

1956

ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I offer an amendment on page 10, line 5, to strike out the provision reading "That \$25,000 of this amount shall be available only upon the enactment into law of House Joint Resolution 576, 84th Congress." The amount appropriated is, for the Alexander Hamilton Bicentennial Commission.

The House did not pass House Joint Resolution 576 until July 23. For that reason, as Chairman of the Commission of which the senatorial Members are the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNING], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], and myself, I offer the amendment. I have discussed it with the minority and majority leaders and with the chairman of the Appropriations Committee and other Senators.

I ask that the authorizing language of House Joint Resolution 576 be inserted in lieu of the language on lines 5 through 7 on page 10.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 10, line 5, after the word "Provided", it is proposed to strike out "That \$25,000 of this amount shall be available only upon the enactment into law of House Joint Resolution 576, 84th Congress" and insert in lieu thereof:

That section 7 of the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to establish a commission for the celebration of the 200th anniversary of the birth of Alexander Hamilton," approved August 20, 1954, is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 7. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums, not to exceed \$25,000, in addition to the sum of \$175,000 heretofore authorized to be appropriated, as the Congress may determine to be necessary to carry out the provisions of this joint resolution."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT].

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Mr. President, I do not wish to offer an amendment. I merely ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a letter which I addressed to the chairman of the Appropriations Committee relating to the Upper Harbor project. I am pleased that that appropriation has been made available. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement I have prepared on the Davis-Bacon provisions.

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

JUNE 28, 1956.

The Honorable CARL HAYDEN,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I should like to call to your attention the fact that the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors on June 19, 1956, recommended that the authorized

project on the Mississippi River at St. Anthony Falls, Minneapolis, Minn., be completed substantially as authorized. Original authorization was on August 28, 1937.

You may recall that the engineers had been requested to review the project by action of the House Committee on Public Works in August 1954.

The action of the Board of Engineers was taken on the report of the district engineer dated April 15, 1955, recommending completion of the extension at St. Anthony Falls.

In discussions with the Army engineers, I am told that if the engineers were asked to indicate the amount of funds which would permit full resumption of work on this authorized project during the coming fiscal year, they would specify that the sum of \$400,000 could be utilized. This would permit completion of the lower lock and dam, which is 82 percent complete, and commencement of work on the upper lock and dam.

Because of the pending decision of the Board of Engineers, the engineers had not initiated a budget request for the St. Anthony Falls extension for the fiscal 1957 budget.

Now that the decision of the engineers has been made, and the Congress will be given a favorable recommendation to complete the project, I wish to request the Committee on Appropriations to consider the appropriation of the sum of \$400,000 to be added to the supplemental appropriation on which the committee is now conducting hearings.

This harbor and channel improvement at St. Anthony Falls will be of immense value to the entire Upper Midwest, and not only to the city of Minneapolis. The project has been exhaustively reviewed and its completion favorably recommended. Since 1948, work has gone steadily forward on this magnificent engineering task. It would be a tragic loss to be forced to suspend construction for an entire year.

That is why, Mr. Chairman, I urge that funds be appropriated to permit uninterrupted progress toward the development of the upper harbor at St. Anthony Falls.

Kindest personal regards,
Sincerely yours,

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUMPHREY

I am pleased to note that the Appropriations Committee has provided \$300,000 for carrying out the labor-standards provisions of the Federal-Aid Highway Act enacted a few weeks ago. You will recall that the act was intended to assure that employees building the Interstate System will be paid not less than prevailing-wage rates in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act. The Highway Act imposes the duty on the Secretary of Labor to determine the prevailing-wage rates in the immediate locality of each project, after consulting with the highway department of the State involved and giving due regard to the information obtained from it.

These responsibilities of the Secretary of Labor will add a tremendous burden on the Office of the Solicitor of Labor. The Solicitor recently testified before the Senate Appropriations Committee that the Highway Act may increase the wage determination workload of his Department by approximately 12,000 determinations per year. This is based on estimates by the Bureau of Public Roads, Department of Commerce, on the number of contracts that will be made each year under the program.

The Solicitor of Labor explained that the workload and cost for each determination under the Highway Act will be substantially greater than for other Davis-Bacon determinations. This additional cost per determination is caused by several factors. For

one thing, the greater bulk of the new highway construction will be in rural areas where complete or accurate wage-rate information cannot be obtained from the present sources. Many on-the-spot wage surveys will have to be conducted under the new program. In contrast, most of the present wage determinations are for building and heavy construction projects located in urban areas where information is readily available. Secondly, the requirement for the Secretary of Labor to consult with the appropriate State highway department before making each highway determination means that he must maintain constant liaison with the 48 State highway departments. This costs money. Thirdly, the Department of Labor will have to increase its subscriptions to the private reporting services which furnish information on contract awards.

Clearly the Secretary of Labor will need additional funds for making wage determinations under the Highway Act. He will also require extra funds for coordinating enforcement under the act, necessary to insure compliance with the labor-standards provisions of the act.

The sum of \$300,000 is less than the amount requested by President Eisenhower in his communication of July 11 to the President of the Senate with respect to supplemental appropriations for fiscal 1957. It will, however, provide a minimum budget for the enforcement program. I'm sure if more funds are needed, the Congress will respond favorably.

Let there be any question regarding the authority of the Secretary of Labor to coordinate enforcement of the labor standards provisions of the Federal-Aid Highway Act, I think that an examination of what Congress did in enacting the Highway Act clearly shows that both Houses intended to give the Secretary of Labor this responsibility.

Section 115 (a) of the act requires that employees working on the Interstate System shall be paid not less than prevailing wage rates in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act. And the Secretary of Labor is given the overriding authority, under Reorganization Plan No. 14 of 1950, "to assure coordination of administration and consistency of the labor standards provisions" of the Davis-Bacon Act and related statutes.

It will be recalled that section 115 (a) was added on the floor of the Senate by the Chavez amendment, with the junior Senator from Oregon, among others, as cosponsor. The senior Senator from New Mexico pointed out that the language of his amendment was identical with the labor standard provision inserted in the highway bill by the House Public Works Committee and passed by the House. The provision was not in the bill when reported out by the Senate committee but was reinserted here by enactment of the Chavez amendment. During the debate on the amendment, the junior Senator from Oregon had printed in the RECORD the portion of the House committee report explaining the meaning and operation of the section. The House report stated, "In discharging his responsibilities, the Secretary of Labor will have, with respect to the labor standards specified in the bill, the authority and functions set forth in reorganization plan of 1950" and under the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended.

So when this Chamber voted to include the House labor standards provision in the bill, it was fully aware that the Secretary of Labor was being given the responsibility of coordinating enforcement of the provision, as provided in Reorganization Plan No. 14. The senior Senator from California, in opposing the Chavez amendment, correctly pointed out to the Senate that: "Inclusion of the Davis-Bacon Act in the highway bill would also result in placing enforcement functions in the Federal Government as provided under Reorganization Plan No. 14, 1950. This would

mean that the Federal Department of Labor would have authority to conduct compliance inspections" on work conducted under the program. The senior Senator from Florida also referred to the responsibility of the Secretary of Labor if the amendment were adopted.

Nothing can be clearer than that the statement of the House committee is controlling with respect to the application of Reorganization Plan No. 14. The Senate accepted the provision exactly as reported out by the House committee. As the junior Senator from Tennessee explained with respect to the bill reported out of conference: "This particular section was not before the conference committee, because it was approved in identical language in both the Senate version of the bill and the House version of the bill."

The Secretary of Commerce is responsible, as stated by the managers on the part of the House in connection with the conference report, "to insure that the Davis-Bacon Act is applied to Interstate System projects." His enforcement responsibility under the Highway Act is comparable to that vested in each Federal contracting agency under the Davis-Bacon Act. But it is equally clear that the Secretary of Labor has the overall responsibility of coordinating enforcement under the Highway Act, as he has with respect to Davis-Bacon projects.

There is no inconsistency between the enforcement responsibilities of the Secretary of Commerce and the coordinating functions of the Secretary of Labor under the Highway Act. During the 6 years since adoption of Reorganization Plan No. 14, the functions performed by the agencies having the primary enforcement responsibility and those of the Secretary of Labor have been mutually complementary in producing effective enforcement of the labor standards provisions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference thereon with the House of Representatives, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer (Mr. BIBLE in the chair) appointed Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. HILL, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. KNOWLAND the conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I further ask unanimous consent that the clerk be given authority to change the section numbers, if necessary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1957—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the 2 Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 12138) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of July 21, 1956, pp. 12630-12631, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I desire to ask the distinguished Senator from Arizona, the chairman of the committee, whether the conference report includes agreement by the House of Representatives to the provision for the Advisory Committee on Weather Control, which provision was inserted in the bill by the Senate.

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes, that was agreed to.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, this item was not included in the bill at the time when it was passed by the House of Representatives, because at that time the President had not signed the bill extending the life of the Advisory Committee on Weather Control.

I recognize the lateness of the hour, and I shall not detain the Senate; but I wish to say that when history is written, I think the work of the Advisory Committee on Weather Control and the value of the experiments on modification of clouds will be considered among the most important results from the tasks authorized by this Congress.

I may say that I have before me a paper by Capt. Howard T. Orville, chairman of the Committee, presented by him at a conference on weather control, held just a few days ago in the State of South Dakota, by invitation of Gov. Joe Foss. I ask unanimous consent that the statement by the chairman of the Advisory Committee be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

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

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON WEATHER CONTROL
(By Capt. Howard T. Orville, chairman, Friez Instrument Division, Bendix Aviation Corp.)

Gentlemen, it is indeed a pleasure for the task force of the Advisory Committee on Weather Control to meet with the distinguished gentlemen from South Dakota headed by His Excellency, Gov. Joe Foss. We sincerely hope when this day is over you will all have a better understanding of what is meant by cloud seeding experiments and you will have a deeper appreciation of the capabilities and limitations of present cloud seeding techniques and even more important the great difficulties in determining exactly what effects have been obtained when cloud seeding experiments are carried out.

You will note that I have used the term "experiments" in connection with the cloud seeding. The use of this term is intentional to emphasize the fact that there is still much to be learned about cloud seeding and how to determine what results, if any, have been obtained when cloud seeding experiments are conducted over an area.

If it may seem strange to some of you that even though the present techniques of creat-

ing precipitation artificially were first discovered almost 10 years ago there are still many questions remaining to be answered and because so many of the answers are unknown the whole question of weather modification using present scientific techniques is still controversial. There are many today who feel that cloud seeding can completely modify the weather and that the day of absolute weather control is on the horizon. There are many more, and probably most of us here today are in this classification, who take the more conservative view that cloud seeding experiments can and do produce increases in precipitation of varying amounts under favorable weather conditions. Then, of course, there is the third group who are positively skeptics and will never accept the view that cloud seeding has any effect on the weather until they have observed repeated positive demonstrations almost with mathematical certainty.

Because of the widely different opinions as to the effectiveness of cloud seeding and because of the tremendous economic importance of any methods of increasing precipitation in the western drought States, Congress became interested in weather modification as early as 1948. However, it was not until 1953 that through the efforts of your distinguished Senator FRANCIS CASE, assisted by Senators CLINTON ANDERSON, of New Mexico, and WARREN MAGNUSON, of Washington, that a bill was finally passed and signed into law creating the Advisory Committee on Weather Control. This bill was signed by President Eisenhower on August 13, 1953, and created an 11-man committee to study and evaluate public and private experiments in weather modification. It is now known as Public Law 256 (67 Stat. 559). Its members consist of 5 members from private life of recognized standing in the fields of science, agriculture, and business, and 6 members from interested Government departments. The members from private life were appointed by President Eisenhower on December 9, 1953, and confirmed by the Senate on January 25, 1954. This 11-man Committee held its first meeting on December 18, 1953. At this first meeting the Committee adopted four guiding principles to ensure that its evaluation would be impartial in all respects. These principles are:

"First, the Committee will base its conclusions on facts obtained and interpreted, and not any preconceived notions. Experiments to date have suggested that weather control may eventually provide benefits to agriculture, industry, and Government. Without such a hint of substantial benefits, the Congress would most likely not have created this Committee. However, the Committee will not proceed under the assumption that weather control, including rainmaking, does 'work' or does not 'work.' It will aim to examine all the evidence with scholarly care and scientific impartiality.

"Second, the Committee recognizes the need for additional basic research dealing with processes related to rain, snow, and cloud phenomena. There is also a need to develop ways and means of providing methods for reliable evaluation of weather-control activities. The Committee will encourage such research in industry at our universities and throughout Government.

"Third, the Committee will welcome, and will solicit, the information possessed by and the opinions held by all individuals and groups having an interest in the field of weather control. It will carefully consider all facts and opinions pertinent to its study.

"Fourth, the Committee will not act in any way prejudicial to responsible individuals and concerns attempting to modify the weather."

Since that time the Committee has—
1. Held a total of 12 meetings.

2. Made numerous field trips to observe cloud-seeding operations.

3. Received and analyzed several hundred reports from private meteorologists, commercial cloud-seeding companies, and corporations.

4. Obtained complete information on Government-sponsored projects.

5. Consulted with or sought the advice of most of the leading scientists in the world who are familiar with one phase or another in the field of weather modification.

6. Developed an evaluation program consisting of two principal phases, a statistical one and a study of the physical process. You will hear much more of this program this afternoon from Capt. F. A. Berry, our chief scientific adviser.

The Committee was severely handicapped in its operations prior to July 1, 1954, due to lack of funds. A very modest budget was granted by Congress on July 1 and this permitted setting up a staff headquarters in Washington, D. C. As most of you know, the first executive secretary was Charles Gardner, Jr., a native son from Miller, S. Dak. Also you will be interested in knowing that our administrative assistant, Miss Rosalea Munkvold, is also a native of South Dakota. Since this was a temporary Committee, due to go out of existence on June 30, 1956, extreme difficulty was encountered in obtaining a competent technical staff. In fact, the only way in which this was possible was because Public Law 256 permitted the Committee to obtain personnel from other Government agencies on a reimbursable basis. The Committee obtained its chief scientific advisor, Capt. F. A. Berry, from the Navy, its chief climatologist, H. Thom, from the United States Weather Bureau, as well as several other members of the technical staff, and then the Department of Agriculture and Meteorological Survey assisted in furnishing several persons who were willing to come with the Committee for about 2 years.

The Committee is primarily concerned with three aspects of weather modification or cloud seeding as conducted by the commercial cloud-seeding companies.

1. The technical aspects. How effective is cloud seeding? Does it increase or decrease rainfall or is there no effect?

2. If the answers to (1) above are in the affirmative and there is a positive effect then what economic benefits may be expected from cloud seeding? Dean Eberle, our vice chairman, headed a group of economists and businessmen that has already made a study of the benefits to be obtained if a 10 percent increase in rainfall is produced.

3. If the answers to (1) and (2) are in the affirmative then the Committee has been directed to report to the President immediately on the advisability of the Federal Government regulating by means of licenses or otherwise, those who carry out weather modification activities.

Up to the present time the Committee has found partial answers to (1) and (2) above, but sees no reason to recommend Federal regulation at this time. It has found:

(a) That supercooled stratified clouds can be dissipated by aircraft seeding with dry ice or silver iodide.

(b) Water seeding of warm cumulus clouds will initiate precipitation under favorable temperature and moisture conditions.

(c) Dry ice and silver iodide seeding of cumulus clouds over 5,000 feet above the freezing line and temperature at top -10° C. will induce precipitation.

(d) Ground generator silver iodide seeding in the three Pacific Coast States has produced average increases in precipitation of 9 percent to 17 percent from late winter and early spring storms. These results cannot be referred to other areas or other seasons of the year. The Committee hopes to find answers to flatland seeding and interior mountain

areas during the next 2 years that Congress has just granted.

(e) Intensify study of hail storm suppression and the possibility of inhibiting lightning fires seems well justified. Captain Berry may mention this in his discussion of project Skyfire this afternoon.

In its study the Committee is paying particular attention to any research leading to the discovery of new types of nucleating agents and new methods of dispersing these agents.

In closing I would like to quote from a report by Assistant Secretary Aandahl, of the Department of Interior, when he sums up the relation between cloud seeding and irrigation:

"While the studies to date offer hopes of some eventual increase of water supply, there is, within the present scope of scientific knowledge, little likelihood that artificially induced precipitation can ever substitute for irrigation in most of the areas now requiring irrigation. Precipitation cannot be caused when there is insufficient moisture vapor in the air. Furthermore, as far as is known now, other factors such as temperature must be favorable. Thus, it may not always be possible to cause rain when needed for the crops. There are also times when rainfall, while needed for some crops, may bring damage or even ruin to others. Air movements are sufficiently erratic that it would be impractical, if not completely impossible, to deposit rainfall on certain localized plots. Even if the techniques develop to their maximum anticipated potential of effectiveness, the total annual rainfall in most arid areas will probably still be a fraction of that required for crops, and much of it will be at times when it cannot be fully used. Reservoirs will still be required to conserve water for use when needed, and canals and related works will still be needed to convey the water to the exact spot of use."

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an account from the Sioux Falls Daily Argus-Leader for July 19, 1956, dealing with experiments in cloud seeding by the use of jet planes, as carried on by the South Dakota Air National Guard; and also an editorial from the same newspaper, commenting upon the results obtained.

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

CLOUD SEEDING IS HELD SUCCESSFUL

PIERRE, July 19.—South Dakota has successfully pioneered in cloud seeding experiments by jet plane, it was reported to a State weather modification conference here.

Clouds were seeded for the first time by a specially equipped jet plane and produced excellent results, Chief Howard Wells, United States Navy representative on the National Advisory Committee on Weather Control, told the conference.

The plane, carrying a converted jato tube (jet assist takeoff) with 60 pounds of dry ice on each flight, successfully seeded the clouds in the southeastern part of the State on 6 days.

Wells said arrangements for the experiments were made in Washington 2 weeks ago in conference with Senator Francis Case, Gov. Joe Foss, and Lt. Col. D. L. (Duke) Corning. One of the Air Guard planes of the 175th Fighter Interceptor Squadron at Sioux Falls was specially equipped for the experiments on July 5.

TRACKED DOWN BY RADAR

"The experiments were carried out in cooperation with the United States Weather Bureau station at Sioux Falls which tracked

the seeding operations by radar," Wells disclosed.

"We made one run in a C-47, but the icing level in this country is high (12,000-14,000 feet) and it took too long to reach that altitude."

Wells said M.Sgt. Bob Perkins, Air Guard mechanic, designed a trapdoor arrangement for a jato tube and placed screen mesh at one end. The tube, loaded with dry ice, was attached to the belly of a T-33 jet trainer. The pilot tripped the trapdoor from his pressurized cockpit, rushing air through the tube and supercooling it while the screen prevented chunks of ice from escaping.

THREE HUNDRED AND FIFTY MILES AN HOUR

The super-cooled air was spread over the tops of storm clouds at altitudes ranging from 6,500 to 39,000 feet while the jet plane was traveling about 350 miles per hour. Except for one trip over the West River and near Pickstown, all flights were flown over the East River area.

Most of them were flown near Sioux Falls to permit ground as well as air observation.

Wells said every cloud seeded produced rains, many of them minutes after the plane had made its run over the tops. The ground observers kept in radio contact with the pilot and learned that the clouds rose quickly after seeding. One pilot reported that the top of a cloud he had seeded rose 2,500 feet within 3 minutes.

Flights were made July 9, 10, 13, 15, 16, and 17 and Wells gave instructions to the pilots on days when cloud formations were not right for seeding and when there were severe thunderstorms in the area.

THREE INCH FALL

"There was a complete changeover in the formation of the clouds after seeding and rain fell from them soon after each run," Wells said. "On one flight, three clouds 20 miles apart were seeded and one of them dropped three inches of rain in the Sioux City region."

Colonel Corning, Maj. John Schilt and Capt. Justin Berger took turns piloting the plane on the experimental flights. A chase plane went along on each flight to observe the effect of the seeding.

Colonel Corning described flying through one of the clouds after seeding and said, "Something was churning in there and I flew out of it fast."

"There were a lot of skeptics among my boys at first," Corning added. "But they joined me in believing there's something to it now."

Wells said the dry ice disappeared at the rate of about one pound for every 4 miles, while normal cloud seeding with dry ice requires from 3 to 20 pounds every 4 miles.

He added, "There is an abundance of moisture in the clouds out here."

FOSS OPENS EVENT

Governor Foss opened the weather modification conference by stating that rain increase programs should be encouraged in an effort to provide more stable rainfall for this agricultural State. He said arrangements have been made to conduct further experiments by the State.

"We're going to try out some new ideas," Foss said. "I realize that these programs are still pretty much of a gamble. However, rain increase research has been improving the odds."

Two other members of the advisory committee on weather control, Chairman Howard T. Orville, New York, and Dean A. M. Eberle of South Dakota State College, also addressed the conference. Orville described rain increase projects on the West Coast and Eberle traced the progress of rain programs in this State.

Other speakers were Charles Gardner, formerly of Miller, S. Dak., and Jack Disanto,

Rapid City, representing commercial rain increase companies.

JETS EXCEL AS RAIN PRODUCERS

The experiments with the "seeding" of rain clouds by jet airplanes in the Sioux Falls territory are an interesting development in this new field of scientific exploration.

According to the reports, the jets have made several tests under a program suggested by Gov. Joe Foss and Senator FRANCIS CASE. Dry ice was sprayed on the clouds and precipitation resulted.

One pilot said the reaction was noticeable when he dropped the ice on a cloud. He cited an instance where a cloud he had seeded rose 2,500 feet immediately afterward—an apparent result of the lightening of its weight due to the precipitation of some of the moisture it was carrying.

Each run produced results, the report said. The jets traveled through and above the clouds at about 350 miles an hour.

Col. Duke Corning said odd things took place after the seeding. "Something was churning in there," he explained in describing one incident, "and I flew out of it fast."

Then he added: "There were a lot of skeptics among my pilots at first but they join me in believing there's something to it now."

The experiments provided reason to believe that the jets achieved results better and faster than other types of airplanes.

All of this points up to another interesting chapter in the program of weather control. The experiments may have been the occasion for a rather peculiar and somewhat erratic rain pattern in the Sioux Falls area during July—many rains that struck limited areas and bypassed others.

Obviously it is wrong to classify today's rainmaking with the fakes of some 50 and 60 years ago. The earlier attempts were unscientific and often misrepresented. But these of today are something else. Rain can be produced, the tests have demonstrated, when conditions are right.

But there are countless problems that may develop. In fact, some already have developed. There may be a battle among areas in respect to the right to seed moisture-bearing clouds. There may be questions about hail resulting from the activity. There may be instances when the rain falls in areas where it isn't desired. There may be cases of excessive rainfall. In any event, all of it is extremely interesting and in a few more years we may know much more about it.

Mr. CASE of -South Dakota. Mr. President, I may say to the Senate that the use of jet planes for cloud seeding—the dropping of dry ice in cumulus clouds—is a new thing. The jet plane has made it possible to get on top of and higher clouds, and to do so with some remarkable results. On six trials between July 5 and July 17, as I recall, success was obtained in each instance. In view of the fact that the Congress is so repeatedly called upon to bring relief in one form or another to drought-stricken areas, the significance of this matter is not to be underestimated. Therefore, I have included in the RECORD the article and the editorial from the Sioux Falls Daily Argus-Leader.

I also ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a report by Mr. Howard J. Wells, an expert of the Advisory Committee on Weather Control, who was sent to South Dakota as an observer during the conduct of these trials. In the report he details the incidents and the circumstances under which the seeding was carried on, and

the results which were obtained. I am sure they will be of interest to every Member of the Senate. I think they have great significance for the country as a whole.

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

REPORT OF HOWARD J. WELLS, ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON WEATHER CONTROL, SIOUX FALLS, S. DAK.

Thursday July 5, 1956: Dean Aberle picked up at the Carpenter Hotel, and we proceeded to the Air National Guard Terminal at the Sioux Falls Airport. I was introduced to Lt. Col. Duane L. Corning and staff, and we inspected the available aircraft for the project. One C-47, one B-25 in overhaul and 3 T-33 Jets were found suitable for conducting the project. During the afternoon, a metal chute was made for the C-47. Dean Eberle and I established a source of dry ice at 4 cents a pound. We went to the United States Weather Bureau and met Mr. Clark, officer in charge. Everything is working fine, and all personnel are very interested and cooperative. We gave a cold box demonstration in Colonel Corning's office during the afternoon.

Friday, July 6, 1956: We briefed Colonel Corning for first seeding run in the C-47. About 30 pounds of ice remaining from Thursday's demonstration was used. The top of the cumulus clouds was about 14,000 feet. Good results both by observation and radar were observed. This was a single drop method, and it was a wonderful experience for the crew. Also the colonel saw the results, which is an important part of the operation.

Saturday, July 7, 1956: After looking over the weather at the Weather Bureau, it was decided not to seed due to severe thunderstorms throughout the area. The remainder of the day was spent devising a suitable dispenser which could be used on Jet aircraft. The result was using a Jato bottle and tripping mechanism control from the inside of the aircraft.

Sunday, July 8, 1956: This was a very good seeding day. The T-33 equipped with dispenser proceeded on discussed flight plane. It was decided to seed perpendicular to the wind and 40 miles away from the station on a bearing of 310 degrees. This would bring the seeding area over the station in about 1 hour. A chase plane accompanied the seeding plane to watch the dispenser in operation.

The seeding was conducted on top of clouds working back and forth along a 20-mile line. Complete change over was noted in about 30 minutes. The thunderstorms which formed at the end of the run were, or could have been, caused by seeding as the plane turned around at each end of the run. If this is true, then we are underseeding except at turning points.

The dispenser used 60 pounds of dry ice in 50 minutes, or about 1 pound per every 4 miles. Again the pilots could see very good results and were amazed at the growth. A second run was made in the afternoon, but the clouds were not forming due to subsidence in the atmosphere. There were no results to speak of.

Monday, July 9, 1956: This was a fair seeding day. The T-33 aloft proceeded at 27,000 feet. Clouds were visible at the station, and all available flying personnel were standing by to observe the results. We were in contact with the plane through radio, and the pilot gave word when the dispenser was opened. The target cloud was 60 miles distant from the station. Rain was observed to fall from the base of the cloud in about 30 minutes. The top of the cloud, in accordance with the pilot's report, rose at the rate of 2,500 feet in about 2 minutes. Everyone was very impressed.

Tuesday, July 10, 1956: The bottle was modified to give greater output. The T-33 was out and hit the top of three clouds about 20 miles apart. One of these clouds gave 3 inches of rain to Sioux City. The other two were observed to give rain, but how much was unknown.

Wednesday, July 11, 1956, and Thursday, July 12, 1956: There was high pressure over the area. The time was used to instruct pilots and men in methods of seeding.

Friday, July 13, 1956: The forecast proved a failure and spent the day in working with pilots in a simple method of when to work and when not to.

Saturday, July 14, 1956: Again, we decided not to seed because of severe thunderstorm and tornado warnings.

Sunday, July 15, 1956: A weak front was crossing the State southwest to northeast with thunderstorms reported north of station. We decided to conduct operation trying to slow down thunderstorms. Good results at station with 0.20 of light to moderate rain falling.

Monday, July 16, 1956: Air over the station was too dry to operate, but a moist zone was expected to move down from the north. At 1330 first top of cumulus clouds could be seen to the northwest and west. The flight departed from the area and reported moderate thunderstorms through the north half of the State. Captain Berger decided to seed only clouds that were not raining. One cloud was seeded, and as the plane descended to observe base, rain commenced to fall approximately 15 to 20 minutes after seeding.

Tuesday, July 17, 1956: Weak front south and southwest to north northeast through eastern half of the State with thundershowers in progress by 0900. The flight went to the extreme south end of the State and seeded again along the clear air side of the front. During the afternoon, a flight departed to conduct seeding operations over the airport. The cloud base was 6,500 feet and the tops 9,000 to 12,000 feet. Seeded clouds were observed to form and reach 19,000 to 20,000 feet. This bank moved southeast and light rain showers were falling from the base of the cloud by 1700.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, this is the conference report on the first supplemental appropriation bill, is it not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I wish to thank the conferees for keeping in the bill the item of \$35,000 for the building of an elevator at Anderson, S. C.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask that the message from the House of Representatives announcing the action of the House on certain amendments of the Senate be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 12138, which was read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.,
July 23, 1956.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 16, 26, 34, 38, 45, 58, 59, 60, and 61 to the bill (H. R. 12138) entitled

1956

"An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes", and concur therein.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.,
July 23, 1956.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of Senate No. 4 to the bill (H. R. 12138) entitled "An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes", and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum of \$18,915,000 proposed, insert "\$16,250,000."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 22, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"SEC. 310. Not exceeding \$5 million of the funds available to the Department of Defense for military construction may be used for capital expenditures other than for amortization of outstanding mortgages on any housing project constructed under title VIII of the National Housing Act as in effect prior to the Housing amendments of 1955, in accordance with applicable provisions as may be authorized by law during the 2d session of the 84th Congress: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Defense or his designee, in acquiring such housing projects, may make purchases subject to any existing mortgage or assume such mortgage."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 27, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"REPAIR, IMPROVEMENT, AND EQUIPMENT OF FEDERALLY OWNED BUILDINGS OUTSIDE THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

"For an additional amount for repair, improvement, and equipment of federally owned buildings outside the District of Columbia, not to exceed \$35,000, to remain available until expended."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 33, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: After the word "expended", insert: "*Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for the acquisition of any land without the approval of the local government concerned."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 36, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In line 5 of the amendment, delete the words "assisting the Territory in."

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 4, 22, 27, 33, and 36.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, amendment No. 33 has been mentioned. The only reason I rise is to explain that today I have received a considerable number of telephone calls because certain language relative to amendment No. 33 denies the right to expend any of these funds until agreement is obtained from the local units of the Government. Many persons fear that that provision

will restrict the use of the funds entirely, because concurrence will not be obtained from the local units of Government.

I wish to make this explanation because some persons have accused me of being the author of the amendment. It is a House provision. In the conference we were unable to get the House to agree to amendment No. 33 unless that language was made a part of the legislative enactment. I wish the Record to show that I am not the author of the amendment, and that the Senate conferees were unable to obtain concurrence.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the Senator from Minnesota has correctly stated the situation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arizona.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record, as a part of my remarks, a summary of the bill, showing for each appropriation title the amount of the budget estimate, the amount provided by the House of Representatives, the amount provided by the Senate, and the amount appropriated under the conference report.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The supplemental appropriation bill, 1957 (H. R. 12138)

| Department or agency (1) | Budget estimate (2) | House allowance (3) | Senate allowance (4) | Conference allowance (5) |
|--|------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------|
| CHAPTER I | | | | |
| DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE ¹ | | | | |
| AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH SERVICE | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses—plant and pest control..... | \$2,500,000 | | Language \$2,500,000 | \$2,500,000 |
| Salaries and expenses—plant and pest control..... | 18,915,000 | | 18,915,000 | 16,250,000 |
| Animal disease laboratory facilities..... | | | | |
| COMMODITY STABILIZATION SERVICE | | | | |
| Administrative expenses—Sugar Act program ² | (180,000) | (\$180,000) | (180,000) | (180,000) |
| FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE CORPORATION | | | | |
| Subscription to capital stock..... | 13,000,000 | 13,000,000 | 13,000,000 | 13,000,000 |
| Total, chapter I..... | 34,415,000 | 13,000,000 | 34,415,000 | 31,750,000 |
| CHAPTER II | | | | |
| DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE | | | | |
| CIVIL AERONAUTICS ADMINISTRATION | | | | |
| Land acquisition, additional Washington Airport..... | 2,420 | 2,420 | 2,420 | 2,420 |
| COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses..... | (3) | (3) | (3) | (3) |
| BUSINESS AND DEFENSE SERVICES ADMINISTRATION | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses..... | 75,000 | 75,000 | 75,000 | 75,000 |
| BUREAU OF FOREIGN COMMERCE | | | | |
| Export control..... | 3,000,000 | 3,000,000 | 3,000,000 | 3,000,000 |
| BUREAU OF PUBLIC ROADS | | | | |
| Jones Point Bridge..... | 14,325,000 | 14,325,000 | 14,325,000 | 14,325,000 |
| Total, Department of Commerce..... | 17,402,420 | 17,402,420 | 17,402,420 | 17,402,420 |
| RELATED AGENCIES | | | | |
| Advisory Committee on Weather Control..... | 350,000 | | 300,000 | 300,000 |
| Total, Chapter II..... | 17,752,420 | 17,402,420 | 17,702,420 | 17,702,420 |

See footnotes at end of table.

The supplemental appropriation bill, 1957 (H. R. 12138)—Continued

| Department or agency (1) | Budget estimate (2) | House allowance (3) | Senate allowance (4) | Conference allowance (5) |
|---|------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------|
| CHAPTER III | | | | |
| CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY | | | | |
| Construction..... | \$49,000,000 | \$49,000,000 | \$49,000,000 | \$49,000,000 |
| DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—MILITARY FUNCTIONS | | | | |
| DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY | | | | |
| Operation and maintenance..... | | | 88,369,170 | 88,000,000 |
| DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE | | | | |
| Operation and maintenance..... | | | 18,626,130 | 18,500,000 |
| DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION | | | | |
| INTERSERVICE ACTIVITIES | | | | |
| Toran stations..... | 5,450,000 | 5,450,000 | 5,450,000 | 5,450,000 |
| DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY | | | | |
| Military construction, Army..... | (193,000,000) | (193,000,000) | (202,000,000) | (202,000,000) |
| Reduction in appropriation—Army stock fund..... | | (357,000,000) | Language | Language |
| DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY | | | | |
| Military construction, Navy..... | \$165,000,000 | -165,000,000 | \$133,000,000 | \$165,000,000 |
| DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE | | | | |
| Military construction, Air Force..... | \$871,000,000 | 1,228,000,000 | 1,238,000,000 | 1,228,000,000 |
| Total, Department of Defense..... | 1,041,450,000 | 1,398,450,000 | 1,533,445,300 | 1,504,950,000 |
| Total, chapter III..... | 1,090,450,000 | 1,447,450,000 | 1,582,445,300 | 1,553,950,000 |
| CHAPTER IV | | | | |
| FOREIGN OPERATIONS | | | | |
| DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY—CIVIL FUNCTIONS | | | | |
| Government and relief in occupied areas..... | 2,380,000 | 2,350,000 | 2,350,000 | 2,350,000 |
| EXPORT-IMPORT BANK | | | | |
| Administrative expenses..... | (1,670,000) | (1,670,000) | (1,670,000) | 1,670,000 |
| Total, chapter IV..... | 2,380,000 | 2,350,000 | 2,350,000 | 2,350,000 |
| CHAPTER V | | | | |
| GENERAL GOVERNMENT MATTERS | | | | |
| EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT | | | | |
| BUREAU OF THE BUDGET | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses..... | 405,000 | 375,000 | 400,000 | 385,000 |
| INDEPENDENT OFFICE | | | | |
| COMMISSION ON GOVERNMENT SECURITY | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses..... | 665,000 | 600,000 | 665,000 | 632,500 |
| PRESIDENT'S ADVISORY COMMISSION ON PRESIDENTIAL OFFICE SPACE | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses..... | | 50,000 | | |
| Total, chapter V..... | 1,070,000 | 1,025,000 | 1,065,000 | 1,017,500 |
| CHAPTER VI | | | | |
| INDEPENDENT OFFICES | | | | |
| FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses..... | Language | | Language | Language |
| GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION | | | | |
| Operating expenses, Public Buildings Service, 1956..... | 1,450,000 | 1,450,000 | 1,450,000 | 1,450,000 |
| Operating expenses, Public Buildings Service, 1957..... | 3,550,000 | 3,550,000 | 3,550,000 | 3,550,000 |
| Repair, improvement, and equipment of Federally owned buildings outside the District of Columbia..... | | | 50,000 | 35,000 |
| Acquisition of land, District of Columbia..... | 300,000 | 150,000 | 300,000 | 250,000 |
| Additional court facilities..... | (?) | (?) | (?) | (?) |
| United States Post Office and Courthouse, Nome, Alaska..... | 200,000 | 200,000 | 200,000 | 200,000 |
| Expenses, general supply fund..... | 400,000 | 200,000 | 400,000 | 300,000 |
| General supply fund..... | 9,000,000 | 8,000,000 | 8,000,000 | 8,000,000 |
| Acquisition of tin..... | 9,600,000 | | 8,700,000 | 8,000,000 |
| Total, General Services Administration..... | 24,500,000 | 13,550,000 | 22,650,000 | 21,785,000 |
| HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY | | | | |
| Public Housing Administration | | | | |
| Annual contributions, 1956..... | 1,300,000 | 450,000 | 450,000 | 450,000 |
| NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses..... | 789,000 | 789,000 | 789,000 | 780,000 |
| NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION | | | | |
| Synthetic rubber research and development..... | (?) | (?) | (?) | (?) |
| Total, chapter VI..... | 26,589,000 | 14,789,000 | 23,889,000 | 23,024,000 |

See footnotes at end of table.

The supplemental appropriation bill, 1957 (H. R. 12138)—Continued

| Department or agency (1) | Budget estimate (2) | House allowance (3) | Senate allowance (4) | Conference allowance (5) |
|---|-------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------|
| CHAPTER VII | | | | |
| DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR | | | | |
| OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY | | | | |
| Office of oil and gas..... | \$100,000 | \$100,000 | \$100,000 | \$100,000 |
| BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT | | | | |
| Construction..... | 100,000 | 100,000 | 100,000 | 100,000 |
| VIRGIN ISLANDS CORPORATION | | | | |
| Revolving fund..... | 550,000 | 125,000 | 125,000 | 125,000 |
| Total, Department of the Interior..... | 750,000 | 325,000 | 325,000 | 325,000 |
| DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE | | | | |
| FOREST SERVICE | | | | |
| Acquisition of land, Superior National Forest, Minnesota..... | 500,000 | | 500,000 | 500,000 |
| INDEPENDENT OFFICES | | | | |
| DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AUDITORIUM COMMISSION | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses..... | 150,000 | 150,000 | 150,000 | 150,000 |
| National Monuments Commission, salaries and expenses..... | | | 25,000 | |
| Total, chapter VII..... | 1,400,000 | 475,000 | 1,000,000 | 875,000 |
| CHAPTER VIII | | | | |
| DEPARTMENT OF LABOR | | | | |
| OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses..... | \$ (500,000) | | | |
| EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT | | | | |
| President's Committee on Education Beyond the High School..... | 300,000 | | | |
| DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE | | | | |
| PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE | | | | |
| Assistance to States, general: | | | | |
| 1956..... | ¹⁰ (11,000) | 11,000 | 11,000 | 11,000 |
| 1957..... | 90,000 | 90,000 | 90,000 | 90,000 |
| Venereal disease: | | | | |
| 1956..... | ¹⁰ (9,900) | | | |
| 1957..... | 55,000 | 55,000 | 55,000 | 55,000 |
| Tuberculosis: | | | | |
| 1956..... | ¹⁰ (6,600) | | | |
| 1957..... | 35,000 | 35,000 | 35,000 | 35,000 |
| Communicable diseases: | | | | |
| 1956..... | ¹⁰ (10,800) | | | |
| 1957..... | 540,000 | 540,000 | 540,000 | 540,000 |
| Hospitals and medical care: | | | | |
| 1956..... | ¹⁰ (268,500) | 268,500 | 268,500 | 268,500 |
| 1957..... | 1,225,000 | 1,225,000 | 1,225,000 | 1,225,000 |
| Foreign Quarantine Service: | | | | |
| 1956..... | ¹⁰ (8,000) | | | |
| 1957..... | 70,000 | 70,000 | 70,000 | 70,000 |
| Indian health activities: | | | | |
| 1956..... | ¹⁰ (25,700) | | | |
| 1957..... | 650,000 | 650,000 | 650,000 | 650,000 |
| Microbiology activities, 1956: | | | | |
| 1956..... | ¹⁰ (8,800) | | | |
| 1957..... | 25,000 | | 25,000 | 25,000 |
| Disease and sanitation investigations and control, Territory of Alaska..... | 500,000 | | | |
| Construction, mental health facilities, Territory of Alaska..... | 800,000 | 720,000 | 720,000 | 720,000 |
| Salaries and expenses..... | | | | |
| REDUCTIONS IN APPROPRIATIONS | | | | |
| Grants to States for poliomyelitis vaccination..... | | (4,000,000) | (4,000,000) | (4,000,000) |
| Grants for hospital construction..... | | Language | Language | Language |
| Total, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare..... | 3,900,000 | 3,664,500 | 3,689,500 | 3,689,500 |
| Total, chapter VIII..... | 4,290,000 | 3,664,500 | 3,689,500 | 3,689,500 |
| CHAPTER IX | | | | |
| DEPARTMENT OF STATE | | | | |
| Extension and remodeling, State Department Building..... | 55,600,000 | 44,920,000 | 44,920,000 | 44,920,000 |
| International Fisheries Commission..... | 620,000 | 620,000 | 620,000 | 620,000 |
| Vatican City claims..... | 964,200 | 964,200 | 964,200 | 964,200 |
| Total, Department of State..... | 57,184,200 | 46,504,200 | 46,504,200 | 46,504,200 |
| THE JUDICIARY | | | | |
| COURTS OF APPEALS, DISTRICT COURTS, AND OTHER JUDICIAL SERVICES | | | | |
| Fees of jurors and commissioners, 1956..... | ¹¹ (100,000) | | ¹¹ (100,000) | ¹¹ (100,000) |
| Administrative Office of the United States Courts..... | 113,500 | | | |
| UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY | | | | |
| Acquisition and construction of radio facilities..... | 2,000,000 | | | |
| FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT | | | | |
| President's special international program..... | 9,000,000 | 4,687,400 | 7,100,000 | 5,900,000 |
| Total, chapter IX..... | 68,207,700 | 51,191,600 | 53,604,200 | 52,404,200 |

See footnotes at end of table.

The supplemental appropriation bill, 1957 (H. R. 12138)—Continued

| Department or agency (1) | Budget estimate (2) | House allowance (3) | Senate allowance (4) | Conference allowance (5) |
|---|---------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|
| CHAPTER X | | | | |
| TREASURY DEPARTMENT | | | | |
| BUREAU OF ACCOUNTS | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses..... | \$82,000 | \$82,000 | \$82,000 | \$82,000 |
| DIVISION OF DISBURSEMENT | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses..... | 275,000 | 175,000 | 175,000 | 175,000 |
| INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses..... | 1,130,000 | 750,000 | 750,000 | 750,000 |
| BUREAU OF THE MINT | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses..... | | 3,500 | 3,500 | 3,500 |
| Striking of gold medal for Gustaf E. Lambert..... | | 350 | 350 | 350 |
| COAST GUARD | | | | |
| Retired pay..... | 425,000 | 425,000 | 425,000 | 425,000 |
| FEDERAL FACILITIES CORPORATION | | | | |
| Administrative expenses limitation increase..... | (225,000) | | (175,000) | (175,000) |
| Total, chapter X..... | 1,912,000 | 1,435,850 | 1,435,850 | 1,435,850 |
| CHAPTER XI | | | | |
| DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA | | | | |
| Federal payment..... | 3,000,000 | | | |
| OPERATING EXPENSES | | | | |
| Department of general administration..... | (332,000) | (300,000) | (308,990) | (308,990) |
| Office of corporation counsel..... | | (3,600) | (3,600) | (3,600) |
| Regulatory agencies..... | (21,800) | (21,800) | (21,800) | (21,800) |
| Department of occupations and professions..... | (3,200) | | (3,200) | (3,200) |
| Public schools..... | (155,000) | (155,000) | (155,000) | (155,000) |
| Public schools (1956)..... | (155,000) | (155,000) | (155,000) | (155,000) |
| Metropolitan police..... | (831,200) | (695,000) | (831,200) | (758,100) |
| Courts..... | (424,000) | (379,250) | (398,850) | (398,850) |
| Department of Public Health..... | (336,000) | (121,290) | (261,780) | (191,520) |
| Department of Public Health (1955)..... | (75,000) | (75,000) | (75,000) | (75,000) |
| Department of Public Welfare..... | (450,000) | (450,000) | (450,000) | (450,000) |
| Department of vehicles and traffic..... | (3,175) | | | |
| National Guard..... | (11,600) | (7,500) | (11,600) | (9,000) |
| Personal services, wage-scale employees..... | (943,000) | (943,000) | (943,000) | (943,000) |
| Total, operating expenses..... | (3,740,975) | (3,306,440) | (3,819,030) | (3,473,060) |
| CAPITAL OUTLAY | | | | |
| Public building construction, 1957..... | (8,818,500) | (7,427,929) | (7,922,829) | (7,922,829) |
| Public building construction, 1956..... | (343,000) | (335,000) | (335,000) | (335,000) |
| Department of Highways..... | (140,000) | (140,000) | (140,000) | (140,000) |
| Department of Sanitary Engineering..... | (5,197,000) | (5,000,000) | (5,000,000) | (5,000,000) |
| Total capital outlay..... | (14,498,500) | (12,002,929) | (13,397,829) | (13,397,829) |
| Settlement of claims and suits..... | (22,281) | (22,281) | (22,281) | (22,281) |
| Judgments..... | (13,461) | (13,461) | (13,461) | (13,461) |
| Audited claims..... | (83,093) | (83,093) | (83,093) | (83,093) |
| Total, Federal funds (ch. XI)..... | 3,000,000 | | | |
| Total, District of Columbia funds..... | (18,358,310) | (16,328,204) | (17,135,694) | (16,989,724) |
| CHAPTER XII | | | | |
| SENATE | | | | |
| For payment to Jane R. Barkley, widow of Alben W. Barkley, late a Senator from the State of Kentucky..... | | | 22,500 | 22,500 |
| CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE SENATE | | | | |
| Miscellaneous items, 1956..... | | | Language | Language |
| Joint Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies, 1957..... | | | 215,000 | 215,000 |
| HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES | | | | |
| Gratuity payment to beneficiary of deceased Member..... | | 22,500 | 22,500 | 22,500 |
| CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE HOUSE | | | | |
| Miscellaneous items (1956)..... | 125,000 | 100,000 | 100,000 | 100,000 |
| GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE | | | | |
| Revolving fund..... | | | Language | Language |
| Total, chapter XII..... | 125,000 | 122,500 | 360,000 | 360,000 |
| CHAPTER XIII | | | | |
| Claims, audited claims, and judgments, sec. 1301..... | 2,683,396 | 2,683,396 | 2,683,396 | 2,683,396 |
| Claims for damages, audited claims, and judgments, sec. 1302..... | Language | Language | Language | Language |
| Grand total..... | 1,254,364,525 | 1,555,589,275 | 1,724,639,675 | 1,691,341,875 |

¹ Estimates of \$2,500,000 consisting of \$675,000 for eradication of Mediterranean fruit fly and \$325,000 for control of burrowing nematode, contained in H. Doc. 403, and \$1,500,000 for Mediterranean fruit fly contained in H. Doc. 407 (of which \$1,250,000 made available during balance of 1956) included in Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1957 (Public Law 554).

² Provides increase in limitation for other than payments to producers as authorized in H. R. 7030, now Public Law 545.

³ Language making funds available to commemorate the 150th anniversary of the establishment of the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

⁴ To be derived by transfer from the "Army stock fund."

⁵ And \$200 million to be derived by transfer from the "Navy stock fund" and \$35 million to be derived by transfer from the "Marine Corps stock fund."

⁶ And \$357 million to be derived by transfer from the "Army stock fund." In lieu of this transfer the House committee recommends rescission of this amount.

⁷ Unobligated balances continued available until June 30, 1957.

⁸ \$500,000 of the unobligated balance continued available until June 30, 1957.

⁹ To be derived by transfer from the highway trust fund established pursuant to sec. 209 of Public Law 627, the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956.

¹⁰ Authority was requested to transfer this amount from other appropriations.

¹¹ To be derived by transfer.

1956

AMENDMENT OF CERTAIN ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS OF TARIFF ACT OF 1930—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I believe that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] has a conference report on the customs simplification bill, House bill 6040. I ask that the report be submitted, so it may be considered by the Senate.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6040) to amend certain administrative provisions of the Tariff Act of 1930 and to repeal obsolete provisions of the customs laws. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report. (For conference report, see House proceedings of July 21, 1956, p. 12654, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the Senate receded on only 1 amendment, and the House receded on 12. So the conference report is practically the bill as it was passed by the Senate. It is a unanimous report by the conferees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OF AGRICULTURAL TRADE DEVELOPMENT AND ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1954—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 3903) to amend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, so as to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated for purposes of title I of the act, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report. (For conference report, see House proceedings of July 24, 1956, pp. 13056-13057, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the conferees agreed unanimously on the provisions of the conference report. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an explanation of the dif-

ferences between S. 3903 as passed by the Senate and the conference substitute therefor.

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

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN S. 3903 AS PASSED BY THE SENATE AND THE CONFERENCE SUBSTITUTE THEREFOR

1. The provision of S. 3903 (sec. 2) providing for the use of foreign currencies generated under title I for American schools, libraries, and community centers abroad has been modified in technical respects (1) to conform to changes made in Public Law 480 by the Mutual Security Act of 1956 and (2) to meet parliamentary objections in the House. No change in substance was made in this provision.

2. The Senate bill would have modified section 304 of Public Law 480 so as to restrict it to title I transactions and permit barter with Iron Curtain satellites. The House amendment would have modified it to make it clear that barter with such countries is prohibited. The conference substitute omits both the House and Senate provisions and leaves the law unchanged.

3. The conference substitute extends the famine and urgent relief provisions of title II to provide assistance in meeting extraordinary relief requirements, such as those for refugee relief, which may be extraordinary although no longer urgent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

CREDIT FACILITIES AVAILABLE TO FARMERS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 11544) to improve and simplify the credit facilities available to farmers, to amend the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report. (For conference report, see House proceedings of July 21, 1956, pp. 12657-12658, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the conferees were unanimous in their decision. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an explanation of the differences between the conference substitute and the Senate amendment to House bill 11544.

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

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE CONFERENCE SUBSTITUTE AND THE SENATE AMENDMENT TO H. R. 11544

1. The House bill and the Senate amendment contained language restricting farm ownership and operating loans on less than family-size farms to bona fide farmers, but defined bona fide farmers somewhat differ-

ently. The conference substitute generally follows the House bill in this respect, but substitutes historical residence on a farm and historical dependence on farm income for dependence during 1 of the last 10 years on farm income.

2. The Senate amendment would have limited farm ownership refinancing loans on less than family-size farms to loans to refinance indebtedness constituting a lien on the farm. The conference substitute would permit such loans to refinance indebtedness incurred for any agricultural purpose.

3. The Senate amendment would have prohibited farm ownership or operating loans to borrowers able to obtain loans from other sources at "reasonable rates." The conference substitute leaves the existing law unchanged. Existing law prohibits such loans if obtainable elsewhere at prevailing rates but not in excess of 5 percent. The conferees felt the existing law to be adequate to assure that such loans will be restricted to other than the well-to-do farmers.

4. The Senate amendment would have permitted loans to be made on family-size farms having a value in excess of the average value of efficient family-size farms in the community. The conference substitute would permit improvement loans to be made for such farms, but not acquisition or enlargement loans.

5. The conference substitute would extend the economic emergency loan authority of Public Law 727, 83d Congress for 2 years and increase the overall limitation on such authority to \$65 million. The Senate amendment contained no similar provision, the Senate having previously passed S. 3559, to provide for a similar extension and to increase the limitation to \$50 million.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OF WATERSHED PROTECTION AND FLOOD PREVENTION ACT—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8750) to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report. (For conference report, see House proceedings of July 24, 1956, pp. 13055-13056, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, was the conference report signed by all the conferees?

Mr. KERR. It was. I will say to the Senator from California that the provisions agreed upon in conference were substantially in line with the spirit of the bill as passed by the Senate.

There were three principal changes. First, the Senate bill had provided that in certain instances plans should be submitted to the Public Works Committees of the House and Senate. In the bill as

passed by the House, it was provided that the plans be referred to the Agriculture Committees of the House and Senate.

It was agreed in conference—and certain specifications were agreed upon—that when the plan was predominantly a flood control plan, it be referred to the Public Works Committee, and when it was predominantly an agricultural plan, it be referred to the Agriculture Committees.

An effort was made to make especially clear the intent of the language as provided by the Senate, which permitted the local organization to have the optional right of employing engineering services in connection with plans for development. Where the structure for the impounding of water exceeded 5,000 acre-feet—in other words, when it became a structure which involved a considerable part of the program in the matter of conservation of water for municipal water supplies or irrigation—the privilege of employing local engineering services was made optional.

The other point, as I recall, was to clarify the language in the bill which specified that help was available to the local organization from the Secretary of Agriculture, in the preparation of specifications for the plan. The employment of necessary assistance in preparing advertisements for bids and entering into contracts for carrying out the structure as planned, was provided for.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, let me say for the Record that both the Department of Agriculture and the Bureau of the Budget are opposed to this bill, although it was not generally known at the time it was passed by the Senate last Saturday morning.

Yesterday I had inserted in the Record, at page 12967, correspondence from these two agencies of the Government, setting forth their opposition to the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF TIME WITHIN WHICH AWARDS OF CERTAIN MILITARY AND NAVAL DECORATIONS MAY BE MADE—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1637) to extend the time limit within which awards of certain military and naval decorations may be made. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of today.)

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the conference report is signed by all the conferees on the part of the Senate and the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

IMPROVEMENT OF HOUSING AND CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF URBAN COMMUNITIES

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate a hand engrossed copy of House bill 11742, which has just come over from the House of Representatives.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate a bill coming over from the House of Representatives.

The bill (H. R. 11742) to extend and amend laws relating to the provision and improvement of housing and the conservation and development of urban communities, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute. I ask that the amendment be printed in the Record at this point without reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment may be printed in the Record at this point without reading.

The amendment offered by Mr. FULBRIGHT, in the nature of a substitute, was to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Housing Amendments of 1956."

TITLE I—FHA INSURANCE PROGRAMS PROPERTY IMPROVEMENT LOANS

SEC. 101. (a) Section 2 (a) of the National Housing Act, as amended, is hereby amended by striking out "September 30, 1956," and inserting in lieu thereof "September 30, 1959."

(b) Section 2 (b) of such act, as amended, is amended by—

(1) striking out "made for the purpose of financing the alteration, repair, or improvement of existing structures exceeds \$2,500, or for the purpose of financing the construction of new structures exceeds \$3,000" and inserting "exceeds \$3,500";

(2) striking out "except that" in clause (2) and inserting "except that the Commissioner may increase such maximum limitation to 5 years and 32 days if he determines such increase to be in the public interest after giving consideration to the general effect of such increase upon borrowers, the building industry, and the general economy, and"; and

(3) striking out the first proviso and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "Provided, That no insurance shall be granted under this section (A) in the case of any obligation in a principal amount of \$2,500 or less, representing any loan, advance of credit, or purchase made after the effective date of the Housing Amendments of 1956, if such obligation has a financing charge in excess of an amount equivalent to 65 discount per \$100 original face amount of a 1-year note to be paid in equal monthly installments calculated from the date of the note, or (B) in the case of any such obligation in a

principal amount in excess of \$2,500, if such obligation has a financing charge in excess of (1) an amount equivalent to 65 discount per \$100 original face amount of a 1-year note to be paid in equal monthly installments calculated from the date of the note, with respect to that part of the principal amount not in excess of \$2,500, and (ii) an amount equivalent to 64 discount per \$100 original face amount of a 1-year note to be paid in equal monthly installments calculated from the date of the note, with respect to that part of the principal amount which is in excess of \$2,500: *Provided further,* That such charges correctly based on tables of calculations issued by the Commissioner, or adjusted to eliminate minor errors in computations in accordance with requirements of the Commissioner, shall be deemed to comply with the preceding proviso: *And provided further,* That insurance may be granted to any such financial institution with respect to any obligation not in excess of \$15,000 (nor an average amount of \$2,500 per family unit), having a maturity not in excess of 7 years and 32 days, representing any such loan, advance of credit, or purchase made by it if such loan, advance of credit, or purchase is made for the purpose of financing the alteration, repair, improvement, or conversion of an existing structure used or to be used as an apartment house or a dwelling for two or more families."

HAZARD INSURANCE ON FHA ACQUIRED PROPERTIES

SEC. 102. Title I of the National Housing Act, as amended, is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 10. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to establish a Fire and Hazard Loss Fund which shall be available to provide such fire and hazard risk coverage as the Commissioner, in his discretion, may determine to be appropriate with respect to real property acquired and held by him under the provisions of this act. For the purpose of operating such fund, the Commissioner is authorized in the name of the fund to transfer moneys and require payment of premiums or charges from any one or more of the several insurance funds established by this act and from the account established pursuant to section 2 (f) of this act, in such amounts and in such manner, including any repayments of such moneys, as the Commissioner, in his discretion, shall determine. In carrying out the authority created by this section, the Commissioner and the Fire and Hazard Loss Fund shall be exempt from all taxation, assessments, levies, or license fees now or hereafter imposed by the United States, by any Territory or possession thereof, or by any State, county, municipality, or local taxing authority. Moneys in the Fire and Hazard Loss Fund not needed for current operations of the fund shall be deposited with the Treasurer of the United States to the credit of the fund or invested in bonds or other obligations of, or in bonds or other obligations guaranteed as to principal and interest by, the United States or in bonds or other obligations which are lawful investments for fiduciary, trust, and public funds of the United States.

"Notwithstanding the provisions of this section, the Commissioner is authorized to purchase such other insurance protection as he may, in his discretion, determine, and he may further provide for reinsurance of any risk assumed by the Fire and Hazard Loss Fund."

COOPERATIVE HOUSING INSURANCE

SEC. 103. Section 213 (b) (2) of the National Housing Act, as amended, is amended by—

(1) striking out "65 percent" and inserting in lieu thereof "50 percent"; and

(2) amending the last proviso to read as follows: "And provided further, That for the purposes of this section the word 'veteran'