitant.

Admittedly, the continuing record flow of bicycle imports, despite the President's intention to diminish them, is disturbing. Equally disquieting is the emergence of other patterns, highlighted briefly below, which tend to thwart the relief that was supposed to have been granted the American Industry.

British imports sets new records

The Wall Street Journal in a special dispatch from Nottingham, England on March 21, 1956, flatly states that foreign-made bicycles are rolling into the United States at an accelerated rate, despite last year's tariff increase. As proof, it quotes the head of the British Cycle Manufacturers Union as follows:

"Hugh Palin, head of the British Cycle and Motor Cycle Manufacturers Union, has finished counting up 1955 exports and found that more British bicycles were shipped to the United States last year than ever before. This record was set despite the 50 percent boost in United States bike tariffs last August."

After reporting a gain of almost 20 percent in the number of British bikes shipped in January 1956, compared to the same month in 1955, the pattern of expansion was further confirmed by a spokesman for one of the "big four" British manufacturers. He said: "We are so well established that the increase in the American duty will not have an adverse effect on our sales."

Germany and France score new gains

The ability of foreign bike makers to hurdle the Government's decision to slowdown imports has not been limited to the British. After showing how other European countries increased their exports here, the Journal (March 21) said:

"You can get an idea of what's happening by glancing at figures from Germany. They are not complete for all of 1955, but in the three post-tariff-hike months of September, October, and November the producers of Germany sold 179,544 bicycles to the States, up more than 50 percent from the similar months of 1954."

Foreign plants boost profits and employment

In contrast to the plight of the American industry, foreign bike producers are enjoying ever increasing profits and expanded employment. The Journal article makes this clear:

"To handle heavy foreign demand—in large part from the United States—Raleigh is constructing a 20-acre plant expansion, costing $11.2 million."

The same article continues: "The prosperity of British bicycle makers, Raleigh's profits, for instance, jumped nearly half a million dollars in 1955 * * * should perhaps calm the excitement of Europeans who have been agitated by escape clause hikes in American tariffs."

Foreign makers copy new United States styles

Like President Eisenhower, the American bike makers hoped that the introduction of the new style middleweight bicycle might help us meet the price competition of imports. A story in the catalog of the Sixth International Toy Exhibit reports a leading German bike importer as saying:

"With the introduction in 1955 by American manufacturers of the new middleweight type of bicycle, a number of German manufacturers are already making plans to include this new model in their 1956 production. This new addition to the bicycle field has much to recommend it, including eye and sales appeal, lighter weight and ease in riding comfort. It is much more durable from a construction angle than the present lightweight model."

It is quite apparent that there is no salvation for the domestic bike industry in such ingenuity.

Unfair continental prices irk British

The March 21 Journal reports:

"The main British worry nowadays seems to be unfair competition in the American market from other European producers in Germany, France, Austria, Belgium and Holland. English companies claim their price is being undercut by 2 or 3 dollars."

What, it may now be asked, has happened to the oft-repeated propaganda line of the so-called irresistible appeal of British style and quality? Faced with lower priced competition in the United States (as American producers have been) the British admit that when the shoe is on the other foot it pinches.

The importance of price is borne out in the Journal article which quotes the buyer of a leading mail order house as admitting:

"His company is taking most of its imported bikes from the Continent (rather than Britain) because prices are 10 percent cheaper."

What is a 50-percent bike tariff increase?

At first glance a 50 percent tariff increase appears to be a substantial one. In the case of bicycles it is negligible because it only added 3¾ percent to the former 7½ percent duty on lightweight bikes. "This particular increase," said the Journal story, "raised the price of the typical British-made lightweight by only $1.25 to $1.50." The increase was even lower for other countries.

Foreign nations to get compensation

At the request of the British in accordance with the GATT program, our Government has instructed United States trade experts to work out compensatory concessions to foreign governments to offset the assumed hardships resulting from higher bike tariffs.

This is in shocking contrast to the British boast that they are currently selling more bikes in the United States than ever before—as is the case with Germany, France, Austria, and others.

THE PRESIDENT'S VETO OF THE FARM BILL

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, the veto by President Eisenhower of the unpalatable agricultural bill—H. R. 12—once again demonstrates the quality of our national leader. The action once again reveals his political courage, his statesmanship, his continuing high resolve to do what is best for the whole country, for all of the people.

Thoughtful farmers, and all who value sound long-range planning over short-term expediency, will, I am sure, hail and approve his action.

In fact, approving statements are coming forth immediately, in quality and in quantity. Particularly I wish to point to two statements in the New York Times on the editorial page of Tuesday, April 17: First, the lead editorial, called No Retreat, and second, the Arthur Krock column on "the Factors in the Farm Bill Veto."

Mr. President, there is still time to get the soil-bank program through Congress before adjournment. There are other legislative steps we may yet take to tackle this program affirmatively.

Secretary Benson found the amended-to-death and unfortunate H. R. 12 a measure with which he could not effectively work. I am very glad to observe that once again the President has backed the Secretary of Agriculture to the hilt.

I ask unanimous consent that the articles to which I have previously referred be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

[From the New York Times of April 17, 1956]

NO RETREAT

President Eisenhower has accepted the challenge of those cynically minded leaders in Congress who had handed him what can only be described as a travesty on farm legislation, relying with serene confidence on the impudent assumption that no President in an election year would dare to withhold his signature from any bill that bore the label "farm relief," even though the label was counterfeit and the contents of the package a spurious and dangerous imitation of what they purported to be.

Yesterday Mr. Eisenhower brought the mounting speculation of the politicians and the public to an end by vetoing H. R. 12, designated as "The Agricultural Act of 1956." But this veto was neither a hasty action, an arbitrary one nor a negative one. Few persons, we think, will question the fact that, as the President declared in a compact, but devastatingly clear, message to Congress, justifying his action, that he was acting "only after thorough consideration" and "after searching my mind and conscience." Nowhere does Mr. Eisenhower's message reflect any tendency to minimize the economic difficulties of the farm population or to question the need of an accelerated and generous program of constructive aid. On the contrary, the President notes: "It is with intense disappointment and regret that I take this action. Our farm families are suffering reduced incomes. They had a right to expect workable and beneficial legislation to help solve their problems." And he leaves no doubt where responsibility lies for failure up to now to provide such legislation.

The heart of the farm problem, the President points out (as he has done time and again over the last 3 years), is "price-depressing surpluses." Any forward-looking sound program to meet the needs of the farm people "must remove the burden of these accumulations." But, he notes, H. R. 12 would not correct this situation. On the contrary, "It would encourage more surpluses. It would do harm to every agricultural region of the country and also to the interests of consumers. Thus it fails to meet the test of being good for farmers and fair to all our people."

The President's objections to H. R. 12 are best summarized in his observation that "to sign it would be to retreat, rather than advance toward a brighter future for the farm families."

But what is likely to impress most people reading the President's message is the fact that it isn't merely an exercise in dialectics, nor is it simply an effort to put the onus on Congress for not providing the aid to which the farmer is entitled. That, after all, would be of little comfort to the farmer.

The President is convinced that despite the long and unnecessary delay in framing this measure, and despite the fact that it is completely unacceptable as it stands, there is still much that can be done if Congress is prepared to cooperate with the Administration. He proposes that, acting under authority that it possesses under the legislation of 1954, the Administration undertake a three-part program for temporarily alleviating the farmer's plight by voluntary increases in the support levels for crops and dairy products. He calls upon Congress, for its part, to "pass a straight soil bank bill as quickly as possible." He concludes:

"It is vital that we get the soil bank authorized in this session of Congress. There is general agreement on it. I am ready to sign a sound soil bank act as soon as Congress sends it to me. That can be accomplished in a very few days if the leadership in Congress will undertake the task. The combined program of administrative action and legislative enactment will begin now to improve the income and welfare of all our farm families. Here is a challenge for both the legislative and executive branches of the Federal Government.

[From the New York Times of April 17, 1956]

IN THE NATION

(By Arthur Krock)

THE FACTORS IN THE FARM BILL VETO

WASHINGTON, April 16.—Suppose the President had signed the farm bill, as a number of Republicans in the farm States, including governors, and most Democrats, urged him to do:

He would have sacrificed to a cynical concept of political expediency an economic principle he repeatedly said was basic to the first steps toward improvement of the income of agriculture and to its ultimate stability on a prosperity level.

He would have discredited his Secretary of Agriculture, whose unwavering opposition to the continuation of rigid price supports the President steadfastly encouraged and emulated. If Secretary Benson had not resigned, he would have been set down as a man whose desire to stay in office rose above his deep conviction of what the fundamental public contribution of that office should be.

The President would, by signing the bill, have also rejected the views of another counselor on whose judgment in agriculture he greatly relies and with whom he has the closest personal bond: his younger brother, Milton Eisenhower.

In the ranks of the repudiated would also have been (a) the administration spokesmen in Congress, who warned their colleagues of a veto if the conference form of the bill was passed; and (b) the Members of Congress who voted against the legislation as an expression of confidence in the administration's farm policy, some at great political risk.

These are among the calculable debits the President would have contracted by signing the conference report. And to them would have been added a debit as much greater than the sum of them all as it is incalculable. This would have been the inevitable and sharp downward revision of an overwhelming public impression the President has created—that he lives by a set of principles, personal and political. By signing the bill he would have compromised both, and in a sector where they are mutually inclusive.

What many politicians urged the President to do, and Senator KEFAUVER confidently predicted he would do, was to sign legislation that further embedded in the farm economy the component which, above all others, he charged with responsibility for the depressed state of that economy. "It only extends rigid 90 percent parity for another year," was again the argument which, accepted annually by the President's predecessors, has piled higher and higher the agricultural surpluses that are largely responsible for the steady slump in farm income while the income of nearly all other groups has constantly been rising.

THE LOST MAGIC

On this argument Congress from year to year has deferred the institution of the flexible price support system it legislated some time ago. And on this argument the economic condition that is frightening the officeholders in the farming areas has been more and more deeply entrenched by those same politicians. Though what the President referred to in his veto message as "the insatiable markets associated with war" shrank with the shrinking postwar demand, the 90 percent price system was constantly extended in changing circumstances where it lost whatever magic it may have had. This was demonstrated when, in every year but one between 1947 and 1954, farm income declined despite the Congressional mandate for 90 percent parity.

In standing by his principle the President, however, recognized and served certain economic considerations with which political factors are plainly linked. By setting price supports on five basic crops at 82½ percent of parity he fixed national averages for a number of farm products that would also have resulted from the bill he vetoed. This undoubtedly will be as welcome politically to the beleaguered farm-belt Republicans as it will be economically to their constituents. The Democrats, and those Republicans who supported the bill the President vetoed, can claim credit for this move by the Administration, contending that the passage of the farm bill forced the President to fix these averages. But the hand that feeds will be the President's. And it was evident today that this thought greatly comforted the Republican Governors who went to the White House to advocate signing and left with the news of the new levels.

The economic interest of farmers in the United States is not the same in all areas. What helps one group does not help all. Moreover, despite the drive in Congress to pass the bill the President vetoed, and the activity of some farmers' organizations in its behalf, other organizations as actively opposed it. A large body of political, economic, consumer, and agricultural opinion stands with the President against those aspects of the bill that evoked his veto. It was not a case of General Eisenhower and Secretary Benson alone on the burning deck.

Congress may decline to rescue the soil bank from the veto, as the President requested in his message today, but that request, plus the new minimum support levels he fixed, puts him on the affirmative and Congress on the negative side of the equation. And on the moral test of standing by a principle he has all the best of it.

FISCAL ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE EISENHOWER ADMINISTRATION

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, one of the surest signs of an election year is the lush growth of wild charges that spring up like rank weeds in the field of politics. This is one crop that needs no encouragement of price supports or foreign aid. It is distinctly a domestic crop of the "fibbus politicandidatus," a quadrennial variety of shrinking violets.

The crop grows like skunk cabbage in spring, and dies away just as quickly when the spring peepers have had their short day in the sun.

These political weeds take the form of flagrant personal attacks on a good President, whose statesmanship and integrity is the envy of his political enemies. They also take the form of vicious distortions of the good record of the Republican administration.

Certain members of the party which has burdened our people with deficits in 17 out of their 20 years in office are now trying to rewrite the record in such a way as to turn public censure on the Eisenhower administration. They are trying to mislead the people into the false belief that ours is the party of spendthrift and deficit.

Here is what one of the leading candidates for the Democratic nomination had to say on the subject of Fiscal Integrity, which he called an advertising slogan:

> Which arrested inflation most—the Truman administration which reduced the national debt $12 billion in 6 years, or the Eisenhower administration which has increased it $12 billion in 3 years?

That statement was made by Candidate Stevenson at Kennewick, Wash., as reported in the New York Times of February 16, 1956.

A man who can make a statement like that is either ignorant of plain facts, readily available in Government reports, or he is deliberately misrepresenting the facts. Fortunately, this is one rank weed in the political garden easy to spot and easy to eradicate with simple truth as a weed killer.

Harry Truman has been making the same false statement as he goes about the country trying to cover his tattered political record with a new Sunday suit. "Give-em Hell Harry" is counting on the people either to have short memories or to lap up political elixir from the same old sideshow faker.

What are the facts and what is the truth?

Let us first look at the presidential budgets, because this is a direct test of presidential intentions. Then we shall look at the exact results of Government finances.

THE DEMOCRAT SPENDING RECORD

Mr. President, Mr. Truman was President from April 12, 1945, to January 20, 1953. In that time he presented eight budgets to Congress, as follows:

Year	For fiscal year	Budget surplus (+) or deficit (−)
		Billions
1946 (January)	1946–47	−$4.3
1947	1947–48	+.2
1948	1948–49	+4.8
1949	1949–50	−.873
1950	1950–51	−5.1
1951	1951–52	−16.5
1952	1952–53	−14.4
1953	1953–54	−9.9

With the exception of 2 years, Mr. Truman's plans for Government finances ended in deficits. The 2 years in which surpluses occurred were the years of the Republican 80th Congress, noted for its demand for economy.

Even though he had from Democratic Congresses three tax increases totaling $16 billion in a year and one-half, Truman could not come anywhere near to making income cover outgo.

What were the actual results of Truman's 6 years, as written in the official record of the Treasury? Let us be charitable and exclude the $20 billion deficit of 1946, which cannot be fairly charged to Mr. Truman, since it was a legacy of World War II financing. After excluding that item, here are the actual deficits and surpluses—stated in billions of dollars—during his administration:

Fiscal year ending—	Deficit	Surplus
1947		[1] 0.754
1948		[1] 8.419
1949	1.811	
1950	3.122	
1951		3.150
1952	4.017	
1953	9.449	
Totals	18.399	12.683
Net deficit	5.716	

[1] Republicans were in control of Congress during these 2 years (the Republican 80th Cong.); all other years were Democratic Congresses.

Source: Statistical Abstract of the United States 1955, p. 348.

If we look at this table, we can readily see where Truman and Stevenson get their claims of a $12 billion surplus. Both focus on the surplus column, and conviently ignore the $18.4 billion deficit. Subtracting the surplus from the deficit—as every schoolchild learns to do—we have a net deficit of $5.716 billions for the years of the Truman administration.

Before we leave that revealing table, suppose we ask one more question. Where did that $12 billion surplus come from?

Here, again, the answer is plain. Some $9 billion of that surplus came in the 2 years of the 80th Republican Congress which climaxed the vigorous Republican fight for economy in government. We waged this fight ever since the party of "spend and elect" had taken office. Incidentally, it was the same 80th Congress that gave the American people a tax reduction over Truman's veto.

DEEPER IN DEBT WITH DEMOCRATS

Mr. President, how did the Truman deficit record show up in the national debt? Let us turn again to official reports of the Treasury. The following figures are stated in billions of dollars:

Fiscal year:	*Public debt*
1945–46	$269.4
1946–47 (Truman's first full year and Republican 80th Congress in action in the latter half)	258.2
1947–48	252.2
1948–49 (Truman and Democrats in control of Congress in 1949)	252.7
1949–50 Democrats in control	257.3
1950–51 Democrats in control	255.2
1951–52 Democrats in control	259.1
1952–53 the last Democrat fiscal year	266.0

From this table it may be seen at a glance that it was the Republican 80th Congress, with its insistence on Government economy, that enabled Truman to make some reduction in public debt. It came about through rescission of war contracts and other economies directed by the Republican Congress. The drop in the public debt continued as long as a Republican Congress had some influence on the public purse strings.

But once a Democratic Congress got back into the saddle, in 1949, the public debt began to mount again, as it had every year for the 16 years of the Roosevelt administration. When President Eisenhower came into office in 1953, he inherited an insolvent Treasury and a mountain of public debt.

The 1953 budget deficit over which President Eisenhower had no control was $9.4 billion. The public debt stood at $266.1 billion. And the Treasury was faced with $81 billion in Government promises to pay for goods contracted for under the Truman administration. Three-fourths of the public debt at the time of the changeover from the Truman administration to the Eisenhower administration came due within 5 years. All these items were delayed-action financial bombs bequeathed by the Truman administration to the Eisenhower administration.

REPUBLICANS MOVE TOWARD A BALANCED BUDGET

One of the issues on which President Eisenhower and Republicans waged the 1952 campaign was the promise to cut Government spending and the pledge to move toward a balanced budget. What effort have we made to redeem these pledges? Let us again turn to official sources—and I now refer to the budget report for the fiscal year 1957:

[Billions of dollars]

Fiscal year	Budget surplus (+) or deficit (−)	Public debt
1953 (last Truman year)	−9.4	266.1
1954 (first Eisenhower year)	−3.1	271.3
1955	−4.2	274.4
1956 (estimated)	+.2	274.3
1957 (estimated)	+.4	273.8

There are several things to observe about this table.

First, even though the Eisenhower administration inherited $81 billion of the Truman administration's unpaid debts, the Republican administration cut Mr. Truman's estimated deficit for 1954 from $9.9 billion down to $3.1 billion.

Second, in 1954, the Republican administration gave the American people a $7.4 billion tax reduction, the largest

in the Nation's history. Sixty-two cents of every dollar in the tax cuts went to individuals—almost 25 cents to taxpayers with incomes of less than $5,000 a year.

Third, it can be seen that the Republican administration has actually kept below the old debt ceiling of $275 billion, although it had been given authority to go up to $281 billion.

Fourth, it can also be seen that the Republican administration will actually balance the budget at the close of the 1956 fiscal year.

After a quarter of a century of Government deficits and constantly rising public debt—mostly under Democratic administrations—the country can at last look forward to balancing income with outgo.

Few people realize how inflation robs the average family. A recent survey made by the National Committee on Monetary Policy, a private organization of economists and financial researchers, shows that, because of inflation, between 1938 and 1952, Americans lost $158 billion in purchasing power. The organization found that at the end of 1952, the dollar was worth 52.4 cents, based on the 1938 yardstick. The resulting losses in purchasing power included $97 billion lost by holders of life-insurance policies, $31 billion lost by holders of bank deposits, $21.5 billion lost by owners of Government savings bonds, and $8.5 billion lost in other channels.

A balanced budget, an economical Government, and a stable but balanced rise in the economy, such as have now been achieved by the Eisenhower administration, means that those tragic losses to our people will be stopped. The fall in the value of the dollar has already stopped. Every indication points to some recovery of the value previously lost. This means that the farmers' dollar and the workers' dollar will bring home more in the market basket and more of the other good things of life. Sound finance, coupled with prosperity, means that there will be more dollars for everyone and that each dollar will buy more.

REPUBLICANS PRACTICE ECONOMY

Mr. President, let me say a few words about how the Eisenhower administration accomplished this healthy improvement in Government finances and economy.

Compared with the last year of the Truman budget operations—1953—the Republicans reduced actual spending by $6.5 billion in the first full year—1954—of Republican control, by almost $10 billion in 1955, and by almost $11 billion—estimated—in 1956.

The Republicans reduced requests for new spending authority from $72.2 billion in the last Truman budget—1954—to $58.6 billion in the 1956 Eisenhower budget.

Every department of Government was instructed by President Eisenhower to comb its budget in the search for savings. Waste and inefficiency were eliminated wherever found. Thousands of detailed examples of these savings can be found in departmental reports. Hoover Commission recommendations were adopted wherever that was administratively possible. Government agencies disposed of commercial-type plants and operations, ending the competition of Government with its own citizens. Tax loopholes were closed. By eliminating waste and extravagance, the Republican administration and the Republican 83d Congress teamed together to save the taxpayers more than $16 billion.

In looking over the full 3 years of the Eisenhower administration, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture Earl L. Butz declared:

> During the first 3 years of the present administration, the Government will spend $36 billion less than it would have, had the spending policies of the preceding administration been continued. That represents a saving of nearly $1,000 for every farm and city family of 4 in the United States.

At the same time, not a single element of security in national defense or social welfare of our people has been sacrificed.

Mr. President, this is exactly what President Eisenhower meant by a program which is liberal in its human concerns, conservative in its economic proposals.

Here is a record of economy to cite everywhere with pride. It meets the Democrats' wild charges—the rank weeds raised in the Democratic political hothouse—with the cool, refreshing facts of official reports. It shows that a Republican President abides by his promises and keeps his pledges. It shows that waste and extravagant spending of other people's money can be stopped if there is the will to do it. It shows that prosperity need not depend upon Government handouts or war. It reaffirms our hope that there can be such a thing as good government.

IS FOREIGN AID UNCONSTITUTIONAL?

Another rank weed in the current political crop is the wild charge that the President and Congress are violating the Constitution by enacting the so-called foreign-aid programs. A charge like this is 100 percent pure nonsense, Mr. President. People who make such a charge know next to nothing about the Constitution.

THE CONSTITUTION IS NOT A SEARS, ROEBUCK CATALOG OF DETAILED ITEMS

These people thumb the Constitution the way they flip the pages of a Sears, Roebuck catalog. If they do not see a precise listing of grass skirts in the Sears, Roebuck catalog, then they are sure the mail-order house cannot sell a grass skirt.

In the same way, they expect the Constitution to offer a specific listing for every item dealing with national affairs. If in the Constitution they do not see a statement that "Congress shall have power to provide economic aid to Japan" or "military aid to Turkey," they rush to the conclusion that the President and Congress have no power to do those things. If the aid is given, then Congress, they conclude, is acting unconstitutionally.

REAL DESIGN OF THE CONSTITUTION: BROAD POWERS AND PRINCIPLES

Mr. President, the Founding Fathers did better by the Constitution than such people appreciate. The Founding Fathers were well aware that times and circumstances change. They knew that if they laid down a broad charter of government, setting forth the principles to govern a free people, they could safely entrust the day-to-day interpretation of powers to a Congress and a President freely elected by the people.

They looked upon the Constitution as a living document with principles broad enough to enable each generation to meet the circumstances and needs of that generation. How well they wrought is proved by the flexibility of the Constitution in meeting a constantly changing America for more than 160 years. Few democracies in world history have so successfully met the challenge of time.

If the designers of the Constitution had been so unwise as to spell out each right and power in detail, the Constitution would have burst its seams and left our people in chaos with no compass points of government to guide us at all.

People honestly may differ about the wisdom of a foreign aid program, economic or military. Logic and reason may make a plausible case either way—for or against foreign aid as a matter of national policy. I do not question the sincerity of those who incline either way.

But it is sheer ignorance of the law to say that Congress and the President have violated the Constitution by adopting such a program.

BASIS FOR THE CONSTITUTIONALITY OF FOREIGN AID

The Constitution specifically grants exclusive power to Congress and the President to act in national affairs. This is the prime purpose of the Constitution—to unify the Nation and give it a single voice in matters affecting the Nation as a whole.

The legal case for the constitutionality of foreign-aid programs is unassailable.

By article I, section 1, all legislative powers are vested in the Congress of the United States. More specifically, in section 8 it is provided:

Clause 1:

> The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the defense and general welfare of the United States (including income taxes by the 16th amendment).

Clause 3:

> To regulate commerce with foreign nations.

Clause 10:

> To define and punish piracies and felonies committed on the high seas, and offenses against the law of nations.

Clause 11:

> To make war.

Clause 14:

> To make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces.

Clause 18:

> To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.

These powers cover both economic and military aid to foreign nations. They vest exclusively in the Congress in order that the United States may speak and act with a single voice in matters touching the defense of our country, the governance of our military, and in dealing with foreign nations. The individual States of the Union are expressly forbidden to deal with such matters.

CONGRESS HAS POWER TO DISPOSE OF UNITED STATES PROPERTY

The Constitution then takes one step further in defining the powers of Congress. In article IV, section 3, it declares:

The Congress shall have power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belong to the United States.

POWERS OF THE PRESIDENT

Turning now to the Presidency, the Constitution vests the Executive power in the President of the United States. It makes him Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy.

I gives him the power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to appoint ambassadors and other public ministers, and to make treaties which the Constitution expressly declares shall be the supreme law of the land. All laws enacted by Congress must have the concurrence of both Houses and approval by the President.

FOREIGN-AID PROGRAMS FOLLOW CONSTITUTIONAL REQUIREMENTS

Our foreign-aid programs rest upon the solid foundation of treaties and laws enacted by Congress, both of which when properly executed are the law of the land. All our treaties with our Western allies and with those in Asia providing for mutual aid and defense have been made within these provisions of the Constitution. All laws authorizing foreign aid and appropriating funds for that purpose have scrupulously followed the constitutional requirements.

FINDINGS IN THE LEND-LEASE ACT

One of the most extensive programs for foreign aid was the Lend-Lease Act of 1941. It is significant that Congress expressly entitled it "An act to promote the defense of the United States" and the law was used for that purpose. By that law the President was empowered to authorize the manufacture, sale, transfer, lease, lend, or otherwise dispose of "any defense article for the government of any country whose defense the President deems vital to the defense of the United States." And the term "defense article" was given the broadest possible interpretation—55 Statute 31.

Do our critics today hold this law to be unconstitutional? Had they done so back in 1941, these critics would not be here today and free to voice their criticisms.

FINDINGS IN THE MARSHALL PLAN

Few people will deny that amid the chaos and devastation of a war-torn Europe, the people there would have turned to another form of totalitarian tyranny—communism—if they received no help in reestablishing their lives and economic enterprise. Had they been abandoned to this fate, the Iron Curtain would have stretched from the Bering Sea to the European shores of the Atlantic Ocean.

How long, then, could the United States have remained an island of freedom in a totalitarian, Communist world?

It was therefore in the highest interest of the defense and welfare of the United States for us to come to the aid of our European friends and allies. And we did come to their aid with a program that has won the admiration of the free world. This was the Marshall plan which did much for the security of the United States.

In the statement of policy contained in that legislation, the Congress declared:

Recognizing the intimate economic and other relationships between the United States and the nations of Europe, and recognizing that disruption following in the wake of war is not contained by national frontiers, the Congress finds that the existing situation in Europe endangers the establishment of a lasting peace, the general welfare and national interest of the United States—62 Statute 137.

Subsequent foreign-aid programs rest upon full knowledge of the worldwide nature of the Communist conspiracy and the great need of the United States to lead and help in preventing the red tide from engulfing the free world.

We cannot exist smug, complacent, and free, if the world around us sinks into communism out of frustration and despair. To prevent this, we have been acting both individually and in concert with other nations of the United Nations and thus far we have been successful in checking the spread of communism by aggression.

No one, of course, can prevent the people of a foreign nation from accepting Communist enslavement if that is their wish, but we can point out the superior values of freedom and we can help such nations to attain and preserve freedom if they desire to do so. That is what our foreign-aid programs aim to do. Our efforts are just as much for the security, freedom, and national interest of the United States as they may be to aid our friends abroad.

Mr. President, at this point in my remarks I wish to call attention to a memorandum prepared by the legal section of the Library of Congress and submitted to me. I quote from page 2 of that memorandum:

Accordingly, the validity of an expenditure of public moneys derived from tax receipts will depend largely upon whether the expenditures in fact will advance the national welfare or contribute effectively to the national defense. The determination of the latter questions, as the Supreme Court has acknowledged, rests almost entirely with Congress; and unless the decision of Congress is clearly wrong or involves a display of arbitrary power rather than an exercise of judgment, judicial condemnation thereof is not likely to occur. As a practical matter, moreover, the courts, on grounds of lack of substantial interest on the part of the individual taxpayer, have made it almost impossible for the latter to obtain a judicial review of the constitutionality of a specific expenditure of public funds; and as a consequence, Congress, from the very beginning of the Federal Union, has been virtually unobstructed, legally speaking, in its spending ostensibly to promote the general welfare. Thus, grants for the relief of human suffering, the validity of which has been challenged on the ground that no noticeable improvement of the general welfare can be effected thereby, have been made at intervals since 1794, when relief was voted for the refugees of Santo Domingo (*Massachusetts* v. *Mellon*).

Mr. President, the entire memorandum is of great interest, and I am sure it will be helpful to a general understanding of this problem. I ask unanimous consent that the entire memorandum be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the memorandum may be printed in the RECORD, as requested.

(See exhibit 1.)

PRESIDENT EISENHOWER'S SCRUPULOUS CONCERN FOR CONSTITUTIONAL PROCESSES

Mr. WATKINS. The charge of unconstitutionality in foreign operations falls flat when we consider how seriously and scrupulously President Eisenhower has regarded the mandates of the Constitution. It is absolutely inconceivable that he would commit the country to any foreign transaction, much less a foreign war, without taking full council with Congress and the country.

Under President Eisenhower there will not be such actions as will be remembered of a former President who "by his own unaided, unheralded act in affecting the 'Fifty-Destroyer Deal' converted, as it were at a blast of the trumpet, the international status of the United States as a neutral to that of a quasi-belligerent in the war then raging in Europe"—Edward S. Corwin, the President: Office and Powers, New York, New York University Press, third revised edition, page 246.

President Eisenhower has shown his reverence for the Constitution on several recent occasions. Barely 2 weeks ago, the President was asked at his press conference—April 15—if he would order our marines in the Mediterranean to war "without asking the Congress first?"

I have announced time and time and time again—

President Eisenhower replied—

I will never be guilty of any kind of action that can be interpreted as war until the Congress, which has the constitutional authority, say so.

Again, on April 12 when the crisis in the Middle East became serious, the President and Secretary Dulles issued a statement that the United States will not shrink its responsibilities under its United Nations commitments. But in the very next accompanying paragraph, they declared they would act "within constitutional means."

The President's fidelity to the Constitution is not a matter of words. He practices what he preaches which is the best proof of integrity. In January 1955, when a real crisis had arisen concerning Formosa, President Eisenhower laid the facts before Congress asking authority to use troops if necessary in the interests of peace and for the security of the United States. Congress readily granted the

authority requested because it recognized the sincerity of the President and the nonpartisan nature of his request.

Commenting on this January 25, the New York Times observed that short of a declaration of war, the special message was undoubtedly one of the most important any President has ever sent to Congress.

His action was important for three good reasons. He united the country. He united Congress. And he served notice on the Red enemy that America was united and determined to stop aggression and preserve peace. The threatened invasion of Formosa never took place and peace was preserved.

One other reason accounting for the unusual character of the message lies in the scrupulous regard the President showed for the provisions of the Constitution and for the prerogatives of Congress as representatives of the people. By no act of his alone did he intend to take this country into operations likely to mean war.

When another crisis threatened in Indochina, President Eisenhower refused to be drawn into warlike operations there.

His careful regard for the Constitution contrasts sharply with the conduct of a former President who engaged American forces in the Korean war in 1950 without asking specific approval of Congress. It contrasts also with the acts of another President in our history who maneuvered the country into warlike actions in complete disregard of the sole right of Congress to declare war.

President Eisenhower's action in the Formosa case will stand as one of the great landmarks in history because it proves conclusively that a President can act constitutionally if he respects that great charter of government.

To say that President Eisenhower and Congress have acted unconstitutionally in foreign aid or in any matter, domestic or foreign, over the last 3 years is to be grossly ignorant of history and lacking in plain reason and logic.

President Eisenhower takes very seriously his solemn oath to preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution. He has honored that oath time and time again in the last 3 years when others would have had him act without authority. This is one of the chief reasons for the people's confidence in his honesty and integrity.

He has scrupulously refrained from infringing upon the sphere of Congress in many matters of domestic legislation. He has respected the independence and prerogatives of the Supreme Court.

Where other Presidents before him engaged in open war with Congress and even tried to pack the Supreme Court as did President Roosevelt when he disliked its decisions, President Eisenhower respected the rights of each branch of government exactly as the framers of the Constitution intended. So long as we have a man like that in office, with a strong and responsible political party to back him up, our democracy and the freedoms of our people will be secure.

EXHIBIT 1

VALIDITY OF FEDERAL TAXATION FOR THE BENEFIT OF A FOREIGN COUNTRY

The provisions of the Constitution that can be invoked to sustain the validity of the expenditure of Federal tax revenues for the benefit of a foreign government are:

1. Article I, section 8, clause 1: "The Congress shall have power to levy and collect taxes, duties, imports, and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States."

2. Article I, section 8, clause 3: "The Congress shall have power to regulate commerce with foreign nations."

3. Article I, section 8, clause 17: (The Congress shall have power) "to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof."

4. Article II, section 2, clause 2: (The President) "shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur."

Although a determination to raise public moneys through the levy of Federal taxes obviously is governed, if not actually preceeded, by decisions as to the purposes for which the moneys thus collected are to be spent, the exercises of the power to tax and the power to spend, generally, are distinguishable as the utilization of two separate grants of authority. As long as the proceeds from the levy of any specific tax are not segregated and employed exclusively to finance any particular activity of the Federal Government, the validity of any Federal tax will not be impaired by the character of any particular one of the purposes for which Federal tax revenues in the aggregate are to be spent. In short, as long as Congress has the power to impose a given tax, the constitutionality of that tax or its collection will not be jeopardized by the fact that a controversy subsequently arises as to the authority of the National Government to spend Federal funds in support of a debatable purpose (*Halvering* v. *Davis* (1937) 301 U. S. 619).

Accordingly, the validity of an expenditure of public moneys derived from tax receipts will depend largely upon whether the expenditure in fact will advance the national welfare or contribute effectively to the national defense. The determination of the latter questions, as the Supreme Court has acknowledged, rests almost entirely with Congress; and unless the decision of Congress is clearly wrong or involves a display of arbitrary power rather than an exercise of judgment, judicial condemnation thereof is not likely to occur. As a practical matter, moreover, the courts, on grounds of lack of substantial interest on the part of the individual taxpayer, have made it almost impossible for the latter to obtain a judicial review of the constitutionality of a specific expenditure of public funds; and as a consequence, Congress, from the very beginning of the Federal Union, has been virtually unobstructed, legally speaking, in its spending ostensibly to promote the general welfare. Thus, grants for the relief of human suffering, the validity of which has been challenged on the ground that no noticeable improvement of the general welfare can be effected thereby, have been made at intervals since 1794, when relief was voted for the refugees of Santo Domingo (*Massachusetts* v. *Mellon* (1923) 262 U. S. 447).

Similarly, the power to regulate commerce with foreign nations has been construed to embrace the power to promote such commerce; that is, to increase the volume of trade in both directions between the United States and foreign nations. Consequently, if there is a reasonable basis in fact for the conclusion by Congress that financial aid to a foreign nation ultimately will be productive of mutually expanded trade between the two countries, a justification would exist sufficient to sustain the proposed assistance as a valid exercise of this power. Moreover, there can be no doubt that Congress is competent, under the necessary and proper clause (art. I, sec. 18, clause 17), to appropriate moneys to carry into effect otherwise permissible measures designed to extend our foreign trade.

Finally, mention should be made of the treatymaking power. Deducible in part from this grant of authority is the power of the United States, as a sovereign nation, to conduct foreign relations, and in conjunction therewith to formulate and apply foreign policies. To carry out foreign commercial and defensive policy, the United States is competent to effect agreements with specific nations, in the form of treaties, by the terms of which it agrees to extend financial aid to the other signatory powers. In the absence of any explicit limitations on the treatymaking power, it cannot be contended that an agreement to extend financial assistance is not, by international usage, an appropriate subject of treaty negotiations, and as a consequence, Congress clearly is empowered, under the necessary and proper clause, to appropriate the sums required to carry such an agreement into effect.

RECESS TO MONDAY

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNAMARA in the chair). If there is no further business to come before the Senate, pursuant to the order previously entered, the Senate will stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

Thereupon (at 5 o'clock and 33 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, the recess being, under the order previously entered, until Monday, April 23, 1956, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 19 (legislative day of April 9), 1956:

PATENT OFFICE

Arthur Wilbur Crocker, of Maryland, to be First Assistant Commissioner of Patents, to fill an existing vacancy.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following candidates for personnel action in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service:

FOR APPOINTMENT, SUBJECT TO QUALIFICATIONS THEREFOR AS PROVIDED BY LAW AND REGULATIONS

To be senior assistant sanitary engineers

John E. Munzer	George F. Mallison
Richard Moore	John L. S. Hickey
Eugene J. Nesselson	Thad Patrick

To be assistant sanitary engineers

John E. McLean	Ernest D. Harward, Jr
Herbert A. Bevis	Charles A. Froman, Jr.
Richard D. Vaughan	Jack F. Neal

To be junior assistant sanitary engineers

Charles S. Oulman	Robert J. Kleffmann
Harry C. Vollrath III	Joseph L. Gerit
Joseph H. Norman, Jr.	Jack L. Witherow
Morton D. Sinkoff	John C. McMahon
Jules B. Cohen	Lynn D. Wilder
James G. Gardner	