Mr. PURTELL. The Senator referred to page 4 of the report, from which he quoted the following:

Your committee was specifically concerned about the possible retroactive effect of enactment of this legislation upon pending protest proceedings. The Commission through its witnesses and in a letter made part of this report stated that where the Commission has already made a determination that a protest should be set for evidentiary hearing or that the effectiveness of a grant should be postponed pending such hearing and the matter has proceeded on this basis, reconsideration of these determinations would not appear to be required and would normally appear to serve no public purpose.

I believe the Senator has referred to the same thing.

Your committee concurs with this view and construes this to apply to any protest on file with the Commission prior to the enactment of this bill.

Is it the Senator's understanding that the language I have just read refers not only to protests filed under section 309 (c), but also to objections filed under section 309 (b), prior to the enactment of the bill?

Mr. PASTORE. The subject matter to which the Senator from Connecticut now refers and calls to my attention in the form of a query was called to my attention by him yesterday. So as to obviate any doubt at all about our position in answering that question, I had a member of the staff communicate with the Federal Communications Commission in order to get a direct, positive answer to the question. This is the answer I have, and I think it answers the Senator satisfactorily and in the affirmative.

Mr. PURTELL. It does.

Mr. PASTORE. It reads as follows:

I was specifically concerned about the possible retroactive effect of enactment of this legislation upon pending proceedings. Insofar as the protests that are pending prior to the enactment of this bill, the report is very clear. In order to avoid any possible misunderstanding as to the situation where a party in interest has filed an objection or opposition in a proceeding prior to the enactment of this bill and such objection or opposition is denied without a full hearing, and a protest under 309 (c) is filed by such a party in interest at a later date, this bill will not apply. In other words, 309 (c) as it presently is written will apply.

In other words, section 309 (c) as it is written at present will apply. This is no denial of any pending rates; it is merely to simplify the procedure before the Federal Communications Commission.

Mr. PURTELL. I thank the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, in this connection, I have prepared a statement in support of the bill, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR IVES

In 1952, section 309 (c) was added to the Communications Act of 1934. It was an attempt by Congress to insure that an interested party could obtain a hearing when he alleged considerations of public interest to the effect that an authorization granted without a hearing should not have been made. It was thought that the status quo should be maintained and the proposed authorization should be frozen until disposition of the protest hearing.

A few years of experience with this section has demonstrated that, while it has its merits, it has been used by competitors to effectively prevent a new radio or television station from going on the air for a considerable period of time. In section 309 (c), certain radio and television stations have found a ready tool to postpone competition effectively. Whenever we find that a law, such as this, lends itself to abuse, we should be alert to correct it, while preserving the protection to the public that it was designed to give.

In my opinion, that is what the bill as reported would accomplish. It eliminates the necessity for holding full evidentiary hearings with respect to facts alleged by a protestant which, even if proven to be true, would not constitute grounds for setting aside the grant which the Commission has made. It gives the Commission some discretion to keep in effect the authorization being protested where the Commission finds that the public interest requires the grant to remain in effect. It grants the Commission the power to redraft issues to make them conformable with the facts or substantive matters alleged in the protest.

There is no excuse for continuing a system which lends itself to dilatory tactics. The accelerated expansion of wire and radio services and the complexities of new technical developments have multiplied greatly regulatory and administrative burdens. In the past 5 years, the Commission's workload has more than doubled. Figures for a recent period indicate that over 25 percent of the Commission's time was devoted to protest cases.

This is an area where we can give the Commission definite help without cost, at a saving of time and expenditures and without sacrificing the public interest. I am convinced that this is what H. R. 5614 would do.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Rhode Island if the report of the committee was unanimous?

Mr. PASTORE. Yes; it was.

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

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I am very strongly in favor of the bill. I do not understand that the bill goes into the merits of any application whatsoever. It simply makes it possible for the Commission to use its discretion in suspending a license for the operation of a plant during the time between the filing of a protest and the hearing thereon.

It would be entirely possible to work a great hardship on large communities if a television system were forced to go out of business pending a delay which ensued between the time of the filing of a protest and the earliest time at which the Commission could hear the protest.

I favor the bill.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that remarks prepared by the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] on the proposed legislation may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BRICKER

The Federal Communications Commission is one of the busiest agencies of the Government. In the last fiscal year, for instance, it had to process 430,000 applications of all kinds, 850,000 incoming letters and 20,000 tariffs and reports of common carriers requiring review. In addition, there were 500 hearing cases, thousands of petitions and other legal findings in connection with hearings and rule-making proceedings. Attention had to be devoted to nearly 100 court cases affecting the Commission. When we consider the fact that the Commission operates with less than 1,100 employees, it is truly remarkable that it can accomplish as much as it does.

In 1952, the Congress enacted section 309 (c) to the Communications Act of 1934.

It was our intention by so doing to protect the public interest, without adding unnecessary redtape. Under section 309 (c), the Commission has the power to grant certain routine authorizations without a public hearing, but a party in interest is permitted to raise questions of public interest by way of protest.

Experience has shown that this provision is being abused by persons who wish to stifle competitors.

The Commission has pointed this out to the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. The Commission says this section is being used as a tactic by competing radio or television interests to delay a proper grant for a year or more for their own selfish interest.

The amendment to the act reported by the committee protects the public interest. It would continue the policy of allowing a hearing in meritorious cases or in cases raising serious considerations of public interest. However, it would also permit the Commission to dispense with a full evidentiary hearing when the facts alleged would not be grounds for setting aside the grant, even if later proved true in a full hearing. This is a power commonly possessed by courts and administrative boards. It is plain common sense.

Furthermore, the bill would grant the Commission some discretion to keep in effect the authorization being protested where the Commission finds that the public interest so requires. In such a case, however, the Commission must make a specific finding to that effect and set it forth in its decision.

Finally, the Commission would be authorized to redraft issues to make them conform to facts or substantive matters set out in the protest. This is in harmony with better administrative procedures and would further a prompt disposition of the case.

In short, the bill before us gives the Commission an efficient tool which should prove of great value in lightening somewhat the enormous administrative load we have placed on its shoulders. In view of the heavy demands on the Commission's time, this is the least we can do to assist it in disposing of applications with promptness and efficiency in the public interest.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LONG in the chair). If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill (H. R. 5614) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, before announcing the program for Monday, January 16, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until Monday next.

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

PROGRAM FOR MONDAY—CALL OF THE CALENDAR

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, on Monday, January 16, it is planned to have a call of the calendar from the beginning. I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the morning business on Monday there be a call of the measures on the calendar to which there is no objection.

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

ANNOUNCEMENT OF HEARINGS ON THE FARM BILL

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I should like to announce that the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] desires the Members of the Senate to know that the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry will hear Members of Congress—both Senators and Representatives—on the farm bill, beginning at 10 o'clock in the morning, next Tuesday, January 17.

AMENDMENT OF THE NATURAL GAS ACT, AS AMENDED

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, following the call of the calendar on Monday, as previously announced, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1234, Senate bill 1853, the so-called natural-gas bill. I ask unanimous consent that that bill may now be made the unfinished business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the bill by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 1853) to amend the Natural Gas Act, as amended.

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 (S. 1853) to amend the Natural Gas Act, as amended, which had been reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce with an amendment.

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA AND THE UPPER COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, for several years, now, residents of 16 western reclamation States have watched with dismay as southern California water interests have spent millions of dollars in pernicious propaganda which they hoped would retard or defeat development of Colorado River water by the States of Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming. This unjustified and atrocious program of misrepresentation and untruthful propaganda has held up very worthwhile water resource projects proposed by those five States, and also has caused great damage to the reclamation movement as a whole.

During this bitter and frustrating battle, most Californians from the central and northern sections of the State have kept silent, approving by their silence the tactics of their associates from below the Tehachapi. This was not true, I hasten to add, of a few stalwart exceptions, such as Representative CLAIR ENGLE and Representative B. F. SISK, both of whom have cautioned their colleagues from southern California that their unwarranted attack upon reclamation could have serious repercussions upon the State of California in its $15 billion program of future water development. Representative ENGLE also has given loyal and continued support to the proposed upper Colorado River water development program.

However, now it appears that other advocates of water development in California are becoming concerned about the efforts and tactics of the well-organized and heavily-financed southern California water lobby.

In fact, the suspicion has dawned on the good residents of northern California that the Colorado River Basin States are not the only ones concerned about southern California's poorly concealed designs to get water that doesn't belong to them. Southern California, it appears now, also is out to take over a vital dam site required for a desperately needed water development project in California's Central Valley.

This latter admission is made in a two-article series on the Colorado River Board of California, which appeared last week in the highly respected Sacramento Bee.

The Bee articles, in fact, make two rather serious charges against southern California:

First. That southern California's lobbying activities have resulted in such ill repute throughout the country that the Colorado River Board probably will be kept out of the the New California State Water Department, now in formation.

Second. That while Governor Knight and other State officials have favored construction of the proposed San Louis project as a Federal project, integrated with State water development plans, southern California interests have tried to forestall this program, which they may not be able to control, by urging immediate State purchase of the San Luis site.

The Bee articles also disclose that my estimates last session of the high finances involved in the Southern aCli-fornia fight against non-California development of the Colorado River were entirely sound.

I had a compilation made last spring of receipts reported by three major lobbying organizations maintained here in Washington by southern California interests. These reported lobbying receipts totaled roughly $855,000 for a period beginning in 1951, following announcement of the upstream development plans, and I made the charge that southern California was spending millions to acquire a water resource worth billions.

Now the Sacramento Bee reports that the total cost of supporting the Colorado River board, including legal expenses furnished the State attorney general's office, will be an estimated $425,000 during the current fiscal year. The articles also indicated that a similar amount would be requested of the State legislature for 1956, and stated that Mr. Northcutt Ely, southern California's chief lobbyist, would earn $75,000 from State sources this year.

This means that, if State contributions to this southern California water board amounted to only half the present level since its organization, the total California tax money contributed for this legal and lobbying service has amounted to more than $4 million since 1937. When current lobbying receipts reported by other southern California water interests are added for the period 1951–55, the grand total will be more than $5 million to supposedly protect California's interests in a river which has been almost fully developed in the California portion of the lower basin, largely at Federal expense.

In view of the interest shown by other States in the efforts of southern California to spend millions to prevent upstream development of water allocated by solemn interstate compact in 1922, I ask unanimous consent to have these two articles, written by Mr. Robert J. Markson, reproduced in the RECORD following these remarks. I also wish to express appreciation to the McClatchy Newspapers, Inc.—publishers of the Sacramento, Fresno, and Modesto Bees—for publishing this revealing information as a service to California and the other 47 States.

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

COLORADO RIVER BOARD FIGHTS INCLUSION IN STATE AGENCY

(By Robert J. Markson)

A movement is afoot to keep the Colorado River board out of the proposed new State water department. This would leave the agency, as it is now constituted, free to speak and act independently of the State government although it is State tax supported.

The board would be, as it has been for the past 18 years, a powerful, uncontrolled force in water politics, yet representing only six special interest groups in southern California.

Board critics have complained its policies have not always been in the best interests of the State as a whole.

FAVOR ONE DEPARTMENT

Many leading water spokesmen believe the first thing necessary to solve California's water problems is an effective State water department with one voice expressing statewide water policy.

The State assembly committee on government organization, under the chairmanship of Assemblyman Caspar W. Weinberger, Republican, of San Francisco, is preparing a bill to accomplish this. Governor Goodwin J. Knigth will call a special legislative session in March if an acceptable measure is drafted.

The Weinberger committee will hold hearings on the water consolidation bill in San Francisco Thursday and in Sacramento Friday.

BOARD EXCEPTED

The group's announced objective is to put in the proposed new department practically all the various independent State agencies dealing with the water problem except the Colorado River Board.

At the committee's recent Los Angeles hearings board members strenuously objected to being included at least until the end of a lawsuit involving rights to Col-