

ported only yesterday at his press conference by the Secretary of Defense. Secretary Wilson argued that the defense cuts decided on by the administration last year had nothing to do with what has occurred on the international scene since. Hence, they can be continued. He argued that if we had twice as large an Army, Navy, and Air Force over the past 18 months, "not a single thing" that happened would have turned out differently. Russia, he said has relied on satellites and on fomenting unrest rather than direct military force. Hence, increasing our Armed Forces is no answer to our problems.

This attitude ignores the fact that while Russia has won victories through satellites and by increasing unrest, she has been building new weapons and increasing her air-atomic power possibly more rapidly than we are increasing our own. The Alsops make the assertion that the Pentagon now has convincing evidence that the Soviets have a guided missile that can drop an atomic or hydrogen warhead on most of our overseas bases. Furthermore, the Soviets are developing a greater guided missile that will bring all our transatlantic and transpacific airbases within range. Both types of missiles are probably now entering the phase of quantity production.

Meanwhile no steps are being taken to give the Strategic Air Command more long-range bombers, to speed up B-47 production, or to provide the kind of leadership and strength needed to insure our continuing possession of overseas bases. Instead, we are being treated to such soothing sirup as we heard from Quantico a few weeks ago, as we heard from the Secretary yesterday, and as we read in the joint congressional committee's report on the new atomic-energy bill—all asserting America's preponderance in atomic weapons and seeking to lull our citizens with the idea that we can afford a stretchout in military build-up—at least until after the November elections. This is certainly fiddle-faddle, as the Alsops call it. More dangerously, it is fiddling while fires that can consume the world are smoldering, ready to burst at any moment into flame. It is ridiculous to say that our military cutbacks have not encouraged the Krem-

lin. When you are in a race you are always encouraged when your adversary shows signs of quitting.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent of my colleagues to extend my remarks, I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following by Joseph and Stewart Alsop from today's Washington Post and Times Herald and New York Herald Tribune. The column is as follows:

THE FIDDLE-FADDLERS

(By Joseph and Stewart Alsop)

The Pentagon has convincing evidence that the Soviets are now quantity producing an efficient guided missile capable of being fitted with an atomic or hydrogen warhead, and with enough range to hit any of our overseas airbases except those in Spain and the Mediterranean.

The Pentagon also has probable evidence of a still larger Soviet guided missile, most likely built around the powerful new M-103 rocket engine that the Soviet engineers have perfected. With a range of 1,800 miles, this missile will bring all our transatlantic and transpacific airbases under fire.

Very recently, hard information has been received of a large order placed in eastern Europe, for special rail cars apparently designed to transport missiles of the larger, longer-range type. This new development if correctly interpreted, indicates that these missiles are also entering the phase of quantity production.

Such facts as these, in turn, are clear proof that this country is now being treated to an unconscionable amount of fiddle-faddle by its leaders. The kind of thing that the official leadership encourages, and the public generally falls for, was well illustrated the other day by the Joint Congressional Committee's report on the new atomic energy bill.

"America's preponderance in atomic weapons," smugly declared the committee, "can . . . serve emphatic notice on the Soviet dictators that any attempt . . . to push further anywhere into the free world, would be foredoomed to failure."

Those words were written when the Soviet dictators were finishing a most successful push in Indochina. But that is not the worst of their implied untruths. Their worst untruth is the idea that large numbers of A- and H-bombs, in and of themselves, will always give this country the whip hand in the struggle for the world. This idea is the true "Maginot-line thinking" of the postwar period.

In fact, of course, the Soviet and American A- and H-bomb stockpiles are only one element in the balance of air-atomic power. A-bombs and H-bombs which cannot be de-

livered are mere expensive toys. In the era of plentiful stocks of the absolute weapons, the ability to deliver the weapons is obviously more important than the weapons themselves.

Nearly a year has passed since the Soviets tested their H-bomb with lithium hydride core, capable of being produced rather rapidly and in large numbers. There is no doubt at all that the Soviets already possess enough A-bombs to inflict terrible damage on this country. In 18, or 24, or 36 months—for the time is not long—the Soviet A- and H-bomb stockpile will be in the plentiful class.

This in turn confers a somewhat lurid future meaning on the two Soviet guided missiles referred to above. For when the Kremlin has enough A- and H-bombs in stock, the missiles can then be fitted with atomic or hydrogen warheads. And when and if that is done, our overseas airbases will, in effect, cease to be dependable assets.

This physical vulnerability of the bases is still quite largely in the future. In the present, however, there is another tendency of almost equal importance. As the Indochinese affair has shown, our allies are less and less willing to risk a collision of will with the Kremlin, because of their growing fear of Soviet air-atomic strength. That means that many of our overseas bases are also politically vulnerable.

No secrets will be revealed to the enemy, but no doubt Americans will be surprised to learn, that the loss of our overseas airbases from any cause, whether military or political, will be the exact equivalent of the physical destruction of approximately 60 percent of the Strategic Air Command.

Gen. Curtis LeMay's great force has been planned just big enough to do its job from the overseas airbases. Last year, the Eisenhower administration actually cutback SAC growth, on the ground that SAC did not need extra long-range air groups.

SAC now mainly relies on its superb medium range-bomber, the B-47. These planes can reach Soviet targets from American bases, but only by the difficult, dangerous and time-consuming process of double air refueling. If this expedient has to be resorted to, the B-47 will only be able to make about 40 percent as many sorties as they could from the overseas bases. Obviously, cutting the number of possible sorties is just like cutting the number of available aircraft.

The Pentagon has effectively admitted the danger to our overseas airbases, by giving SAC a big tanker program, to increase air refueling capacity. But no steps are planned to give SAC more bombers, or to speed B-47 production, which could be doubled in 6 months. And so the threat to our overseas airbases threatens to weaken our overall air-atomic power, at the very moment when Soviet air-atomic power is rapidly and formidably increasing.

SENATE

FRIDAY, JUNE 25, 1954

(Legislative day of Tuesday, June 22, 1954)

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

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

God our Father, as the quiet splendor of another day illumines our path, at noontide we have stepped aside from the crowded highway to this altar of prayer, set up by our fathers, where in all our ways we would acknowledge Thee at the beginning of this day's council together.

Some of us have grown weary with the heat and burden of these tragic days. For Thy name's sake and for our soul's sake, lead us where still waters flow. Gird us with strength to make decisions now which shall not plague us in later years. Deliver us from any present expediency which will hold us back from playing our full part and mobilizing the might of freedom against those who, degrading the sanctities of human life, plot to enslave the world.

In this day of decision, may this dear land of ours, which Thou hast made the world's great bulwark of liberty, stand up and speak out, and boldly, in Thy name and in the name of our imperiled heritage of freedom, that generations to come may call us blessed. And, above

all, save us from crying "peace, peace" when there is no righteous or just peace. We ask it in the Name of that One who, against falsehood, came not to bring peace but a sword. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. KNOWLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, June 24, 1954, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF BILLS

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

of his secretaries, and he announced that on June 24, 1954, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 1004. An act to amend section 86, Revised Statutes of the United States relating to the District of Columbia, as amended; and
S. 2225. An act relating to the administrative jurisdiction of certain public lands in the State of Oregon, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 9143) to repeal the provisions of section 16 of the Federal Reserve Act which prohibits a Federal Reserve bank from paying out notes of another Federal Reserve bank, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bill and joint resolution, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 3476. An act to provide for the advance of Comdr. Donald B. MacMillan, United States Naval Reserve (retired), to the grade of rear admiral on the Naval Reserve retired list; and
S. J. Res. 167. Joint resolution to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, and for other purposes.

COMMITTEE SERVICE

On motion of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, it was

Ordered, That Mr. JACKSON be assigned to service on the Committee on Armed Services.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

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

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that immediately following the quorum call there may be the customary morning hour for the transaction of routine business, under the usual 2-minute limitation on speeches.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT OF INTERNATIONAL CLAIMS COMMISSION

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the International Claims Commission, for the period January 1, 1954, to June 30, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

VALIDATION OF LONGEVITY PAY OF CERTAIN NURSES

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to validate longevity pay to nurses of the Army and Air Force computed on the basis of service in the Army, Navy, and Public Health (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

ASSISTANT CHAPLAIN AT THE UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the appointment of an assistant chaplain at the United States Military Academy and to fix the compensation of the chaplain and assistant chaplain thereof (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

NATURALIZATION OF CERTAIN PERSONS FOR HONORABLE SERVICE IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to permit the naturalization of certain persons by reason of honorable service in the United States Navy prior to December 24, 1952 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITION AND MEMORIAL

A petition and a memorial were laid before the Senate, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution adopted by the Medical Library Association, Washington, D. C., favoring the enactment of legislation to provide adequate funds for the Library of Congress to insure its continuing services to the whole Nation; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

A resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Los Angeles, Calif., protesting against the enactment of Senate bill 1555, and House bill 4449, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

INVESTIGATION OF ELECTRIC UTILITY INDUSTRY IN PACIFIC NORTHWEST—RESOLUTION OF WASHINGTON STATE GRANGE

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the Washington State Grange, favoring an investigation of the electric utility industry in the Pacific Northwest by the Senate Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly Legislation of the Committee on the Judiciary.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on

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

RESOLUTION REQUESTING LANGER MONOPOLY SUBCOMMITTEE INVESTIGATION OF ELECTRIC UTILITY INDUSTRY IN THE PACIFIC NORTHWEST

Whereas the Senate Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly Legislation, under the chairmanship of Senator WILLIAM LANGER, has recently held hearings investigating certain monopolistic practices in the power industry; and

Whereas the last full-scale investigation of the electric-power monopoly was conducted in the period 1927 to 1935 and resulted in many fruitful reforms of the utility business; and

Whereas there now appears to be a re-emergence of an electric-bond-and-share controlled private electric company monopoly in the Pacific Northwest and of undue influence on the Interior Department power policy being exerted by these former EBASCO companies, as is evidenced by the merger of the Pacific Power & Light Co. and the Mountain States Power Co.; the attempt to merge the Puget Sound Power & Light Co. with the Washington Water Power Co.; the formation of the five-company superholding company, Pacific Northwest Power Co.; the hiring of an EBASCO services engineer by the Pacific Northwest Governors' Power Policy Committee to direct its engineering studies; the master-minding by EBASCO of the Idaho Power Co.'s case in the Hells Canyon hearings; and other similar developments: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Washington State Grange on behalf of its members, That the Senate Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly Legislation headed by Senator WILLIAM LANGER be requested to continue and extend its power-monopoly investigations to include an immediate investigation of the electric-utility industry in the Pacific Northwest, to hold public hearings in the Pacific Northwest as soon as possible, and through such hearings to determine (a) the extent to which holding-company monopoly and the abuses therefrom are again present in Northwest private utility service; (b) the influence such monopoly is exerting within Federal power agencies; and (c) if more adequate public regulation is needed to safeguard the electric consumer interest from private monopoly abuse; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, Senator LANGER, and Washington State Senators MAGNUSON and JACKSON.

Adopted by the delegates of the 65th annual Washington State Grange session, June 11, 1954.

PRODUCTION AND SALE OF CATTLE—RESOLUTION OF DAKOTA LIVESTOCK PRODUCERS ASSOCIATION, MORRISTOWN, S. DAK.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the Dakota Livestock Producers Association, Morrystown, S. Dak., relating to the production and sale of cattle.

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

MORRISTOWN, S. DAK., May 27, 1954.

At a meeting of cattlemen held in the city hall in Morrystown, S. Dak., this afternoon, which meeting was attended by cattlemen from both North and South Dakota in this area, the following resolution was

unanimously passed and the chairman and secretary were instructed to send this resolution to the Senators and Congressmen from the States of North and South Dakota:

"That in view of the fact that it now has been definitely proven that fixed, necessary expenses are now exceeding the income received from the production of cattle, we respectfully petition our Senators and Congressmen to do everything within their power to bring about corrections that will at least assure cattle producers income sufficient to pay their operating expenses and allow something for the return on the investment which they must have and carry on their operations.

"That information furnished us seems to indicate that the production of beef at the present time is in excess of the consumptive demand, therefore we are willing to support a sound demand for a reduction of numbers of cattle until such time as the supply will not exceed the consumptive demand. This policy we will support even though it results in a reduction in the numbers of cattle which we are now running.

"That if it is necessary to pay a subsidy to the producers of cattle in order to attain this goal until a proper balance can be accomplished between supply and demand and in order to insure a survival of the cattle business, we consider it an obligation of the Congress of the United States to pass effective legislation and supply the money with which to carry out this subsidy program."

DAKOTA LIVESTOCK PRODUCERS
ASSOCIATION.
GEORGE LIGHTHALL, *Chairman.*

AGRICULTURAL PROBLEMS—RESOLUTION OF WILLISTON (N. DAK.) FARMERS UNION ELEVATOR ASSOCIATION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the Williston, N. Dak., Farmers Union Elevator Association, at their annual meeting, relating to agricultural problems.

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

WILLISTON FARMERS UNION
ELEVATOR ASSOCIATION,
Williston, N. Dak., June 12, 1954.
Hon. Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR BILL: The enclosed resolution was passed unanimously at the annual stockholders meeting of the Williston Farmers Union Elevator Association held on June 12, 1954.

"Whereas the present Republican administration in our Federal Government was elected to office on the basis of policies and principles expounded by their leaders in the campaign prior to the election of 1952; and

"Whereas President Eisenhower at the time he spoke as a candidate at Kasson, Minn., stated publicly, clearly, and explicitly that he favored not only 90-percent parity but 100-percent parity for the American farmers: And so now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That we, the 1,436 stockholders of the Williston Farmers Union Elevator Association in annual meeting assembled this 12th day of June 1954 in the armory at Williston, N. Dak., hereby urge you to vote for and work for passage of a 'package farm bill' which incorporates the following points:

"1. Extension of mandatory supports at a minimum of 90-percent parity for basics—wheat, cotton, corn, peanuts, rice, tobacco, tung nuts, and honey.

"2. Mandatory supports at the feed-value-equivalent ratio to corn for rye, oats, barley, grain sorghums, cottonseed, soybeans, flaxseed and other storables.

"3. Mandatory supports at a minimum of 90-percent parity for milk and butterfat, beef cattle, calves, and wool.

"4. A food allotment program to enable the employed, elder citizens, relief recipients and other low-income consumers to obtain good nutrition diets.

"5. A farm trading post and international food reserve to expand exports of abundant, farm production so as to relieve famine, promote economic developments, and promote the quest for permanent world peace.

"6. An adequate safety reserve for food and fiber for the United States.

"7. Extend marketing orders and agreements to more fruits and vegetables.

"8. A loan program for improved marketing facilities.

"9. Renewal and extension of the agricultural conservation program.

"10. A program of incentive payments to farmers for conservation practices on land taken out of production under acreage allotments and marketing quotas and define diverted wheat acres as being the difference between the 62 million acres of 1954 and the 55 million acres of 1955 and subsequent years and that the 16-million-acre difference between the 78 million acres of 1953 and the 62 million acres of 1954 be permitted to be used in 1955 and subsequent years for such 'income use' as will enable us wheat farmers to stay in business."

Sincerely,
NORMAN ROCKSTAD,
Secretary, Williston Farmers Union
Elevator Association.

P. S.—Please excuse the carbon copy. I've sent copies to the members of the House Agriculture Committee.

FEDERAL WELFARE PRACTICES—TELEGRAM FROM NORTH DAKOTA WELFARE BOARD

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a telegram I have received from the Welfare Board of the State of North Dakota, in which they particularly ask that the attention of Congress be called to certain welfare practices which are carried out administratively.

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

BISMARCK, N. DAK., June 24, 1954.
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senate.

Following telegram sent to Marie Lane, American Public Welfare Association, on present language of 1955 appropriation for Bureau of Public Assistance: "1955 Bureau Public Assistance appropriation administrative formula of 7 percent, etc., gives premium to high case load and excessive cost. According our figures it will probably reward loose administration of no administration and penalize State trying to keep public assistance under control. We gain so to speak in old-age assistance which is our largest caseload. We teeter back and forth quarter to quarter on ADC. We lose a little apparently in APTB. On basis North Dakota figures this legislation contrary to good public policy if good public policy means clean as whip administration of multimillion-million dollar program in America. Privilege to use this telegram based on our own estimates with anyone. All you have to do is to have a high caseload and do nothing about it and you are not going to lose anything administratively. Should guarantee

in many areas sloth procrastination and inaction. Surely the Congress does not want this." Emphasize this is based on North Dakota experience.

CARLYLE D. ONSRUD.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR VETERANS' BENEFITS—RESOLUTION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the Schafer-Boyd-Lange Unit, No. 69, the American Legion, at Flasher, N. Dak., relating to appropriations for veterans' benefits.

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

RESOLUTION

Whereas when our country is in peril and the sons of America must go to war to protect all that is dear to us, nearly everyone waves flags and is ready to back up the man in uniform—"nothing is too good for him," so they then say; and

Whereas soon as the war is won, the shooting and fighting stops, and the doughboy or GI Joe returns to his home (if he is fortunate enough to return), he soon discovers that a number of the very people, for whom he offered to sacrifice his very life, have grown cool toward him and that even downright resentment exists in some quarters (since he has become an ex-serviceman); and

Whereas instead of remembering that GI Joe may have spent months in a living hell, and, as often happens, laid in military hospitals for weeks, and months, on end (and even now, as a civilian, he may have to return periodically to veterans' hospital for further treatment), some of his voluble countrymen, who were willing to verbally back him up with a lot of promises when they needed him (and, incidentally, reap the immense economic, social, and political benefits directly resulting from the wartime activities of GI Joe), now openly declare he is costing our Government (the greatest the world has ever seen) too much money; that he is not entitled to care in a Government hospital or at Government expense; that our great Nation cannot afford to pay him adequate disability pensions, compensation, etc.; and

Whereas statistics from the United States Department of Commerce and the Veterans' Administration show that in the year 1890, when national income was \$10,701,000,000, our Nation spent \$106 million, or a little more than 99 one-hundredths of 1 percent of that total income for the welfare of our ex-servicemen and their dependents; and

Whereas the national income for fiscal year 1953 was approximately \$306 billion, and only seventy-eight one-hundredths of 1 percent of that figure was spent in that fiscal year toward the welfare of our veterans and their dependents; and

Whereas it can clearly be seen that we are now spending a much smaller percentage of our vast national income than our Nation felt our veterans were in need of, and entitled to, 63 years ago, and that the needs of our veterans in 1953 have certainly not lessened, by any stretch of the imagination; and

Whereas in the light of the foregoing, there is no reasonable need for the Federal Government to make, in the name of economy, any reductions in the expenditures covering actual benefits to, or care of, the defenders of our great Nation, and their dependents, as is now being done; and

Whereas there is every reason why the expenditures for veterans' benefits should be increased instead, because of the ever-increasing number and needs of our veteran population, due to the wars (and resulting unstable economic conditions), under which those, opposing such expenditures, are ever increasing, for the most part, their own private economic, social, and political standing, at the very evident expense and sacrifices of their fellow men, women, and children directly participating in, and/or affected by, such conflicts and aftermaths: Now be it hereby

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to carry in all appropriation laws, affecting the Veterans' Administration and all veterans' affairs, provisions explicitly denying the arbitrarily assumed right of any Government official or group to, in any way whatsoever, impound, withdraw, or otherwise reduce such appropriations, or any portions of them, since such actions are now having a detrimental and demoralizing effect upon the lives of many deserving and legally and morally eligible veterans and their dependents; be it further

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be strongly urged and encouraged to increase such appropriations as the need for such increase is shown by the ever-increasing numbers of our veterans and their dependents, always remembering to include the safeguards above-mentioned, thus protecting the veteran and his dependent against being deprived of the benefits otherwise provided for; and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be submitted, for proper and effective disposition, to the North Dakota department headquarters of the American Legion Auxiliary.

Duly approved by the Schafer-Boye-Lange Unit, No. 69, of the American Legion Auxiliary, in legal meeting duly assembled, in the city or village of Flasher, county of Morton, State of North Dakota.

Mrs. HOWARD REINKE,
Unit President.

Attest:

Mrs. EDGAR FINCK,
Secretary.

This 8th day of March 1953.

PROHIBITION OF TRANSPORTATION OF ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE ADVERTISING IN INTERSTATE COMMERCE—PETITION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a petition, together with the signatures and addresses. The signers particularly ask that their names and addresses be printed in full. The petition is in connection with a hearing now being conducted by a subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, dealing with a bill I have introduced, S. 3294, to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverages advertising in interstate commerce.

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

To the Honorable Senator WILLIAM LANGER: We, the undersigned voters of Williams County, are in favor of and urge the passing of the Langer bill, S. 3294, to prohibit the transportation in interstate commerce of alcoholic beverage advertising in newspapers, periodicals, etc., and its broadcasting over radio and TV.

We respectfully ask that you present these petitions to the Senate and have a note made of it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

H. B. Hoare, 811 First Avenue East, Williston; Mrs. Ernest Huston, 812 Fifth Avenue West, Williston; Ernest Huston, 812 Fifth Avenue West, Williston, N. Dak.; Frank L. Snikler, 1005 West 11th Street, Williston; Lyla Beth Smith, 816 Sixth Avenue West; Mrs. George Canfield, 816 Sixth Avenue West; Mrs. Barton Fish, 707 Southwest Street; Mrs. Fern Winter, 522 Eighth Avenue West; Mrs. Stace Long, Epping, N. Dak.; Stace Long, Epping, N. Dak.; Hattie Christman, 813 Eighth Avenue West, N. Dak.; Ella Christman, 813 Eighth Avenue West, N. Dak.; Mary Snyder, 1005 West 11th Street; Mr. and Mrs. B. E. Englbretsen, 1002 Sixth Avenue West; Mrs. George Wingate, Williston, N. Dak.; Mrs. Edith Cartwright, Williston, N. Dak.; Mina Weer, Williston, N. Dak.; Arnold Skoog, Williston, N. Dak.; Mrs. Thomas Yockim, 721 Fifth Avenue West; Virgil Huston, 521 Sixth Avenue West; George W. Canfield, 816 Sixth Avenue West, Williston; Barton L. Fish, Williston, N. Dak.; LeRoy Lutz, 15 Second Avenue East; Mrs. LeRoy Lutz, 15 Second Avenue East; Mrs. Peter Ludwig, 420 Eighth Street West, Williston, N. Dak.

Mrs. Evalyn Scharnberg, Box 194, Williston, N. Dak.; Miss Ruth Westlund, Box 194, Williston, N. Dak.; Mrs. Christine Ike, 310 North Broadway, Williston, N. Dak.; Mrs. Maude Roane, 630 Second Street East, Williston, N. Dak.; Mrs. Lillian Stuen, Bennie Stuen, 1315 First Avenue East, Williston, N. Dak.; Mrs. Ida Flatley, 815 Third Avenue West, Williston, N. Dak.; Mrs. Myrtle Ferrell, 1016 Fourth Street West, Williston, N. Dak.; Mrs. A. Signe Anderson, 723 First Avenue East, Williston, N. Dak.; Marilyn Braaten, 522 Sixth Avenue West, Williston, N. Dak.; Mrs. W. V. Bingsman, 811 West Broadway, Williston, N. Dak.; Mrs. Cornelia Smith, 900 Seventh Avenue West, Williston, N. Dak.; Mayme Bruton, 437 Third Avenue West, Williston, N. Dak.; Miss Jordis Havland, 415 Fourth Street West, Williston, N. Dak.; Miss Mildred Guttormson, 415 Fourth Street West, Williston, N. Dak.; Mrs. Bobbie Schike, Zahl, N. Dak.; Mrs. S. O. Braaten, 522 Sixth Avenue West, Williston, N. Dak.; Art W. Anderson, 723 First Avenue East, Williston, N. Dak.; Mrs. Helen Chanchuck, 1012 Fifth Avenue West, Williston, N. Dak.; Ingvold Hongerholt, 508 West Broadway, Williston, N. Dak.; Clarence Lindteague, 618 Second Avenue East, Williston, N. Dak.; Mrs. James Bervig, 602 East Third Avenue, Williston, N. Dak.; J. A. Bervig, 602 East Third Avenue, Williston, N. Dak.; Mrs. Felix Semran, 712 Fifth Avenue West, Williston, N. Dak.; Mrs. M. W. Anderson, Trenton, N. Dak.; Mrs. Harvey Rodin, 1224 Sixth Street West, Williston, N. Dak.; Mrs. Melvin Shaffer, Route 3, Williston, N. Dak.; John G. Gandy, Trenton, N. Dak.; Mr. M. J. Carter, Williston, N. Dak.; Mrs. Esther V. Will, Trenton, N. Dak.; Mrs. John Anderson, 508 West Broadway, Williston, N. Dak.; Iola I. Bertsch, 317 Fifth Avenue West, Williston, N. Dak.; Mrs. Jack Cripe, 410 Third Avenue East, Williston, N. Dak.; Mrs. William Cripe, 410 Third Avenue East, Williston, N. Dak.; Mrs. Clint Stoner, 419 Sixth Street West, Williston, N. Dak.; Jane Lundgren, 109½ Washington Avenue, Williston, N. Dak.; Signe Halvorson, 318 Third Avenue East, Williston, N. Dak.; Mrs. John Gandy, Trenton, N. Dak.; Mrs. Russell N. Carlson, 414 West Fourth Street, Williston, N. Dak.; Mrs. C. A. Scott, 1510 West Broadway, Williston, N. Dak.; Mrs. C. G. Christenson, Carlton G. Christenson, 116 West Fourth Street, Williston, N. Dak.; John L. Burton, Zahl, N. Dak.; Melvin A. Schaffer, Route 3, Williston, N. Dak.

Dick Prozman, Grand Forks, N. Dak.; David Olson, Fortuna, N. Dak.; John Olson, Fortuna, N. Dak.; Mrs. H. H. White, Williston, N. Dak.; Mrs. Percy Devitt, Williston, N. Dak.; Mrs. Ray Litsey, Williston, N. Dak.; Mr. and Mrs. U. L. Litsey, Route 3, Williston, N. Dak.; Mrs. Richard Hammill, Barreville, Mont.;

Mr. and Mrs. P. M. Zapson, Williston, N. Dak.; Mr. and Mrs. John Zacrep, Williston, N. Dak.; Ann Winter, Williston, N. Dak.; Mr. and Mrs. Clarence Anderson, Buford, N. Dak.; Donald Klebe, Williston, N. Dak.; Mr. and Mrs. Edward G. Olson, Fortuna, N. Dak.; Mr. and Mrs. A. C. Zapara, Williston, N. Dak.; Mr. and Mrs. Clinton Harob, Williston, N. Dak.; Leonard Winter, Williston, N. Dak.; Mr. and Mrs. W. L. Zapore, Williston, N. Dak.

Ray McClure, 107 West Broadway, Williston, N. Dak.; Mr. and Mrs. O. L. Rosenberg, 419 91st West; Mrs. T. J. Kennedy, 1519 Fourth Avenue West; Frank Markham, 1006 Second Avenue West; Faye Sandberg, 310 Hill Court; Mr. and Mrs. D. W. Vader, 116 Seventh Street West, Williston, N. Dak.; Minnie Brown, 614 Fifth Avenue East; Mary Clark, 420 Fifth Street West; Mrs. Nora G. Schuler, 1233 Main City; Mrs. Laura Gordon, 622 Third Avenue West; Minnie Beard, 918 Third Avenue West; Mrs. Myrtle Rieder, 623 Main, Williston, N. Dak.; Mrs. Mac Nelson, Route 1, Williston, N. Dak.; Vera Cartwright, Williston, N. Dak.; Mrs. L. E. Hennigar, 222 68th Street West, Williston, N. Dak.; Mrs. Leea Raymond, 428 Seventh Avenue West, Williston, N. Dak.; Mrs. Fern Leonhardy, 423 Third Avenue West; Williston, N. Dak.; Waldo Leonhardy, 423 Third Avenue West, Williston, N. Dak.; Opal Muir, 222 Sixth Street West, Williston, N. Dak.

Harry Daniel, Kenneth Kuhn, Fonzo Bratcher, Wesley Smith, Mrs. W. E. Helliwell, W. E. Helliwell, Mrs. George Backes, Betty Bratcher, Mrs. Fred Hester, Jon Bratcher, Nell Sorenson, Mrs. Curtis E. Haugsdal, Curtis Haugsdal, Gherton Finn, Fred Hester, Rev. Vernon H. Willard, Mrs. Kenneth Kuhn, Mrs. R. W. De Tienne, Mrs. Vernon Willard, Williston, N. Dak.; Mrs. Ruth Ray, John Chavehuck, Alice Brooten, Colmer Brooten, Buford, N. Dak.; Mike Mortenson, Mrs. Leora Lindtergen, Genora, N. Dak.; Mrs. Ola Bowman, Vernon A. Bowman, Rev. C. G. Scarnberg, J. F. Pepper, Williston, N. Dak.

Carrie Lerruck, Williston, N. Dak.; R. M. Johnson, Williston, N. Dak.; Walter J. Domnese, Williston, N. Dak.; Mrs. Iver Aafedt, Williston, N. Dak.; Iver Aafedt, Williston, N. Dak.; Mrs. Knut Brevik, Williston, N. Dak.; Knut L. Brevik, Williston, N. Dak.; Mrs. A. Salo, Williston, N. Dak.; Albert Salo, Williston, N. Dak.; Mrs. O. N. Saption, Williston, N. Dak.; Knudt Aamodt, Williston, N. Dak.; Mrs. Gerald R. Ziebeck, Williston, N. Dak.; Sanford L. Elkinson, Williston, N. Dak.; Arlen Anderson, Williston, N. Dak.; Mrs. Amalia Rosholt, Williston, N. Dak.; E. C. Arnanson, Williston, N. Dak.; S. N. Lewick, Williston, N. Dak.; Clifton Marple, 619 I Avenue East, Williston, N. Dak.; Mrs. Einar Fetterman, 724 North Maine, Williston, N. Dak.; Dale Lindahl, 721 Third Avenue East, Williston, N. Dak.; Mrs. A. P. Lindahl, 721 Third Avenue East, Williston, N. Dak.; A. C. Lindahl, 721 Third Avenue East, Williston, N. Dak.; Mrs. Elwin F. Anderson, 323 Second Avenue East, Williston, N. Dak.; Elwin F. Anderson, 423 Second Avenue East, Williston, N. Dak.; Eeling E. Smedebaumer, 711 Third Avenue East, Williston, N. Dak.; Oscar D. Lee, Williston, N. Dak.; Theodore Neven, 12 First Avenue West, Williston, N. Dak.; E. W. Gustafson, 22 East Broadway, Williston, N. Dak.; John Monger, 730 Sixth Avenue West, Williston, N. Dak.; Andrew Sashe, 708 13th Avenue West, Williston, N. Dak.; Dina Sashe, 708 13th Avenue West, Williston, N. Dak.; Theo Tuhus, Williston, N. Dak.; Mrs. George Langseth, Williston, N. Dak.; Mrs. Christine Tollefson, Williston, N. Dak.; George Langseth, Williston, N. Dak.; O. B. Haroldson, Williston, N. Dak.; Helen Halborson, Williston, N. Dak.; Mrs. Norman Snider, 1109 East Broadway, Williston, N. Dak.; Mrs. Gust Melland, 1309 West Fourth Street, Williston, N. Dak.; Mrs. Norman Snider, 1109 East Broadway, Williston, N. Dak.; Mrs. Art Mortenson, Route No. 1, Williston, N. Dak.; David Will, Trenton, N. Dak.; Jack Cripe, 410 Third Avenue East; Lyle F. Lundquist, 1102 West

17th Street; Harvey E. Rustman, Municipal Tourist Park; Russell Carlson, 414 West Fourth Street, Williston, N. Dak.; Felix Semran, 712 Fifth Avenue West, Williston, N. Dak.; Harvey Bodin, 1224 Sixth Street West, Williston, N. Dak.; N. W. Anderson, Trenton, N. Dak.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. MUNDT, from the Committee on Appropriations:

H. R. 9203. A bill making appropriations for the legislative branch and the judiciary branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1630).

By Mr. DIRKSEN, from the Committee on Appropriations:

H. R. 9517. A bill making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1634).

By Mr. WATKINS, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments:

S. 2745. A bill to provide for the termination of Federal supervision over the property of the Klamath Tribe of Indians located in the State of Oregon and the individual members thereof, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1631); and

S. 3532. A bill to provide for the partition and distribution of the assets of the Ute Indian Tribe of the Uintah and Ouray Reservation in Utah between the mixed-blood and full-blood members thereof; and for the termination of Federal supervision over the property and persons of the mixed-blood members of said tribe; to provide a development program for the full-blood members of said tribe; and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1632).

By Mr. PURTELL, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

H. R. 7125. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to residues of pesticide chemicals in or on raw agricultural commodities; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1635).

By Mr. BUSH, from the Committee on Public Works:

H. R. 7913. A bill to convey by quitclaim deed certain land to the State of Texas; without amendment (Rept. No. 1641).

By Mr. SALTONSTALL, from the Committee on Armed Services, without amendment:

S. 3284. A bill to provide for the deposit of savings of enlisted members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1636);

S. 3539. A bill to further amend title II of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended, to provide for the computation of reenlistment bonuses for members of the uniformed services (Rept. No. 1640); and

H. R. 6725. A bill to reenact the authority for the appointment of certain officers of the Regular Navy and Marine Corps (Rept. No. 1637).

By Mr. SALTONSTALL, from the Committee on Armed Services, with an amendment:

H. R. 9005. A bill to continue the effectiveness of the act of July 17, 1953 (67 Stat. 177) (Rept. No. 1638).

By Mr. HENDRICKSON, from the Committee on Armed Services, without amendment:

H. R. 9340. A bill to provide for the conveyance of the federally owned lands which are situated within Camp Blanding Military Reservation, Fla., to the Army Board, State of Florida, in order to consolidate ownership and perpetuate the availability of Camp Blanding for military training and use (Rept. No. 1639).

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, June 25, 1954, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bill and joint resolution:

S. 3476. An act to provide for the advancement of Comdr. Donald B. MacMillan, United States Naval Reserve (retired), to the grade of rear admiral on the Naval Reserve retired list; and

S. J. Res. 167. Joint resolution to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, and for other purposes.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. MARTIN:

S. 3664. A bill to provide for research into and development of practical means for the production of alumina, abrasives, refractories, and cements from domestic clays in the interests of national defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BYRD:

S. 3665. A bill for the relief of Dr. Chal Chang Choi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 3666. A bill for the relief of Mary Palanuk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (by request):

S. 3667. A bill for the relief of Elvira Tocchio Anzedel; and

S. 3668. A bill to incorporate the Army and Navy Union of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. AIKEN (for himself, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. THYE, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. SCHOEPEL, Mr. WELKER, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. EASTLAND, and Mr. CLEMENTS):

S. 3669. A bill to amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

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

By Mr. CORDON:

S. 3670. A bill to amend section 1001, paragraph 412, of the Tariff Act of 1930, with respect to hardboard; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. GORE:

S. J. Res. 170. Joint resolution to approve the conveyance by the Tennessee Valley Authority of certain public-use terminal properties now owned by the United States; to the Committee on Public Works.

INCORPORATION OF ARMY AND NAVY UNION

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, by request, I introduced for appropriate reference, a bill providing for the incorporation of the Army and Navy Union of the United States of America. I have received a petition signed by a large number of citizens from a substantial number of States recommending the proposed legislation. My information is that the organization is more than 100 years old.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3668) to incorporate the Army and Navy Union of the United States of America, introduced by Mr. SALTONSTALL, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF SOIL CONSERVATION AND DOMESTIC ALLOTMENT ACT

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPEL], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], and myself members of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act.

The bill is title V of Senate bill 3052, to encourage a stable, prosperous, and free agriculture and for other purposes, which is now before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. It relates to the continuation of the ACP program, and certain other matters relating to that program.

The introduction of this bill should not be taken as an indication that any of the members of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry are pessimistic in regard to getting through a good agricultural bill at this session of Congress. It is simply an anchor to windward, in order to have something to work on quickly in the event the unexpected should happen. It is not to be taken as indicating pessimism on the part of the committee members.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3669) to amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, introduced by Mr. AIKEN (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I wish to confirm the statement made by the Senator from Vermont in introducing his bill. The subject was discussed in the committee yesterday. I would not concede the need for this particular bill. However, if the occasion should arise and if we should need it, I should wish to be a party to the sponsorship of the bill, because I would not want to see placed in jeopardy the phase of our farm program which it covers.

Mr. AIKEN. This bill was introduced so that if something should happen to the main agricultural bill, this bill would be available to act upon almost instantly.

EXTENSION AND IMPROVEMENT OF VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION SERVICES—AMENDMENT

Mr. POTTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 2759) to amend the Vocational Rehabilitation Act so as to promote and assist in the extension and improvement of vocational rehabilitation services, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE APPROPRIATIONS—AMENDMENT

Mr. COOPER submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 9447) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS, 1955—AMENDMENT

Mr. PAYNE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 9517) making appropriations for the government of District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

REVISION OF INTERNAL REVENUE LAWS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I submit for appropriate reference amendments intended to be proposed by me to the bill (H. R. 8300) to revise the internal-revenue laws of the United States. I ask unanimous consent that the amendments, together with a statement by me, be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendments will be received and printed, and will lie on the table; and, without objection, the amendments and statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendments submitted by Mr. BUSH are as follows:

On page 62, line 11, of the committee amendments, after "new stock)", insert "received in a distribution in redemption of stock of a personal holding company (as defined in sec. 542) or."

On page 62, line 19, of the committee amendments, after "property", insert ", or did apply to the distribution of the new stock."

On page 62, line 23, of the committee amendments, strike out the period and insert a comma and the following: "distributions in redemption of all or part of new stock received from a personal holding company to be taken into account, for purposes of the limitation of (a) (1) and (2), only to the extent in excess of the value of all such new stock at the date so received by such shareholder. For purposes of this subsection, stock distributed in redemption of stock of a personal holding company shall be treated as new stock only if it was stock of a corporation held by such company at

the decedent's death, the decedent's proportionate beneficial interest in which as a shareholder of such company had a value at the applicable date for determination of the value of the gross estate of such decedent either more than 35 percent of the value of such gross estate or more than 50 percent of the taxable estate of such decedent."

The statement by Mr. BUSH is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BUSH

Section 303 continues provisions contained in the present code which permit estates owning stock of closely held, or family operating corporations to sell such stock to the operating corporation for the purpose of raising cash to pay estate and inheritance taxes. Such a sale is treated as a capital-gain transaction, rather than as receipt-of-dividend income. Before the adoption of these provisions by Congress in 1950, many estates were forced to sell or liquidate the family corporation in order to meet the requirements of such death taxes, because of the risk that a tax might be imposed upon a sale of stock to the corporation as dividend income.

The present law is, however, inadequate in one respect. It covers only stock which the taxpayer owns at his death and makes no provision for stock received by an estate after the death of the decedent in substitution for the stock held at death, as frequently takes place as a result of a merger, reorganization, liquidation of a family holding company, etc. In such situations the substitute stock received by the estate after death represents merely a different form of ownership of the same business enterprise, and should have the same privilege as the original stock. The tax bill recognizes this and section 303 of the bill adds a provision extending to estates coming into possession of such substitute stock the privilege of redeeming such stock to acquire the funds necessary for payment of the death taxes imposed on the estate.

The amendment contained in the tax bill is, however, defective in one respect. It does not adequately cover the situation where the stock of the family business is held by the decedent at his death in a family holding company. Such arrangements for management of family businesses are quite common for perfectly valid and sound business reasons, and are usually found in small business enterprises. In such a situation, the estate should be permitted to withdraw stock of the family operating corporation from the holding company by means of a partial liquidation, and sell such stock to the operating corporation to secure funds to pay death taxes. This, however, is not provided for under the present law or the new tax bill. No practical distinction exists between the individual who dies owning the stock of his family operating corporation directly in his own name and the individual who happens to die holding the stock of the family operating business in a family holding company. The relief for estates provided by the tax law should be extended equally to the estates of both such individuals.

There are provisions in the tax bill which cover some family holding companies which under the particular State law involved are able to carry out mergers or reorganizations with the family operating corporation. But other family holding companies which are unable to carry out such mergers or reorganizations, simply because of the particular facts involved or the difference in State law, are left outside the scope of the bill's provisions.

The amendment to section 303 of the bill which I am offering eliminates this defect and omission in the bill. It extends the provisions of the bill uniformly to cover all family holding company situations and

eliminates the technical discrimination between estates which exists in the present language of the bill. The bill now recognizes the desirability and necessity for extending the relief of the present law to situations in which an estate by reorganization, recapitalization, etc., secures substitute stock after the decedent's death. The purpose of my amendment is merely to extend this relief uniformly and without technical distinctions or discrimination between taxpayers and their estates.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 9143) to repeal the provisions of section 16 of the Federal Reserve Act which prohibits a Federal Reserve bank from paying out notes of another Federal Reserve bank, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

ADDITIONAL REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. GORE, from the Committee on Public Works, to which was referred the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 170) to approve the conveyance by the Tennessee Valley Authority of certain public-use terminal properties now owned by the United States, reported it favorably, and submitted a report (No. 1642) thereon.

AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL DEFENSE ACT RELATING TO ACTIVE-DUTY STATUS OF ALL PROPERTY AND FISCAL OFFICERS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2217) to amend section 67 of the National Defense Act, as amended, to provide for an active-duty status for all United States property and fiscal officers, which were, on page 3, line 4, strike out "are empowered to" and insert "shall", and on page 3, after "section", insert ", which rules and regulations shall establish a maximum grade, not above colonel, for the United States property and fiscal officer of each State, Territory, and the District of Columbia, which grade shall be commensurate with the duties, functions, and responsibilities of the office."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, on July 6 the Senate passed by unanimous consent Senate bill 2217, which amends the National Defense Act so as to provide an active-duty status for all United States property and fiscal officers with the National Guard of the United States and the Air National Guard of the United States.

This bill was passed by the House on June 22 with an amendment which limits the maximum grade of such property and fiscal officers of the grade of colonel, such grades within the maximum to be specified by rules and regulations prepared jointly by the Secretaries of the Army and the Air Force.

The amendments adopted by the House are agreeable to those interested in this bill; and I move that the Senate agree to the House amendments, without the necessity of a conference.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Massachusetts.

The motion was agreed to.

MARKHAM FERRY PROJECT, OKLAHOMA

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 119) to provide for the construction of the Markham Ferry project on the Grand River in Oklahoma by the Grand River Dam Authority, an instrumentality of the State of Oklahoma, which was, on page 2, line 9, after "pool", insert "and such project shall be designed for an ultimate installed capacity of not less than 72,000 kilowatts: *Provided*, That the initial installation may have a smaller capacity."

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House. I have discussed this subject with the majority leader, the minority leader, and the author of the bill, and they all approve.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Pennsylvania.

The motion was agreed to.

AMVETS MEMORIAL SCHOLARSHIPS

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, 2 weeks ago I, as well as 5 other Members of the Senate, had the pleasure of meeting the teen-agers who had won the nationwide competition for the 4-year \$2,000 memorial scholarships given by the AMVETS National Service Foundation. One of the six winners, Willard Childres II, is from Junction City, in my State; and he visited me during his stay in Washington. I very much enjoyed talking to this extremely intelligent and alert young man.

Willard lost his father during the first month of the fighting in Korea. Sfc. Willard Childres died shortly after going into battle against the Communists in July 1950.

The fathers of the other five youngsters are also dead. Four were killed while in the Armed Forces in World War II, and the fifth died after serving 3 years in the Navy. The families of these teen-agers have made the greatest sacrifice for their country and countrymen.

The AMVETS National Service Foundation, which is the welfare and charitable arm of the American Veterans of World War II and Korea, feels a distinct debt to these families. As a part of its services to veterans, war widows, and war orphans, it awards 6 of the \$2,000 grants each year. Called memorial scholarships, the grants commemorate the sacrifices of the men who fought for this country by helping their children.

The winners of these awards are chosen annually on the basis of, first, their ability to succeed in college, as shown by their secondary-school records and their grades on a national-aptitude examination, and, second, their financial need. All the contestants are the children of either deceased or permanently disabled veterans who served in the Armed Forces after September 16, 1940.

I believe this is a wonderfully practical way of remembering our war dead. I believe it is to the credit of the

AMVETS National Service Foundation and its parent organization, the American Veterans of World War II and Korea, that 18 young men and women who will be in colleges throughout the country next September will have the financial burden of their studies greatly eased by these grants.

But equally wonderful was the action of this year's group of winners. The day after their visit to Congress, they were received by the President at the White House. There they presented Mr. Eisenhower with a pledge that they would dedicate themselves to "the conquest of ignorance, hate, fear and slavery."

I understand that the President was visibly moved by their action. What was to have been a brief meeting, sandwiched in Mr. Eisenhower's busy schedule, became a very friendly 20-minute gathering. When the youngsters were leaving, the President told AMVETS National Commander Henry Mahady that he would interrupt a Cabinet meeting for such a demonstration of faith by American youth.

Mr. President, I should like to include that pledge with my remarks. It is truly an inspiring sign of devotion to the ideals of our Nation. So I ask unanimous consent that the pledge be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

Mr. President, in recognition of the limitless opportunities opening before us, because of our inherited freedoms to think and choose; and aware that those liberties have survived only behind the valiant shield of sacrifice wrought by men such as our fathers; we pledge you that we will strive, through our education to further the conquest of ignorance, hate, fear and slavery; and we will endeavor to uphold our priceless heritage with high courage, determination and devotion.

To this, the great American ideal for which our fathers served, we dedicate ourselves.

AMVETS MEMORIAL SCHOLARSHIP
WINNERS, 1954,
HUGH K. BERKELEY.
WILLARD CHILDRES II.
JOHN D. EBERHARDT.
MARY H. FORDYCE.
VICTORIA HAYWARD.
JUDITH MAXWELL.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. FERGUSON. 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. 8873) making appropriations for the Department of Defense and related independent agency for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of June 23, 1954, pp. 8885-8886, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. What did the conferees do with the amendment regarding the awarding of contracts by competitive bidding?

Mr. FERGUSON. I read from the statement of the managers on the part of the House:

Amendment No. 34: Eliminates provision of the Senate concerning the basis for awarding contracts. The managers are agreed that contracts for procurement in the Department of Defense should not be used for the purpose of relieving economic dislocations as stated in section 733 of the bill. The managers feel that more specific language in the appropriation act may be confusing or impractical, particularly in view of Public Law 413 of the 80th Congress. The managers expect the Department of Defense to comply with basic law. If any changes are to be made they should be made by amendment to Public Law 413.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Will the Senator be kind enough to explain what that means in practical operation? Will it bring about any change in the existing practice with regard to awarding contracts? I refer to the manner in which contracts have been awarded during the past few months.

Mr. FERGUSON. The 80th Congress enacted a law in relation to bids and the letting of contracts. We asked the Department to live up to that law. Let me read again from the statement of the managers on the part of the House:

The managers are agreed that contracts for procurement in the Department of Defense should not be used for the purpose of relieving economic dislocations as stated in section 733 of the bill.

There is also a section in the bill which provides that there shall be no price differential in such cases. It reads as follows:

Provided further, That no funds herein appropriated shall be used for the payment of a price differential on contracts hereafter made for the purpose of relieving economic dislocations.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Under the language of the conference bill would the Secretary of Defense be within the law if he were to award a contract in the manner in which the contract was awarded in the case of the Quincy shipyard? The contract was awarded to the Quincy shipyard on a bid which was about \$8 million higher than the bid of the Bath shipyard. Would a repetition of such an occurrence be permitted under the language of the bill?

Mr. FERGUSON. I have not section 413 of the basic law before me, and I cannot tell the Senator. I assume that that contract complied with the law.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I understood the Senator to say that the conferees struck out the amendment on the basis that existing law is adequate to prevent such a situation. I should like to ask the opinion of the Senator from Michigan. Does the law prohibit the awarding of a contract under such circumstances as

have been described? As I have indicated, the contract was awarded to the Quincy shipyard at a price of \$6 million to \$8 million higher than the lowest responsible bid.

Mr. FERGUSON. I cannot assume that the conference committee struck out the Senate amendment with the idea that the specific contract to which the Senator refers was covered by the law, and would be prohibited. We tried to place language in the statement of the managers on the part of the House which would make clear our intention. By the way, the House conferees are the only ones who submit a statement to accompany a conference report. However, the statement of the managers on the part of the House expressed also the view of the Senate conferees. The statement is:

The managers—

Meaning the conferees from both Houses—

are agreed that contracts for procurement in the Department of Defense should not be used for the purpose of relieving economic dislocations as stated in section 733 of the bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Assuming that the conference report is approved, and the bill is signed by the President, will the Secretary of Defense have authority to do what he did about 4 months ago?

Mr. FERGUSON. I cannot answer that question.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I think the question should be answered.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. In my opinion, there are two problems involved. The first is whether the action is contrary to law. The second is whether it involves a matter of sound public policy. The Senator from Michigan, who was chairman of the conference committee, I believe, has made it very clear that the language in the statement of the managers on the part of the House expresses the views of the conferees on the part of the Senate as well as the House conferees. However, I point out that the bill itself, as the Senator knows, provides that contracts may not be awarded on a differential basis for the purpose of relieving economic distress. In other words, this is not a relief-of-distress bill. This is a national-defense bill.

When we come to the next question which the Senator from Delaware raises, as to whether or not a contract could be awarded to a shipyard in the manner in which the contract was awarded in the specific example which the Senator cites, I think we must keep in mind that either shipbuilding facilities are important to the national defense or they are not. If they are important to the national defense it may well be that contracts will have to be awarded to certain areas of the country, rather than on a strictly low-bid basis. Otherwise, shipyards there might be closed down, and there might be a concentration of shipyard facilities in one area, and if the facilities in that area were destroyed by an atomic attack the country would be left with no shipyard facilities whatever.

Personally, I feel that, as a matter of public policy, the Defense Department should certainly scrutinize any such proposals with great care, and should not make awards except on the basis of the lowest responsible bid, unless the urgent defense needs of the country require different action. If we tie the hands of the Secretary of Defense so that he cannot make any contracts except on the basis of the lowest bid, we may destroy shipyard facilities in other sections of the country—on the Atlantic coast, the gulf, and the Pacific coast. In time of war we would not have the facilities which everyone testifies are necessary if we are to maintain ship-repair facilities for the Navy and for the merchant marine.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I appreciate what the Senator from California has said. Certainly, we are not trying unduly to tie the hands of the Secretary of Defense. I think we should make clear what we wish to do. There is no need of our criticizing the Secretary of Defense for awarding a contract at a cost of \$8 million to \$10 million higher than the lowest responsible bid if that is what we intend to have him do under the law. If we do not intend it, we should correct the law.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think the Senator is entirely correct in saying that at least the Congress ought to be advised, and if it is necessary to change the law, the basic law should be changed. But, as the Senator from Michigan has pointed out, we have a basic procurement act, which was enacted in the 80th Congress. That act lays down the basis upon which the armed services must make their procurements.

I would suggest to the Senator from Delaware that perhaps the proper procedure would be for him to examine that law and the list of exceptions written into the law. Perhaps those exceptions should be narrowed so that they will not be so broad as they are today.

The managers on the part of the House, despite the fact that the Senate conferees pointed out how strong the feeling was in the Senate on this subject, felt that the changes should be made by the proper legislative committee in the form of a separate bill dealing with the subject, instead of in an appropriation bill.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS. For the past 2 years we have been trying to make some fundamental amendments to that law, under which the contract to which I have referred was let. It was not a case of merely trying to keep the establishment in operation, although there was some argument along that line, too, but the Quincy yard did not meet the low bid. The contract was awarded to the bidder who had made a bid \$8 million or \$9 million higher than the second lowest responsible bidder.

To offset criticism later, the construction of 2 or 3 additional destroyers was awarded to the former lower bidder at a price which was practically equal to the previous high bid.

Therefore, in awarding contracts, I believe we are running around in circles. It is our responsibility to correct the situation.

If we are to give consideration only to unemployment and to keeping factories in operation, let us say so. However, I cannot help remember the statement made by the Secretary of Defense, for whom I have great respect, that he is giving no consideration to the problem which the Senator from California referred to, namely, of keeping facilities in operation.

As an example, when he awarded the construction of tanks to one factory, General Motors in Detroit, which is building all the tanks being produced in the country, he did so because General Motors was the lowest bidder. He said, "From now on we are going to disregard the other factors."

However, a few weeks later we found that he had forgotten all about his statement in regard to the construction of tanks, and decided that our policy would be to keep factories operating because it is necessary to do so in order to relieve unemployment.

I want to know what we are going to do. If we are going to give consideration to the idea of keeping plants in operation and to unemployment in certain areas, even though it might cost more money, let us do it. Then each of us, as a representative of our State, will be boasting of unemployment and of our idle factories instead of boasting of the fact that we have no unemployment and no idle factories, and then perhaps we will exert a little pressure to get contracts for our areas. That was not intended under the bill. I think it is wrong.

Mr. FERGUSON. It is not the purpose of the bill I assure the Senator. It is wrong. We say so in no uncertain terms. We say that the differential in prices shall not be used for the purpose of relieving economic conditions, and then we say in the report that it shall not be used under any circumstances for that purpose.

However, there is a great difference, as the Senator from Michigan sees this situation, between a tank plant and a naval shipbuilding facility. I put in the RECORD a statement which I should like to repeat:

The use of negotiation is essential in certain procurements of naval vessels, particularly large combatant ships. This is true not only because of the unique and complex nature of shipbuilding, which often does not lend itself to the inflexible procedures of formal advertising, but also because of the current distressed condition of the shipbuilding industry. This industry, because of a dearth of commercial work, is largely dependent on the Navy's annual construction programs. The concentration of Navy work in a few yards or in a single geographical area must, therefore, be avoided. The national security requires a reasonably broad mobilization base of operating shipyards.

It may be said that the use of existing negotiation authority permits the equitable distribution of procurement contracts among the maximum number of suppliers and the avoidance of dangerous overconcentration; it promotes the integration of current procurement with our industrial mobilization which is a vital requirement of our mobilization readiness.

Mr. President, that is the way the committee feels about the present law.

I said I could not answer specifically the question the Senator from Delaware asked me as to whether the contract for a certain number of destroyers which had been let could now be let under the present law. I do not have all the facts before me. I do not know what the facts were in that case, and therefore I am not willing on the floor of the Senate to interpret the law.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Is there anything in the conference report which would change the existing law whereby it would be possible to prevent such a situation from arising?

Mr. FERGUSON. I would say not, except if there is anything in the existing act which permits the awarding of contracts in order to relieve economic distress, I would say that the Secretary of Defense and the Defense Department would be duty bound, though not legally bound, to respect the language in this report, that the letting of contracts should not be for the purpose of relieving economic distress.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, if I understand the Senator's reply correctly, the conferees were unanimous in their agreement that it should not be done, and they were also unanimous in their agreement that they did not want to have passed a law which would prevent someone from doing it.

Mr. FERGUSON. If the Senator means that a law should be passed which would express in words to the Defense Department, "You must let every contract on an advertised bid," and that Congress should enact a defense appropriation bill of more than \$40 billion for the procurement on the basis of bids of many articles which have never been made before, I will say that we did not feel, as conferees on the defense appropriation bill, that we could write language into the bill that would either put the Defense Department in a straitjacket or perhaps create a situation as wide open as a barn door.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do not think that we should confuse the issue. There was no question about putting the Defense Department in a straitjacket. There was nothing contained in the amendment which provided that the Department had to award the construction only on competitive bids. It said only "insofar as practicable." The Secretary of Defense was allowed to determine what was practicable. It was stated many times the application was only to those cases as to which it had been previously determined that it was practicable to solicit competitive bids, but once the competitive bids were on the desk of the Secretary of Defense, and the bids were from responsible bidders—he should award the contract to the lowest bidder.

In the case which I described the Secretary of Defense advertised for bids. He solicited the bids. He determined in advance that the contract was to be awarded on a competitive bid basis. He had the lowest bid, which was \$8 million lower than the second highest bid, but he awarded the contract to the highest

bidder. I did not tell him that it was practicable in that case to solicit bids. He determined that himself. Once having made that determination, he had the responsibility to recognize the lowest bidder. If not, why solicit bids in the first place?

I am not going to oppose the conference report, because I know we must accept it. However, I want to register my protest against the practice which has been pursued. Unless it is stopped it will permit the Secretary of Defense to invite openly a great deal of political pressure from all Members of Congress, who will urge him to recognize the problems of their own immediate areas with respect to idle plants and unemployment. I believe he should lay down the rules of the game as he wishes to play it, and after he once lays down the rules he should be expected to apply them equally in all the 48 States.

Mr. FERGUSON. We tried to lay down a rule in no uncertain language that contracts should not be let for the purpose of relieving economic conditions. There is a reason for that. If we are going to relieve a situation by taking a contract away from a company in an area where there is full employment, or which does not have 7 percent unemployment, the question should be surveyed whether by preventing the award of a contract to that area unemployment might result there, when we were trying to relieve unemployment in another place.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I wish to give assurances to the Senator from Delaware that the conferees devoted a considerable amount of time to this subject in the conference. The Senator from Michigan and other Senate conferees, including the Senator from California, who was a conferee, and, as the Senator from Delaware knows, participated in some of the debate on the floor, pointed out, as I recall, the discussion which had taken place in the Senate, in which the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], I think, mentioned the particular case of a parachute contract which had been taken from a firm in Arizona which had had experience, and was transferred to a so-called distress area in the New England States, which in turn had the work done by a New York manufacturer who had not had any experience. In this instance, actual distress was caused in the Arizona area. So we alerted the full conference and gave to the House Members the background and very strong feeling of practically the entire Senate on this question.

I am convinced that both as a result of the discussion which took place a year ago on the floor of the Senate and the discussion and the criticisms raised on the floor this year regarding certain of these activities, the Defense Department and the executive branch of the Government are going to be very alert and alive to this problem, as well they may, and I think they should be in position to justify and to account to the Congress for any instance in which they depart from the practice of competitive bidding.

As the Senator from Delaware knows, in certain fields, involving the production of secret, highly classified weapons, we cannot, without disclosing facts to the enemy, send out a broadside of specifications. As the Senator knows, for certain new types of planes, concerning which there is no source of information as to what the costs may be, we cannot let contracts by competitive bidding. I am sure the Senator indicated on the floor he fully understood that in certain fields competitive bidding would not be practicable.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I pointed out on the floor exactly what the Senator from California has said, and that is the reason why the language "insofar as practicable" was inserted. The legislative background was very clear. We recognized those cases, but I felt, as I said before, that the Secretary of Defense should lay down a set of rules, which I do not think has been done in the past, and that set of rules should be applied across the board in all cases when it is practicable to solicit bids. He should not recognize unemployment in one area as a basic consideration. The Senator mentioned a case in Arizona. I know of similar cases. There seems to be a failure to realize that when a contract is awarded to a plant in an area of unemployment the same kind of condition may be created in the area which failed to obtain the contract. The bill is not a relief bill, and I think it should be impressed upon the Secretary of Defense that he is not running a relief organization, but is spending money to build up the defenses of the country. If he wants to run a relief organization, he should transfer his operations elsewhere.

Mr. FERGUSON. No one in the Defense Department has had in mind the operation of a relief agency under the defense program. I think that is clearly shown by the evidence.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I am very sorry, always, and it very seldom happens, when I have to disagree with the senior Senator from Delaware. He knows that I am nearly always in sympathy with him, and I think it is somewhat tragic to have to disagree with him.

There is in my mind not merely the question of placing orders in areas where unemployment has been growing and is high, but there is also the question of authorizing a Defense Department policy about which I have long been dubious, namely, the policy of concentrating orders for defense material in one company. It has not been the plan of the Defense Department management to have available secondary sources. I think that is not a good policy. The best example of that which we have seen is the concentration of the purchase of tanks in the General Motors Corp. The orders, under the principle enunciated by the Senator from Delaware, went to the General Motors Corp. because it was the lowest bidder. I still feel that in spite of that fact a part of those orders should have gone to another source of supply, and, as I see it, the Senator's

amendment would have frozen a policy with which I am not in agreement.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield further?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I should like to say to the Senator from Vermont that he is not in disagreement with me as much as he thinks he is. At the time the contracts were solicited and in the discussion of the contracts with the tank plant, I raised the same question with the Secretary of Defense as the Senator from Vermont now raises, whether he felt there should be given any consideration to the danger of putting all the production under one roof. I received a rather lengthy reply stating that no consideration was given to that fact, that he did not consider it a danger, and that, as Secretary of Defense, he was going to recognize only the sound business principle of awarding contracts to the most responsible bidder, regardless of the geographic location. It was only after that persuasive letter which I received from him that I said, "Let us adopt that principle in all the 48 States."

I was surprised a few weeks after receiving that letter to learn that the Secretary of Defense had apparently forgotten it and had awarded a contract \$8 million higher than that of the lowest bidder. I am only trying to find out what is the rule of the Secretary of Defense. I agree fully with the Senator from Vermont that consideration should be given to the danger of concentrating all our production in one area, whether it be tanks, ships, or whatever it may be. But let us make it a factor and recognize it as such. Let us not in one case say we are going to put all the production in one plant, and then tomorrow morning lay down a different set of rules on a case arising in another State. I want only one set of rules adopted.

Whether the Department awards contracts strictly only to the lowest bidders, or whether consideration be given to other factors, which I might frankly admit should be considered, is immaterial. But if other factors are to be considered, let us recognize the situation and consider them. I am only stating sound business principles, which were laid down by the great Secretary of Defense himself, when he said that the lowest responsible bidder would always get recognition so long as he was the Secretary of Defense.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield, so that I may make a few brief remarks?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. FLANDERS. I am addressing myself still to the distinguished senior Senator from Delaware. It seems to me that he and the Secretary of Defense are in complete agreement so far as the Secretary of Defense adheres to and follows his announced principles.

It has come to my attention that, here and there, a number of cases have arisen which probably never came to the attention of the Secretary of Defense, he being a little too high placed, in which those principles have not been followed. In such cases, the remedy, it seems to

me, lies not in an amendment of the nature proposed by the Senator from Delaware, but lies in the referring of such cases to the Committee on Armed Services, if taking them up with the Department of Defense turns out to be ineffective.

I am certain that the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, who was seated here a moment ago, but who, I presume, probably is at lunch now, would concede that complaints of this sort were worthy of investigation by his committee.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I simply wish to say that I think the fact should be stressed at this point that the Secretary of Defense, when he was writing to the Senator from Delaware, had in mind a particular contract. It is true—and I have no complaint about it—that the Senator from Delaware was anxious to know what the program was and what the rules and regulations were. A contract for a plant in Delaware was being lost; but, as I said on the floor before, the facilities which had been constructed were for the building of tanks.

It must be said, in fairness to the Secretary of Defense, that paragraph (16) of section 2 (c) of the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947, Public Law 413 of the 80th Congress, was the provision under which, as I understand, the Department of the Navy has advised that the shipbuilding contract about which we have been speaking was let. The provision is as follows:

(16) The agency head determines that it is in the interest of the national defense that any plant, mine, or facility or any producer, manufacturer, or other supplier be made or kept available for furnishing supplies or services in the event of a national emergency, or that the interest either of industrial mobilization in case of such an emergency, or of the national defense in maintaining active engineering, research, and development are otherwise subserved.

Mr. President, that is the explanation for the letting of the contract.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. The distinguished Senator from Delaware said that one contract was let which was \$8 million higher than the lowest bid. It seems as though that was a large sum. I wish to commend the Senator from Delaware for his interest in such a condition. When one bid is \$8 million larger than the lowest bid, certainly that is a large sum.

Mr. FERGUSON. I share that view. I am not here arguing in favor of that contract; I am merely stating why the Navy said the contract was let.

Mr. LANGER. Why was it let? Did the Secretary say, may I ask?

Mr. FERGUSON. The shipyard concerned was one of the mobilization base shipyards. Because shipyards now have very little, if any, civilian work, and since an attempt is being made to keep shipyards in operation, which involves the employment of engineers, skilled workers, and other specialized personnel, it was felt desirable to keep shipyards operating on military contracts, which

is practically the only shipbuilding work available at present. The Navy Department says that was the reason.

The Senator says that another contract for destroyers has been let recently to a contractor in Maine, where there is a shipyard.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That statement is correct. But the point is that all this has happened in the last 3 or 4 months. If the Navy intended to award the contract to the Maine shipyard, and probably it should have done so, why was the contract not awarded in the beginning, when the destroyers could have been procured at \$8 million less expense?

Mr. FERGUSON. I cannot answer that question.

Mr. WILLIAMS. A situation was cited on the floor in connection with which it was said that the Navy intended to award a contract for a certain type of ship in a certain geographic area, where there was only one bidder who could possibly have bid. If the Navy intends to award a contract in a geographic area where there is only one bidder, and then solicits a bid from that person, the contractor knows that he will get the contract, regardless of the amount he bids.

I do not say that some consideration should not be given to geographic areas. I think the Senator from Vermont raised an excellent point, and I agree with him.

The junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR] and I, together with the rest of the congressional delegation from our State, raised the question; but when the Secretary of Defense returned, he said that was not a part of the policy and would not be recognized. As a congressional delegation, we supported him in his decision.

Later, we were much surprised to learn of the complete reversal of that policy in view of the new award of a contract \$8 million higher than the lowest bid.

There is no possible way in which anyone can examine the awards of those two contracts and reconcile the reasoning behind them. Either one is wrong, or the other is wrong.

All I am trying to say is, Let us ascertain what the rules of game are; and then apply those rules throughout the 48 States. We do not wish to take up one rule book when the situation applies to Delaware, Arizona, or some other State; and then to pick up another rule book when the situation is, perhaps, more to the advantage of someone who wishes to change the rules. I want to know how many rule books we have, and what the rules are.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Is there any limitation in the contracts as to the amount of profits?

Mr. FERGUSON. No; the contracts are renegotiated.

Mr. LANGER. They are renegotiated?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; later. The Renegotiation Act is still in effect.

Mr. President, I move that the Senate agree to the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. POTTER in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I offered an amendment to the conference report which was just agreed to. The amendment was not agreed to by the conference committee. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, following the acceptance of the conference report, a statement with respect to the amendment.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD

I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] in taking the amendment for proper treatment of foreign currency collections by military agencies to the conference on the defense appropriation bill.

I am sorry the Senate conferees had to give in on it, but I suppose I can understand what they encountered in the conference, and I am not going to press the question or the issue at this time.

But these three observations should be made:

1. Restoration of the House language in this bill does not reduce appropriations, and the expenditure of just as much money is authorized under the language as would have been spent under the budget estimates.

2. Adoption of the House language requires reduction in the Treasury's estimate of receipts in the coming year by \$35 million.

3. The adoption of the House language authorizing direct expenditure of foreign currencies by military agencies collecting them, instead of running through the Treasury as receipts, and appropriating them out under the orderly procedure is diametrically contrary to public policy adopted by both the present administration and the preceding one; it is contrary to efforts of both the Secretary and the Director of the Budget for sound fiscal procedure.

I want to serve notice at this time that I shall oppose any further recurrence of this sort of fiscal bypass by the military, and I shall call upon the President, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Director of the Budget to back me up in the defense of their own policies.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. POTTER in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 8873, which was read, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.,
June 24, 1954.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 6 and 9 to the bill (H. R. 3873) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of Defense and related independent agency for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes", and concur therein;

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: After the word "Amounts" in line 2 of said amendment insert ", not exceeding \$100,000,000."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert: "Provided, That not to exceed \$18,000,000 may be

transferred to this appropriation from the appropriation 'Procurement and Production, Army' for National Guard armory and non-armory construction in accordance with the act of September 11, 1950, when such transfers are determined by the Secretary of Defense to be in the national interest: *Provided further*, That such portion of the amount so transferred as may be applied to the construction of buildings and facilities other than armories shall be without regard to the 75 per centum restriction on contributions contained in section 4 (d) of the act of September 11, 1950."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: Before the period at the end of said amendment insert: ", except that the total unobligated portions of such balances so transferred and merged shall not exceed \$8,703,100."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert: "Provided, That in addition, the Secretary of the Air Force may transfer not to exceed \$5,000,000 to this appropriation from any appropriation available to the Department of the Air Force which is limited for obligation to fiscal year 1955."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert: "That in addition, the Secretary of the Air Force may transfer not to exceed \$9 million to this appropriation from any appropriation available to the Department of the Air Force which is limited for obligation to fiscal year 1955: *Provided further*."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert: "Provided further, That no funds available to agencies of the Department of Defense shall be used for the operation, acquisition, or construction of new facilities or equipment for new facilities in the continental limits of the United States for metal scrap baling or shearing or for melting or sweating aluminum scrap unless the Secretary of Defense or an Assistant Secretary of Defense designated by him determines, with respect to each facility involved, that the operation of such facility is in the national interest."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"Sec. 731½. Those appropriations or funds available to the Department of Defense or any agency thereof which would otherwise lapse for expenditure purposes on June 30, 1954, and designated by the Secretary of Defense not later than July 31, 1954, shall remain available until June 30, 1955, to such department or agency solely for expenditure for the liquidation of obligations legally incurred against such appropriation during the period for which such appropriation was legally available for obligation: *Provided*, That the Department of Defense shall make a review of all contracts entered into under such appropriations or funds and outstanding on June 30, 1954, and report to the Appropriations Committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives by January 31, 1955 (a) the total value of contracts canceled, (b) the total value of contracts adjusted and the resultant savings therefrom, and (c) the total value of contracts continued on the basis of determined need: *Provided further*, That any such contract shall be terminated not later than June 30, 1955, unless the Secretary of the Department

concerned certifies prior to January 1, 1955, that continuation is necessary for reasons of economy or in the national interest."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: Change the section number from "739" to "738."

Mr. FERGUSON. I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 5, 13, 18, 19, 22, 28, and 35. The motion was agreed to.

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE APPROPRIATIONS, 1955

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9447) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I call up an amendment which I have proposed to H. R. 9447.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is advised that his amendment will not be in order until after the committee amendments have been acted upon.

PUBLIC HOUSING PROGRAMS

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a letter which I, as chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, have written to the Honorable Albert M. Cole, Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, requesting certain information with respect to the public housing programs.

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

JUNE 18, 1954.

HON. ALBERT M. COLE,
Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. COLE: As chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, and acting under authority of section 601 of the Revenue Act of 1941, I am requesting at your earliest convenience the following information with respect to the Public Housing Act program:

1. The total number of housing units authorized in basic legislation since the inception of the program.
2. The total number of units constructed since the inception of the program.
3. The number of units authorized but not yet constructed.
4. The number of vacant units by the latest available report.
5. The total amount of lending authority for the program; the total amount loaned, the total outstanding as of the latest available report, total interest paid to Treasury, and the total amount of interest paid to PHA.
6. The total of all contributions paid since the inception of the program.
7. The total of administrative expenses since the inception of the program.
8. A statement as to the extent that the public-housing program is relative, competitive, or independent with respect to any one or more FHA programs, the slum-clearance program, and the college-housing program, and all other programs under HHFA.
9. A statement with respect to the autonomy in which local housing operates.

10. A statement as to the extent of supervision and audit exercised by PHA over housing projects and local authorities.

Very truly yours,

HARRY F. BYRD,
Chairman.

FUNDS RECEIVED FROM GERMANY

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a letter dated June 22, 1954, addressed to me by Lyle

S. Garlock, Acting Assistant Secretary of Defense, together with a statement of funds received from Germany.

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

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D. C., June 22, 1954.

HON. HARRY F. BYRD,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR BYRD: Attached for your information is the latest quarterly report on

deutschemark support received by agencies of the Department of Defense from the Federal Republic of Germany and the Berlin Magistrat. Obligations and expenditures are shown in dollar equivalents for the first 3 quarters of fiscal year 1954, and are arranged by comparable United States appropriation accounts.

Sincerely yours,

LYLE S. GARLOCK,
Acting Assistant Secretary of
Defense (Comptroller).

Department of Defense summary report on standard form 133 basis of the dollar equivalent of deutschemark support received from the Federal Republic of Germany and the Berlin Magistrat for occupation costs and mandatory expenditures based on allocations to the Department of Defense by the High Commissioner for Germany, fiscal year 1954, through Mar. 31, 1954

SECTION I—OBLIGATIONAL STATUS

Military department and comparable United States appropriation account	Total amount available for obligation	Obligations				Unobligated balance Mar. 31, 1954	Unpaid obligations Mar. 31, 1954
		1st quarter	2d quarter	3d quarter	Cumulative		
Department of Defense:							
Federal Republic of Germany	756,035,166	79,971,914	274,519,691	79,400,753	433,892,358	322,142,808	285,578,914
Berlin Magistrat	14,286,821		6,350,142	7,297,390	13,647,532	639,289	8,187,956
Total, Department of Defense	770,321,987	79,971,914	280,869,833	86,698,143	447,539,890	322,782,097	293,766,870
Department of the Army:							
Federal Republic of Germany:							
Military personnel, Army	9,303,000	310,978	2,435,980	4,170,242	6,917,200	2,385,800	4,897,665
Maintenance and operation, Army	320,482,000	64,591,326	100,320,393	54,476,497	219,388,216	101,093,784	92,773,405
Procurement and production	10,369,000		369,048	224,725	593,773	9,775,227	593,773
Military construction, Army	247,086,000	271,305	100,329,337	10,081,510	110,682,152	136,403,848	104,562,303
Reserve personnel requirements, Army	2,000		841	92	933	1,067	911
Reserve for settlement of claims							
Claims, Department of the Army	2,005,000		1,085,232	465,772	1,551,004	453,996	302,788
Preparation for sale or salvage of military property	15,000	2,491	3,087	3,732	9,310	5,690	2,381
Undistributed							
Subtotal, Federal Republic of Germany	589,262,000	65,176,100	204,543,918	69,422,570	339,142,588	250,119,412	203,133,226
Berlin Magistrat:							
Military personnel, Army	45,200		28,527	13,729	42,256	2,944	9,173
Maintenance and operation, Army	8,317,447		4,985,803	3,331,133	8,316,936	511	3,335,500
Military construction, Army	4,523,809		945,212	3,484,542	4,429,754	94,055	4,418,913
Reserve for settlement of claims							
Claims, Department of the Army	140,409		2,835	9,070	11,905	128,504	8,674
Subtotal, Department of the Army	13,026,865		5,962,377	6,838,474	12,800,851	226,014	7,772,260
Total, Department of the Army	602,288,865	65,176,100	210,506,295	76,261,044	351,943,439	250,345,426	210,905,486
Department of the Navy:							
Federal Republic of Germany:							
Ships and facilities, Navy	6,189,192	614,797	2,420,708	1,051,495	4,087,000	2,102,192	1,883,444
Navy industrial fund	859,000	212,723	224,132	162,237	599,092	259,908	79,780
Total, Department of the Navy	7,048,192	827,520	2,644,840	1,213,732	4,686,092	2,362,100	1,963,224
Department of the Air Force:							
Federal Republic of Germany:							
Major procurement other than aircraft	8,463,018		4,143,025	-63,590	4,079,435	4,383,583	3,761,471
Acquisition and construction of real property	60,568,200	2,640,058	30,449,438	28,102	33,117,598	27,450,602	45,902,049
Maintenance and operation	88,962,000	11,156,361	32,418,898	8,839,105	52,414,364	36,547,636	30,558,769
Military personnel requirements	1,166,756	115,816	190,834	124,842	431,492	735,264	219,278
Claims	150,000	56,059	128,738	-164,008	20,789	129,211	40,897
Contingencies	415,000					415,000	
Subtotal, Federal Republic of Germany	159,724,974	13,968,294	67,330,933	8,764,451	60,663,678	69,661,296	80,482,464
Berlin Magistrat:							
Acquisition and construction of real property	212,370			207,771	207,771	4,599	207,771
Maintenance and operation	1,047,586		387,765	251,145	638,910	408,676	207,925
Subtotal, Berlin Magistrat	1,259,956		387,765	458,916	846,681	413,275	415,696
Total, Department of the Air Force	160,984,930	13,968,294	67,718,698	9,223,367	90,910,359	70,074,571	80,898,160

SECTION II—OBLIGATIONAL STATUS

Military Department and comparable United States appropriation account	Total amount available for expenditure	Expenditures				Unexpended balance, Mar. 31, 1954
		1st quarter	2d quarter	3d quarter	Cumulative	
Department of Defense:						
Federal Republic of Germany	835,089,759	37,935,191	69,916,676	119,622,988	227,474,855	607,614,904
Berlin Magistrat	14,391,197		3,346,678	2,217,274	5,563,952	8,827,245
Total, Department of Defense	849,480,956	37,935,191	73,263,354	121,840,262	233,038,807	616,442,149
Department of the Army:						
Federal Republic of Germany:						
Military Personnel, Army	10,449,397	117,068	688,241	2,360,623	3,165,932	7,283,465
Maintenance and Operation, Army	354,512,953	30,294,675	51,069,204	79,341,885	160,645,764	193,807,189
Procurement and production	10,369,000					10,369,000
Military construction, Army	261,821,340		1,549,864	19,305,325	20,855,189	240,966,151
Reserve personnel requirements, Army	2,000				18	1,975
Reserve for settlement of claims						
Claims, Department of the Army	2,340,936		953,231	630,921	1,584,182	750,734
Preparation for sale or salvage of military property	16,364	1,526	3,040	3,727	8,293	8,071
Subtotal, Federal Republic of Germany	639,511,990	30,413,265	54,203,584	101,642,499	186,259,352	453,232,638

Department of Defense summary report on standard form 133 basis of the dollar equivalent of deutschemark support received from the Federal Republic of Germany and the Berlin Magistrat for occupation costs and mandatory expenditures based on allocations to the Department of Defense by the High Commissioner for Germany, fiscal year 1954, through 31 Mar. 1954—Continued

SECTION II—OBLIGATIONAL STATUS

Military department and comparable United States appropriation account	Total amount available for expenditure	Expenditures				Unexpended balance, Mar. 31, 1954
		1st quarter	2d quarter	3d quarter	Cumulative	
Department of the Army—Continued						
Berlin Magistrat:						
Military personnel, Army.....	45,200		22,620	10,463	33,083	12,117
Maintenance and operation, Army.....	8,317,447		3,037,537	1,943,899	4,981,436	3,336,011
Military construction, Army.....	4,523,809		5,913	4,928	10,841	4,512,968
Reserve for settlement of claims.....						
Claims, Department of the Army.....	140,409		2,572	659	3,231	137,178
Subtotal, Berlin Magistrat.....	13,026,865		3,068,642	1,959,949	5,028,591	7,998,274
Total, Department of the Army.....	652,538,855	30,413,269	57,272,226	103,602,448	191,287,943	461,250,912
Department of the Navy:						
Federal Republic of Germany:						
Ships and facilities, Navy.....	6,189,192	281,246	1,056,239	866,071	2,203,556	3,985,636
Navy industrial fund.....	859,000	132,471	172,549	214,292	519,312	339,688
Total, Department of the Navy.....	7,048,192	413,717	1,228,788	1,080,363	2,722,868	4,325,324
Department of the Air Force:						
Federal Republic of Germany:						
Major procurement other than aircraft.....	8,463,018		51,220	266,744	317,964	8,145,054
Acquisition and construction of real property.....	76,677,613	567,062	1,385,220	1,372,679	3,324,961	73,352,651
Maintenance and operation.....	101,616,282	6,454,789	12,824,017	15,337,889	34,616,695	66,999,587
Military personnel requirements.....	1,166,767	30,295	95,109	86,822	212,226	954,542
Claims.....	190,887	56,059	128,738	-164,008	20,789	170,108
Contingencies.....	415,000					415,000
Subtotal, Federal Republic of Germany.....	188,529,577	7,108,205	14,484,304	16,900,126	38,492,635	150,036,942
Berlin Magistrat:						
Acquisition and construction of real property.....	212,370					212,370
Maintenance and operation.....	1,151,962		278,036	257,325	535,361	616,601
Subtotal, Berlin Magistrat.....	1,364,332		278,036	257,325	535,361	828,971
Total, Department of the Air Force.....	189,893,909	7,108,205	14,762,340	17,157,451	39,027,996	150,865,913

THE RECENT TRAGEDY ABOARD THE U. S. S. "BENNINGTON"

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, about a month ago—to be exact, on Wednesday, May 26—all of us were shocked and saddened by news of the explosion and resulting fire aboard the U. S. S. *Bennington*. This Navy carrier at the time was about 75 miles off the coast of Rhode Island and heading for its home port, the United States Naval Air Station at Quonset Point, R. I. Since Rhode Island is my home State, and the Quonset Point Air Station has from its inception been of especial interest to me, I feel impelled to speak on this subject before the Senate today.

The importance of the North Atlantic Naval Air Base at Quonset Point is well appreciated by all of us here. It was there that our Presiding Officer, Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON, received his indoctrination and officer's training, and other Members of the Congress have been stationed there at various times.

In the *Bennington* catastrophe over 100 officers and men lost their lives. Many more were injured, and some of them are still at the United States naval hospital at Newport, receiving expert care for their injuries. I know I speak for all the Members of the Senate in extending to those injured men our sincere wishes for their early recovery. We here, together with the citizens of my State, extend to those who lost their dear ones in this disaster our heartfelt sympathy. We all thank from the bottom of our hearts the heroic captain and crew of the *Bennington* for their rescue efforts in the danger zone aboard the ship and for their splendid work in taking care of those who were injured.

The citizens of my State, I am glad to report, responded wholeheartedly with all kinds of assistance to the Navy. At Newport a call for blood donors was responded to splendidly. The doctors and nurses at civilian hospitals throughout the State volunteered their services, as did State officials, the State police, local police, the State council of defense, and, as a matter of fact, everyone who could in any way be of assistance. The Navy appreciated highly what the good citizens of Rhode Island did to be helpful.

At the present time a board of inquiry appointed by the Secretary of the Navy is conducting an investigation as to the cause of this disaster. It is our sincere hope that this board will be successful in its efforts to determine the cause and to make such recommendations for action as will prevent any recurrence.

Many excellent editorials have been written regarding the explosion and fire aboard the *Bennington*, and I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, editorials appearing in the Providence Evening Bulletin, the Newport Daily News, the Pawtucket Times, the Fall River Herald News, the Christian Science Monitor, the Boston Post, the Boston Daily Globe, the Boston Herald, and the New York Times.

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

[From the Providence Evening Bulletin of May 28, 1954]

"BENNINGTON" TRAGEDY: FOR RHODE ISLAND A PERSONAL LOSS, A PERSONAL PRIDE

"I am damn proud," said Captain Raborn, of the *Bennington*, "to be the commanding officer of such a heroic, unselfish crew."

And the State of Rhode Island shares Captain Raborn's pride, as it also shares the deep grief of the relatives of the men who died Wednesday morning when explosion and fire struck the great carrier 75 miles off our coast.

Those disastrous moments were as tense and deadly as the heat of wartime battle, and the instant response of the *Bennington's* crew was as splendid as the ultimate bravery under enemy fire. There were instances of true heroism, of sacrifice, of patient endurance, of effort far exceeding the limits duty sets. Because there were all of these, the ship and the survivors were spared even greater tragedy.

Rhode Island is a Navy State, and Quonset is the *Bennington's* home port. The disaster she suffered came as a shock throughout the Nation, but it had an even deeper personal impact on the people of Rhode Island. We mourn the *Bennington's* dead, we pray a quick recovery for her injured, and we are proud to salute her crewmen—and their mates ashore—who met the fearful test so well.

[From the Newport Daily News of May 29, 1954]

"BENNINGTON" DISASTER

The people of Newport suffered this week with their brothers in blue who were killed and horribly burned in the holocaust aboard the aircraft carrier *Bennington*.

No words can describe the feelings of horror and sympathy which swept this city when the mounting toll of casualties first began to be announced. The tragedy soon passed beyond the bounds of comprehension. Almost a hundred young men killed.

But a glorious tale was written in the outpouring of aid which this community, in company with the Navy and surrounding areas, rushed to volunteer. It is a tale of which every Newporter can be proud.

We saw a local marketman, still wearing his grocer's apron, helping to lift the blackened forms of the wounded from the buzzing

helicopters which landed on the dusty lot off Third Street.

We saw a 76-year-old woman standing in line at Newport Hospital, begging for a chance to give her blood to save one of the stricken crewmen.

All of us saw reasons to be proud of our fellowmen, displaying in an hour of stark catastrophe the meaning of charity in its most poignant form.

Meanwhile, at the naval hospital three-score and more men are still being treated by the hard-working staff, which has not slackened its mercy efforts for an instant. We hope they will call on us for any aid we can give in coming days.

To the gallant men of the *Bennington* and their families, our heartfelt sympathy. We hope the positive cause of the tragedy can be uncovered and corrected in such a way that never again need there be a similar disaster aboard a ship of our Navy.

[From the Pawtucket (R. I.) Times of May 28, 1954]

SHIP HAZARDS IN PEACETIME

The tragedy on the Quonset-based carrier, *Bennington*, shocks the Nation. The number of dead and injured provokes headlines and stirs the public to the awareness of the dangerous calling of men serving their country in peacetime as well as in war.

A soldier may be killed by accident in Alaska, Greenland, or in Korea. A Navy plane crew may die when they plunge into the sea. Their fate is dutifully recorded in the pages of the local paper, with only the members of the victims' immediate families and close friends concerned and shocked. But when a single tragedy strikes at 300 men the entire Nation is moved.

The disaster aboard the *Bennington* emphasizes that danger is the constant companion of men in service.

The victims of the *Bennington* tragedy died in defense of their country quite as much as did the men who died on the battlefield.

The great floating airfields are shining examples of man's ingenuity. They are filled with machinery and airplanes, with ammunition, and with highly explosive fuels. Those who man our carriers must be constantly on the alert, for danger rides behind the bulkheads. That these tragic explosions on aircraft carriers are few is a bright commentary on the safety measures observed by the Navy.

Since men have been going to sea they have courted dangers. The wind and the waves took toll of men in sailing vessels. Icebergs and fire have visited tragedy on steam-propelled vessels. But sight must not be lost of the fact that as our ships have become more complex there has not been a commensurate rise in the catastrophe roster.

The Navy is conducting an investigation into the *Bennington* tragedy. From the findings may come new emphasis on the need for tighter operation of these great ships in which men live in such close proximity to dangerous chemicals and destructive fuels.

The wonder is there have been so few tragedies on the carriers upon which we depend so much for national defense.

[From the Fall River Herald News of May 27, 1954]

HEROES ALL

The sympathy of all Americans goes to the families of the victims of the *Bennington* explosion horror. The men who made the supreme sacrifice were engaged in the defense of this Nation from the aggression of Red Moscow. They may not have been in actual battle, but a cold war is just as dis-

astrous to those who suffer from it as the most fierce battle.

All honor goes to these heroes who were preparing to save this country from the slavery of Moscow communism. All will be done that is possible for the injured and the Nation will express its gratitude in every manner that can be devised.

The heroism and the good management at the scene of tragedy and emergency, as displayed on the *Bennington*, were typically American, in the best traditions of our Navy and all our armed services.

The American people were stirred. Everybody wanted to help in some way. The response of so many who offered their blood for the burned and injured men was thrilling.

The *Bennington* was a disaster ship, but the rescue work became an epic in bravery and good Americanism.

[From the Christian Science Monitor of May 28, 1954]

THE "BENNINGTON"

Again the world is reminded that they who go down to the sea in ships face hazards in peace as well as in war. And again it is demonstrated that men of the sea, as well as those of the land, often find their bravest and finest selves in meeting such crises.

The men injured by the terrific blast that swept through a forward deck of the carrier *Bennington*, and the families of all the casualties, are due the helpful sympathy and supporting prayers of people everywhere and of whatever faith. And their officers and fellow seamen are due heartfelt gratitude and praise for their heroic rescues and cool handling of the emergency. So are the pilots of the mercy helicopters and all others who played a part in bringing aid to the injured or the injured to the aid.

May the public be as cool and helpful as they. No sabotage is indicated, say responsible officials on the scene—and none should be imputed without solid evidence. No human negligence is as yet charged—and none should be without sober reasons. An experienced board of inquiry is already convened. Let us hope it finds evidence of neither.

Let us trust, rather, that it finds causes which, if human imperfection permitted to exist, the intelligence of men will be sufficient to correct.

[From the Boston Post of May 27, 1954]

CARRIER DISASTER

The toll of lives in the disastrous fire aboard the 27,000-ton aircraft carrier *Bennington*, one of the Navy's worst peacetime losses, is part of the price that this Nation must pay to maintain national security.

These vast floating airfields, jammed with men, machinery, explosives, fuel, and jet planes, can at best be hazardous. In the struggle to preserve maximum security for the Nation in the face of an administration policy to cut defense expenditures, the carriers in commission are called upon to stretch their facilities to the utmost.

Those who gave their lives on the *Bennington*, although they may be officially recorded as peacetime casualties, died in defense of their country just as surely as if they had been locked in mortal combat. The time may not be far off when, in a national emergency, those who have strained ever fiber to keep the carriers at peak efficiency will be the men to whom the Nation will look to retain or regain mastery of the sea and air.

The Navy will conduct an official investigation of the disaster, but we are sure that no investigation will emphasize the sad fact that the dead were men the Nation can, at this juncture, ill afford to lose.

[From the Boston Daily Globe of May 27, 1954]

HAZARDS ABOARD CARRIERS

The disastrous fire aboard the *Bennington* again emphasize the peacetime hazards of a modern navy.

For the third successive year there has been great loss of life in a mishap involving an aircraft carrier. In 1952 the *Wasp* collided with the destroyer *Dobson*, and 176 were killed. Last year there were 37 fatalities aboard the *Leyte* in Boston Harbor, due to an explosion in her catapult room. Now comes the *Bennington* blast.

Man has made great progress in building ships that give protection against the dangers of the sea, but they still occasionally collide and go aground. And modern vessels, especially carriers with their complex machinery, heavy loads of gasoline and reliance on chemicals, have revealed that they contain new hazards.

Repeated disasters make it clear that the utmost care is needed in the operation of these ships.

[From the Boston Herald of May 27, 1954]

WHIRLIGIGS TO THE RESCUE

Those wonderful helicopters.

Following the shocking tragedy on the aircraft carrier *Bennington* they went at it again. As soon as the ship was within range, they began ferrying wounded from the flight deck to the very front door of the hospital on shore.

They could not bring back the dead. But there is no way to tell how many lives they saved as they whirled, however, dropped and darted off carrying stretcher after stretcher to a place where they could get expert care.

It will be some time before the cause of the explosions and fire are fully explained, but it is not too early to pay tribute to those men who fought for the development and adoption of helicopters against the conservative forces in the Navy and the Army.

The silly-looking whirligigs have accomplished miracles of mercy at the battle front in Korea; at sea by rescuing fliers seconds after they have crashed in the water; in places too numerous to mention. We salute those who are responsible for basing helicopters at Quonset.

[From the New York Times of May 28, 1954]

THE "BENNINGTON" DISASTER

Once again we have suffered a shocking peacetime naval disaster in the explosions and fire on the carrier *Bennington*. These recurrent tragedies are a part of the hazard that is faced by the men who sail our ships and fly our planes. No matter how many precautions are taken, there seems always to be an accident margin and an element of mechanical or human fallibility that takes its toll.

In this case we have no doubt that the Navy will make the most scrupulous investigation in the effort to learn not merely the cause of the accident but anything more that can be ascertained about how to reduce the likelihood of catastrophe.

Meanwhile we extend our deep condolence to those who have been bereaved. We honor those, living and dead, who showed the sort of heroism that we expect from the men who man our ships. We share in grief and mourning with our Navy and with the families of its men.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, the memorial program conducted aboard the *Bennington* on Memorial Day, Monday, May 31.

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

PATRIOTIC MEMORIAL SERVICES CONDUCTED ON THE FLIGHT DECK OF THE U. S. S. "BENNINGTON," CVA20, MONDAY, MAY 31, 1954, FOR OUR BELOVED DEPARTED OFFICERS AND ENLISTED MEN OF THE U. S. S. "BENNINGTON" AND AIR TASK GROUP 181 WHO DIED ON BOARD THE U. S. S. "BENNINGTON" ON MAY 26, 1954

IN MEMORIAM

"If I take the wings of the morning
And dwell in the uttermost parts of the sea
Even there shall Thy hand lead me
And Thy right hand shall hold me."

"Jesus said, 'I am the resurrection and the life; he that believeth in Me, although he be dead shall live. And everyone that liveth, and believeth in Me shall not die forever'.

"We have loved them during life, let us not abandon them until we have conducted them by our prayers into the house of the Lord."

Out of the depths have I cried unto Thee,
O Lord: Lord, hear my voice.

Let Thine ears be attentive to the voice of my supplication.

If Thou, O Lord, wilt mark iniquities,
Lord, who shall stand it?

For with Thee there is merciful forgiveness: and by reason of Thy law, have I waited for Thee, O Lord.

My soul hath relied on his word: my soul hath hoped in the Lord.

From the morning watch even until night:
let Israel hope in the Lord.

Because with the Lord there is mercy: and with him plenteous redemption.

And he shall redeem Israel from all his iniquities.

Eternal rest grant unto them, O Lord.

And let perpetual light shine upon them.

PROGRAM

Hymn, Abide With Me

U. S. S. *Bennington* band

Invocation.....Lt. (jg) M. H. Jay

Protestant chaplain, U. S. S. *Bennington*

Solo, Panis Angelicus.....Everett Morrison

Address.....Capt. W. F. Raborn, U. S. N.

commanding officer, U. S. S. *Bennington*

Solo, Jesus Lover of My Soul.....Mrs. Edith Hill

Choir selection, Heavenly Light

NAS Quonset Point Choir under the

direction of Priscilla A. Baslow

Benediction.....LCDR B. V. Cunningham

Catholic Chaplain, U. S. S. *Bennington*

Navy hymn, Eternal Father

U. S. S. *Bennington* band

Firing of Volley.....Marine detachment

U. S. S. *Bennington*

Taps.....Bernard McFarland, MUI

U. S. S. *Bennington* band

"I am crucified with Christ: nevertheless I live; not I, but Christ liveth in me; and the life which I now live in the flesh I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me, and gave Himself for me."

Gave His head to wear thorns for me: "And the soldiers platted a crown of thorns, and put it on His head."

Gave His eyes to weep for me: "And when He was come near, He beheld the city, and wept over it."

Gave His tongue to pray for me: "Then said Jesus, Father, forgive them; for they know not what they do."

Gave His side to the spear for me: "But one of the soldiers with a spear pierced His side, and forthwith came there out blood and water."

Gave His hands and feet to the nails for me: "And when they come to the place which is called Calvary there they crucified Him."

Gave His precious blood for me: "Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over these which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the church of

God, which He hath purchased with His own blood."

Gave His life for me: "I am the good shepherd: The good shepherd giveth his life for his sheep."

Gave all His riches and became poor for me: "For ye know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, that though He was rich, yet for our sakes He became poor, that ye through His poverty might become rich."

Will never rest until He comes again for me: "And if I go and prepare a place for you, I will come again, and receive you unto myself; that where I am, there ye may be also."

You cannot have truth without Christ, for Christ is the truth.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, during these Memorial Day exercises Capt. W. F. Raborn, the commanding officer of the *Bennington*, in touching words, addressed those privileged to attend the solemn ceremony. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, as part of my remarks, Captain Raborn's address.

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

ADDRESS BY CAPT. W. F. RABORN ABOARD THE U. S. S. "BENNINGTON," MEMORIAL DAY, MONDAY, MAY 31, 1954

Shipmates, honored guests, we are gathered here this morning on the flight deck of our good ship, the *Bennington*, to honor and pay homage to our shipmates who gave their lives that we and this great ship might live. It is difficult for me to adequately express the emotion which fills our hearts, for mere words can by no means describe the heroism and devotion to duty which characterized our departed shipmates. Their loss will be felt very keenly by all of us; to our bereaved families, we extend our heartfelt and deepest sympathy. To these families we also give assurance that these grand and splendid officers and men have not died in vain but that our Navy and our country, inspired by their unselfish devotion to duty will be enriched and strengthened beyond my poor power of words to describe. So, shipmates, let us take heart and let the heroic example of our departed ones strengthen our determination to go forward in the spirit with which they would have us do. Let us be inspired by the heroism of our shipmates and let us face life with the same courage which they showed in giving their lives that we might live.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, to the captain and the members of his crew, we in the Congress, and the citizens of my State, where the ship is based, extend our heartfelt sympathy for the loss of their shipmates, and commend them for their excellent performance of duty under extremely hazardous conditions.

Captain Raborn has received thousands of letters since this tragedy, and among them was a very touching one addressed to the captain by the father of one of the brave young men who died aboard the *Bennington*. The writer enclosed a poem with his letter, and it so deeply impressed Captain Raborn that he is sending copies to the bereaved families of the officers and men who lost their lives in the same catastrophe. I believe my colleagues will be interested in the letter and poem, which I shall read:

JUNE 4, 1954.

DEAR CAPTAIN RABORN: I have tried to write this letter before, but have been unable to

put into words the thoughts that have been in my heart and mind concerning you and your shipmates. However, when your kind letter arrived, it became easier. We have sustained a mortal blow over the death of our precious son, and our grief knows no end. But even in the depth of our grief we realized that you must be suffering, too. We, along with all the other parents, have lost a son, but you must feel that you have lost a hundred. Please accept for yourself and all the crew our sincere sympathy and well wishes for your future.

I am enclosing a memorial poem written by a friend which I feel might be of some help to you, as it was to us. Mrs. _____ and our remaining son, _____, join me in the sentiments expressed in this letter.

Sincerely,

I now read the poem:

I think the gentle God
Is weary welcoming
To His green fields
The aging ones,
Outspent,
From long years wanderings.

Today
A troop of robust youth
Stormed Heaven!
And there was one,
Lithe-limbed,
Bright-eyed
(His fresh young face, forever now,
Engraved in memory).

I would that he can know—
That brave young heart—
My spirit, grateful,
At beating of a drum,
The roar of plane,
The dip of ship at sea,
At all the cost of keeping
This dear land
Unvanquished, proud, and free.

I do not stop a flow of tears
(Though for myself I'm surely weeping),
But raise again aloft his flag,
And know, at last, it is
A costly heritage that whips the breeze.

CIVIL WAR IN GUATEMALA—COMMUNIST PENETRATION OF WESTERN HEMISPHERE

Mr. THYE obtained the floor.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BENNETT in the chair). Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I am about to ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consider Senate Concurrent Resolution 91. Its consideration will not take very long. The concurrent resolution was ordered reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations today. The distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], would like to have it taken up at this time.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I have no objection, and I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, I report favorably, with amendments, the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 91) to express the sense of Congress on interference in Western Hemisphere affairs by the Soviet Communists, and I submit a report (No. 1633) thereon.

The report itself is short, and I ask that the clerk read it for the information

of the Senate, because I shall ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution be considered immediately.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no objection, the clerk will read the report.

The report (No. 1633) was read, as follows:

The Committee on Foreign Relations, having had under consideration Senate Concurrent Resolution 91 (relating to the taking of necessary and proper steps to support the Organization of American States in action to prevent interference by the international Communist movement in the affairs of states of the Western Hemisphere) favorably reports the resolution, with amendments, and recommends that the Senate approve it.

COMMITTEE ACTION

On June 25, 1954, the Committee on Foreign Relations considered Senate Concurrent Resolution 91 which had been introduced by Mr. JOHNSON of Texas on June 22, 1954. The Committee had before it a letter from the Department of State approving the pending resolution, but recommending certain language changes to conform the resolution to the language adopted at the Caracas Conference in March 1954.

The perfecting amendments suggested by the Department of State were adopted, as well as additional amendments making it clear that the Communist threat is international in scope.

The committee then without objection reported the amended resolution which reads as follows:

"Whereas for many years it has been the joint policy of the United States and the other States in the Western Hemisphere to act vigorously to prevent external interference in the affairs of the nations of the Western Hemisphere; and

"Whereas in the recent past there has come to light strong evidence of intervention by the international Communist movement in the State of Guatemala, whereby government institutions have been infiltrated by Communist agents, weapons of war have been secretly shipped into that country, and the pattern of Communist conquest has become manifest; and

"Whereas on Sunday, June 20, 1954, the Soviet Government vetoed in the United Nations Security Council a resolution to refer the matter of the recent outbreak of hostilities in Guatemala to the Organization of American States; Therefore be it

"Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of Congress that the United States should reaffirm its support of the Caracas Declaration of Solidarity of March 28, 1954, which is designed to prevent interference in Western Hemisphere affairs by the international Communist movement, and take all necessary and proper steps to support the Organization of American States in taking appropriate action to prevent any interference by the international Communist movement in the affairs of the States of the Western Hemisphere."

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, as I have pointed out this morning, the concurrent resolution was ordered reported unanimously by the Foreign Relations Committee.

Therefore, I now ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to consider Senate Concurrent Resolution 91.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent

resolution (S. Con. Res. 91) to express the sense of Congress on interference in Western Hemisphere affairs by the Soviet Communists, which had been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with amendments, on page 2, in line 3, before the word "prevent", to strike out "determination to" and insert "support of the Caracas Declaration of Solidarity of March 28, 1954, which is designed to"; in line 4, after the words "by the", to strike out "Soviet Communists" and insert "international Communist movement"; in line 5, after the words "steps to", to strike out "insure that", and insert "support"; in line 6, after the words "American States," to strike out "take direct and", and insert "in taking"; in line 7, before the word "interference", to strike out "further Soviet"; and at the beginning of line 8, before the words "in the affairs", to insert "by the international Communist movement."

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, there are urgent reasons for approval of this concurrent resolution today. The most pressing is the meeting of the United Nations Security Council which is scheduled for this afternoon. That session is certain to involve the issue of jurisdiction over the civil war in Guatemala.

International communism is seeking to hamper and impede any effort to assign the jurisdiction where it properly belongs—in the Organization of the American States. The Communists are trying to reserve every power which will enable them to continue their aggression in the Western Hemisphere.

Adoption of this concurrent resolution by a unanimous vote will be clear notice that our delegates have the backing of the Senate of the United States. It will be an unmistakable warning that we are determined to keep communism out of the Western Hemisphere.

There is no partisanship in this concurrent resolution, and there should not be. The defense of our freedoms against international communism is not a partisan issue. It is one upon which we should be united, regardless of our party affiliations. The report by means of which the concurrent resolution has come to the floor of the Senate shows that the members of both parties who constitute the great Committee on Foreign Relations, of the United States Senate, are unanimous in their views on this subject.

On this declaration, both I and the majority leader are united. I think it can be a potent force for uniting all Americans.

There can be no doubt of the dangers we face. The shipment of Communist arms to the Western Hemisphere was an open declaration of the aggressive designs of international communism. The action of the Soviet delegate to the United Nations Security Council—when he refused to agree to have the Guatemalan controversy assigned to the Organization of American States—was an open declaration that the aggression will continue.

Mr. President, in the past we have defended the Western Hemisphere under the terms of the Monroe Doctrine. The spirit of that doctrine, as well as the spirit of the Caracas conference resolution, is embodied in this concurrent resolution.

But, Mr. President, we must recognize changing times and changing conditions which call for a reaffirmation of that doctrine. We must bring it into line with the realities of the modern world.

We are confronted with a new type of imperialism, a type that was unknown during the administration of President Monroe. In those days, imperialistic aggression began and ended with armed forces which landed and physically took possession of states in the Western Hemisphere. The Monroe Doctrine was designed to meet that specific pattern.

On the other hand, international communism begins its imperialism with political infiltration. It builds up groups within the states which are designated as the objects of conquest. These groups at first operate only through subversion, espionage, and sabotage. When they reach a certain point of strength, they are then armed and are turned loose for military conquest.

We have reached that point in the Western Hemisphere. International communism is now arming its followers for conquest by open and naked force and violence.

This is a problem which must be met by the united countries of the Western Hemisphere. We must draw a line into which the Communists cannot penetrate.

This resolution will make it abundantly clear to our friends in the Western Hemisphere that we are determined to stand behind the Caracas Declaration; that we are ready to pledge our resources and strength for the defense of freedom. It can serve as a rallying point for the Organization of the American States against Communist imperialism.

It will also make it clear that we have no intentions whatsoever of interfering in their internal affairs. The force of this resolution is directed solely against external aggression. Its aim is to insure the peace and the integrity of the Western Hemisphere.

There is another purpose behind this resolution, however. It is a long-range purpose.

This is a time for America to state some of the basic realities of our purposes and our intentions. It is a time for America to speak in clear, firm tones of unity.

To the world, we may appear to be divided, and it is true that on many issues we Americans are in disagreement.

But there is no disagreement among the vast majority of Americans on our determination to preserve freedom. There is no disagreement on our determination to keep Communist imperialism from dominating the whole world.

Early this morning, the leader of Great Britain landed on our soil to discuss some of the most important issues that are before freemen everywhere.

It is no secret that there are heavy strains upon the alliance that has held

our two countries together for so many years. No one seeks to conceal the fact that his Government recently spoke in jarring terms that point the way to disunity and confusion.

We do not know whether that disunity can be dispelled. We hope that these discussions will promote a united policy to repel international communism and preserve freedom in this world.

But whatever those discussions produce, this is a time to serve notice on the world that America can speak with a united voice. This is a time to demonstrate that we will defend our freedoms. This is a time to make it unmistakably clear that we will preserve the integrity of the Western Hemisphere regardless of what the future may bring.

Mr. President, I express my deep gratitude for the cooperation of the majority leader and of all the members of the Foreign Relations Committee for the early hearing they gave this subject, and for bringing the resolution to the floor at this time. I hope the resolution will be adopted unanimously.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have added to the other material from the committee report which was earlier read by the clerk, a letter from Mr. Thruston Morton, Assistant Secretary of State, addressed to the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] relative to the resolution, suggesting certain changes, to which the committee added several of its own; and also a copy of the Declaration of Solidarity for the Preservation of the Political Integrity of the American States Against International Communist Intervention, which was Resolution 93 of the 10th Inter-American Conference, held at Caracas, Venezuela, March 1 to 28, 1954.

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

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, June 24, 1954.

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations, United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: Reference is made to your letter of June 23, 1954, requesting the views of the Department of State on Senate Concurrent Resolution 91, "to express the sense of Congress on interference in Western Hemisphere affairs by the Soviet Communists."

The Department approves the objectives of the proposed resolution, but recommends that it be amended to conform with the language adopted at the Caracas conference, which was overwhelmingly approved by the nations attending. It is therefore suggested that the word "Soviet" be stricken out of line 7, page 2, and that the words "by international communism" be inserted after the word "interference" so that the resolution will read as follows:

"That it is the sense of Congress that the United States should reaffirm its determination to prevent interference in Western Hemisphere affairs by the Soviet Communists and take all necessary and proper steps to insure that the Organization of American States take direct and appropriate action to prevent any further interference by international communism in the affairs of the states of the Western Hemisphere."

Sincerely yours,

THRUSTON B. MORTON
(For the Secretary of State).

DECLARATION OF SOLIDARITY FOR THE PRESERVATION OF THE POLITICAL INTEGRITY OF THE AMERICAN STATES AGAINST INTERNATIONAL COMMUNIST INTERVENTION

(Resolution 93 of the 10th Inter-American Conference held at Caracas, Venezuela, March 1-28, 1954)

Whereas the American Republics at the Ninth International Conference of American States declared that international communism, by its antidemocratic nature and its interventionist tendency, is incompatible with the concept of American freedom, and resolved to adopt within their respective territories the measures necessary to eradicate and prevent subversive activities;

The Fourth Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs recognized that, in addition to adequate internal measures in each state, a high degree of international cooperation is required to eradicate the danger which the subversive activities of international communism pose for the American states; and

The aggressive character of the international Communist movement continues to constitute, in the context of world affairs, a special and immediate threat to the national institutions and the peace and security of the American States and to the right of each state to develop its cultural, political, and economic life freely and naturally without intervention in its internal or external affairs by other states, the 10th Inter-American Conference—

I

Condemns the activities of the international Communist movement as constituting intervention in American affairs;

Expresses the determination of the American States to take the necessary measures to protect their political independence against the intervention of international communism, acting in the interests of an alien despotism;

Reiterates the faith of the peoples of America in the effective exercise of representative democracy as the best means to promote their social and political progress; and

Declares that the domination or control of the political institutions of any American State by the international Communist movement, extending to this hemisphere the political system of an extracontinental power, would constitute a threat to the sovereignty and political independence of the American States, endangering the peace of America, and would call for a meeting of consultation to consider the adoption of measures in accordance with existing treaties.

II

Recommends that without prejudice to such other measures as they may consider desirable, special attention be given by each of the American governments to the following steps for the purpose of counteracting the subversive activities of the international Communist movement within their respective jurisdictions: (1) Measures to require disclosure of the identity, activities, and sources of funds of those who are spreading propaganda of the international Communist movement or who travel in the interests of that movement, and of those who act as its agents or in its behalf; and (2) the exchange of information among governments to assist in fulfilling the purpose of the resolutions adopted by the Inter-American Conferences and Meetings of Ministers of Foreign Affairs regarding international communism.

III

This declaration of foreign policy made by the American Republics in relation to dangers originating outside this hemisphere is designed to protect and not to impair the inalienable right of each American State freely to choose its own form of government

and economic system and to live its own social and cultural life.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations, in view of the danger posed to the free nations of the Western Hemisphere as well as to the United States, urges the Senate to approve the pending resolution as soon as possible.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, as majority leader I wish to commend the minority leader for his forthright and vigorous action in submitting Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 91. The free people of the Western Hemisphere have been deeply concerned about Communist penetration of Guatemala, and the threat which that action holds for freedom in the Western Hemisphere.

They were equally concerned over the Soviet action in the United Nations Security Council in vetoing a resolution asking the Organization of American States to take action in case of hostilities in Guatemala. That veto shows the cynicism with which the international Communist movement views efforts by most of the nations of the world to settle disputes by peaceful means and through agencies most competent to deal with such questions.

In considering the pending resolution, I am sure the Senate is aware of the fact that it brings home the realities of the Monroe Doctrine as well as the Caracas Declaration, and the very fine relationships we have had with our American neighbors in Central and South America in matters relating to the common defense of the Western Hemisphere.

In 1823, in his annual message to Congress, President Monroe stated:

We owe it therefore to candor, and to the amicable relations existing between the United States and those powers, to declare that we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portions of this hemisphere, as dangerous to our peace and safety. With the existing colonies or dependencies of any European power, we have not interfered, and shall not interfere. But with the governments who have declared their independence, and maintained it, and whose independence we have, on great consideration, and on just principles, acknowledged, we could not view any interposition for the purpose of oppressing them, or controlling in any other manner, their destiny, by any European power, in any other light, than as the manifestation of an unfriendly disposition toward the United States.

I hope the concurrent resolution will be unanimously adopted.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, as acting chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, and in the absence of the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], our chairman, I rise to identify myself completely with the statements made by the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], our minority leader, and by my colleague from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], our majority leader.

I commend our distinguished minority and majority leaders for urging upon the Senate the adoption of the pending resolution, which restates in simple terms the policy of the United States

which has come down through the years as one of our most cherished and important policies, first enunciated in the Monroe Doctrine, and then expanded into a multi-lateral Monroe Doctrine by action of the other American States. That policy was reestablished and extended in the Caracas Declaration of 1954, declaring that infiltration by the international Communist movement held the same threat to this Hemisphere as the dangers we anticipated at the time the Monroe Doctrine was first enunciated.

As acting chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, and as an individual Member of United States Senate, I wish to identify myself with the sentiments which have been expressed, and to state again, as has already been stated, that this morning, after carefully considering the resolution and making certain amendments to bring it in line with the Caracas Declaration, the committee unanimously stood together in presenting this resolution as a united, bipartisan, American expression at this critical time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, may we have the yeas and nays?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to take this occasion to commend the distinguished minority leader [Mr. JOHNSON of Texas] for the initiative he has displayed in submitting this concurrent resolution.

I wish also to congratulate the distinguished majority leader for seeing to it that the resolution was brought before the Foreign Relations Committee this morning. I commend both the majority leader and the minority leader for bringing it to the floor this afternoon.

I am glad to note that in his remarks the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] made reference to the fact that what he has done today is to reaffirm the declaration of Caracas, and that in their statements both he and the majority leader have brought up to date the interpretation of the Monroe Doctrine. The resolution is a modern interpretation of the Monroe Doctrine.

It is interesting historically to note that, insofar as both the Johnson resolution and the Monroe Doctrine are concerned, they are directed against the same forces—though in different form—which tried to bring about a penetration into the Western Hemisphere in 1823, and which have been more successful at the present time in bringing about a different kind of penetration, through subversion and the like, in this part of the world.

I am extremely happy that the minority leader was able to have such a resolution submitted and considered by the Senate. I believe, with him, that the right place for this problem to be settled is in the Organization of the American States, an organization which has been established for the purpose of looking after the affairs of the Western

Hemisphere. It is comprised of states all of which are, in some form or other, directly or indirectly affected by the present threat to our part of the world. The resolution is timely, and the minority leader is to be commended for his foresight and initiative.

THE MONROE DOCTRINE—THE WESTERN HEMISPHERE

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished majority leader a question. I note from the resolution that it is pointed toward the international Communist movement. Does that preclude any action on our part under the Monroe Doctrine, with respect to encroachment by any other nation?

Mr. KNOWLAND. By no means. This resolution is meant to meet the new type of technique. Both the Rio Pact for the general hemispheric defense and our own earlier Monroe Doctrine are directed against the aggressive tendency of any foreign power to come to the Western Hemisphere and destroy the independence of America. Neither would in any way be weakened or modified by this resolution.

The purpose is merely to meet the language of the Caracas resolution and a new type of penetration, in which no fleets or troops are sent to invade a country, but which nevertheless, is a part of a conspiracy to destroy the freedom and sovereignty of independent nations.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask a further question. There were no fleets or troops sent by the Netherlands or by Great Britain or by France, or by any other European nation which now has a foothold in Latin America. Do I understand the distinguished majority leader to say that the concurrent resolution exempts all other nations who come peacefully?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I do not believe the Senator from Nevada was in the Chamber when I read from President Monroe's message, but I am sure he will recall that President Monroe said:

We owe it, therefore, to candor and to the amicable relations existing between the United States and those powers to declare that we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety. With the existing colonies or dependencies of any European power we have not interfered and shall not interfere. But with the Governments who have declared their independence and maintained it, and whose independence we have, on great consideration and on just principles, acknowledged, we could not view any interposition for the purpose of oppressing them, or controlling in any other manner their destiny, by any European power in any other light than as the manifestation of an unfriendly disposition toward the United States.

Mr. MALONE. I may say to the distinguished majority leader that the junior Senator from Nevada is entirely cognizant of the Monroe Doctrine, and believes in it. As a matter of fact he could recite most of it from memory. The point I make is that for a good number of years now our Secretaries of State apparently did not know where any South American nations were located, but were exploring the world, in order to extend our influence and while our

officials roamed the world, we lost our backyard.

I assume I have the assurance of the majority leader that the Monroe Doctrine, as enunciated in 1823, can be considered a part of this concurrent resolution.

Mr. KNOWLAND. As the Senator knows, during the intervening years since the Monroe Doctrine was promulgated our good friends in Latin America, who have come to positions of greatness on their own account, have desired to work in partnership with us, in order to augment and support the policy that none of them shall lose its independence or sovereignty by aggression from without. The purpose of the concurrent resolution is to voice, on the part of Congress, our concern about the destruction of freedoms by the international Communist conspiracy.

At the Caracas conference a resolution was adopted to which I have already referred. The nations meeting together at that conference—and the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] and the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] attended as representatives of the Committee on Foreign Relations—by an overwhelming vote, and perhaps with only 1 or 2 dissents, went on record, in language similar to that we have in the resolution before us as to the danger of the destruction of those governments because of international Communist movement or conspiracy. The concurrent resolution is, in effect, a reaffirmation of that Caracas action.

Mr. MALONE. We do have the assurance of the distinguished majority leader that the Monroe Doctrine, as enunciated in 1823, can be considered as a part of this resolution. Is that correct?

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Monroe Doctrine still stands. The Rio Pact still stands. The Caracas Declaration still stands.

Mr. MALONE. I should like to remind the distinguished majority leader that Abraham Lincoln made a very important observation. He said "if this country is ever destroyed, it will not be from without, but from within." Therefore, we are taking the Monroe Doctrine literally and saying that regardless of how such attempted control is engineered, either by infiltration or military aggression, it should be prevented.

I merely call the attention of the distinguished majority leader to the fact that for a great number of years we have paid very little attention to Latin America. We have had our sights turned on Europe and on other areas of the world. Now, we come home and find our own backyard invaded.

Guatemala is not much bigger than the State of Nevada. Nevertheless, we think it is endangering the safety of the United States. For the last generation we forgot where Guatemala was. Is it not about time that our Secretary of State pay some attention to the Western Hemisphere?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Of course, I quite agree with the Senator from Nevada that we should be and must be concerned

with our neighbors to the south in Central and South America. I am quite willing to agree that in many instances public officials, perhaps even Members of Congress, have not directed sufficient attention to that area of the world. We cannot effectively help save human freedom in Europe or in Asia if human freedom is to be lost in the Americas.

I know the Senator's great interest in the Western Hemisphere, and I know he has traveled in Central and South America.

In fairness to the Secretary of State, I should say that he went to Caracas with representatives of the Senate. They met with the representatives of Latin-American countries. By an overwhelming vote they adopted what is known as the Caracas declaration. Now, in the Senate, and I hope on Monday in the House, the Congress will go on record in support of that declaration, to emphasize the importance to the Americas of the general plan of helping to maintain a free world of free men.

Mr. MALONE. I would say, further, as I have said on this floor at intervals for 8 years, that if we have a trade future, it is in South America; it is not in old Europe. We have been trying to force trade between the processing and manufacturing area in Europe and the processing and manufacturing area in the United States. It will be perhaps more than one-half century before South America can reach the stage of processing and manufacturing goods that will materially diminish any mutual trade advantages. That being the case, I should like to advise the majority leader that on Monday a subcommittee of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs will release a report that has been 10 months in the making which includes very strong recommendations for closer cooperation with the nations of the Western Hemisphere in order to become self-sufficient in the production of the things without which we cannot fight a war or live in peace so that we may not remain dependent upon offshore materials that we could not possibly depend on should a war start.

I am very glad to support this resolution. It singles out the international Communist movement, but I do not believe that is the only movement in South America that is dangerous to this Nation. Peaceful infiltration of European or Asiatic nations for political and economic control may well be just as dangerous.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield for a question?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I am entirely in accord with the purpose of this resolution, which is, as has been stated, to affirm the Monroe Doctrine and the recent Caracas Declaration. The Monroe Doctrine, of course, could be more easily brought into play because it dealt at that time and until recently, with open, visible intervention. This resolution deals with a more difficult type of interference, namely, a type to which we have become accustomed—the subversion of a government.

I should like to ask the distinguished majority leader and his colleague, the distinguished minority leader, a question. This is a declaration by the Senate of the United States—

Mr. KNOWLAND. By the Congress.

Mr. COOPER. At this time it is the Senate making the declaration. We are hopeful that it will be a declaration by the Congress. It could be interpreted simply as a statement of sentiment or support of opinion. It could be interpreted on the other hand, as a declaration of support of some contemplated action. There is a civil war now going on in Guatemala. Does the distinguished majority leader consider this resolution simply as a statement of belief and of principles upon which our Government rests, in which the Senate concurs, or does he contemplate that from this resolution there shall be any steps taken or recommended by the Congress to the administration to put into effect in any situation the purposes stated in the resolution?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will say to the Senator, in answer to his inquiry—

Mr. COOPER. If the Senator will permit me, I would make myself a little more clear.

In this resolution it is stated that we will support the Organization of American States. I think the Senator knows this country has been criticized in the past because of what has been called American intervention. I know that is not in any way the purpose of the resolution.

Mr. KNOWLAND. It is a cooperative effort with our associates in the inter-American States.

Mr. COOPER. I support the resolution, but I am interested in knowing whether it is only a statement which expresses a very solid position of principle, or whether it contemplates, perhaps, some action within the Organization of American States.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I may answer the Senator in this way: I think the resolution puts the Senate and the House, if the House adopts it, in firm support of the Caracas Declaration expressing the concern of the American States in regard to the upsetting of sovereign governments by the international Communist movement or conspiracy. I think it gives backing to the declaration which our Government has already made at Caracas, through the executive branch, and that it states principles which I think are very sound, principles which this Government has supported from the time of the Monroe Doctrine, later broadened in the declaration at Rio, and still further amplified by the declaration at Caracas.

I do not interpret the resolution as being a blank check for a specific act of some kind, because I think that in every place in the world, leaving aside for a moment the Americas, the President of the United States has made it very clear, and the Government has made it very clear, that we will operate under our constitutional procedures.

If by the Senator's question he means whether there would be some overt act which might be interpreted as a warlike act, I think that question would always

come to the Congress of the United States under our constitutional responsibility. Otherwise, I would interpret the resolution as being a firm endorsement on the part of the Congress of the action which the Executive had already taken at Caracas and in line with long-established American policy.

Mr. COOPER. I had no idea or fear at all about any action being taken without congressional approval. What I wished to express—and it is perhaps my own belief—was the hope that it will not be simply a resolution expressing a very fine principle, one in which we all believe, and nothing else. I hope it will mean that we will advise the administration and the State Department of the necessity of taking such steps within the Organization of American States as will give some practical meaning to the resolution.

Mr. KNOWLAND. And within the framework of the American Constitution.

Mr. COOPER. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the very clear answers given by the distinguished majority leader [Mr. KNOWLAND]. I think there is complete understanding as to the intent and purpose of the resolution. We intend to express as the sense of the Congress reaffirmation and support of the Caracas Declaration, and we here in the Senate today, I hope by a unanimous vote, will say to the nations of this hemisphere and to the other countries of the world that we want to see all necessary and proper steps taken to support the Organization of American States and to prevent any interference in this hemisphere by the international Communist movement.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, being fairly well acquainted with the historical, political, and religious background, and also knowing the characteristics of the people of Latin America, I feel that I can say that the Washington Post and Times Herald is probably as well informed as any newspaper on the problems of Latin America. Yesterday, June 24, 1954, it carried an editorial entitled "Poverty and Communism," dealing especially with the problems of the moment affecting Guatemala. In my opinion, it is a well-thought-out editorial worthy of the attention of the people of the world, especially the American people; and while I do not agree with the conclusions reached in their entirety, it is a fine editorial.

I ask unanimous consent that the Post and Times Herald editorial be inserted in the body of the RECORD after these brief remarks.

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

POVERTY AND COMMUNISM

Either way the somewhat murky conflict in Guatemala turns out, as one correspondent has noted, the United States stands to get blamed. This is indicated by the vote of the Chilean Chamber of Deputies condemning the revolt and expressing to the United

States its "grave preoccupation." However questionable the origin of the insurgent movement, it cannot be doubted that the Arbenz government in Guatemala has become a vehicle of Soviet imperialism. But the struggle in Guatemala is symbolic of the underlying discontent throughout Latin America, and it behooves this country in its own interest to take a closer look at some of the conditions that make Latin America such a fertile seedbed for Soviet designs.

It would be foolish to think that many of the people of Guatemala, largely Indian in background, have any sympathy with communism as such. Guatemala emerged in 1944 from long years of oppression under the dictator, Jorge Ubico. Unquestionably there was a good deal of idealism in the movement for social reform, and the Mexican revolution of 40 years ago was held up as an example. But the revolution miscarried when the leaders found that there was no ready alternative to Guatemala's economic dependence on other countries, and they sought a scapegoat.

Many of the sins charged against the United Fruit Co. were sins of the past. In recent years the company has paid good wages and has promoted scientific agriculture, and it has shown itself willing to share its profits fairly. It was easy enough, however, for demagogues to play upon native and antiforeignism and to blame foreign exploitation for Guatemala's poverty and other ills; and it was also easy for Soviet agents, playing upon the discontent of the students and intellectuals, to bend the movement to suit Communist purposes.

The situation in Guatemala is different from that in other Latin American countries, but only in degree. Throughout the hemisphere there is the same sort of resentment over real or fancied economic exploitation, deriving from the fact that the production of raw materials is the primary industry. The Latin producer is somewhat in the plight of the American farmer in that he has no control over the final use or price of his product, but in Latin America the producer cannot generally rely on a price-support system. Hence the concern in Chile over world copper prices, the concern in Bolivia over tin markets, the recent complaint in Costa Rica that the United Fruit Co. was bigger than the government, the hypersensitivity in a number of countries to criticism of coffee prices.

The plain fact is that since World War II Latin America has not kept pace with the remainder of the free world. During the war Latin American countries enjoyed guaranteed markets at high prices. Since then they have seen the great bulk of American aid go elsewhere, and they have not understood the urgency; they have seen us pouring out billions to Europe and Asia but expecting Latin Americans to jump at the slogan of hemisphere solidarity. Grinding poverty and illiteracy remain the common denominator in much of Latin America. Many improvements have been made through technical assistance in agriculture, public health and the like. But the improvements have merely whetted the appetites of peoples newly awakened from a sort of economic peonage; and they have not been enough to prevent demagogues and misguided nationalists from directing the complaint against the United States.

There is no simple or easy answer to the problem, and any sensible approach must have the cooperation of the countries concerned. Latin American nations themselves have complicated the difficulty by unreasonable restrictions on foreign investments. Certainly the solution is not in a dole. More technical assistance, more help in diversifying the economies, more aid in development projects that contribute directly to the welfare of the people, more rational American trade policies—these are part of the answer. So, too, are enlightened policies by American firms such as the oil companies in Venezuela.

But the problem is not wholly economic; it also is psychological and emotional. Former Assistant Secretary of State Cabot touched on an important consideration when he pointed out that the United States cannot be placed in a position of resisting social reforms. If we hope to divert the people of Latin America from false panaceas, we must have something positive to offer in their stead. Somehow we must persuade the Latin Americans, with a lot more vigor than we have hitherto employed, that we are not dedicated to the status quo, and that we are sincerely anxious to help them better their lot. Poverty does not automatically make communism, but it is a strong ally when an international conspiracy stands ready to exploit it. That is the real lesson of Guatemala.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution, as amended. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas (when the name of Mr. SMATHERS was called). The junior Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] is detained from the Senate Chamber on official business. If he were present, he would vote "yea." He has been of invaluable assistance in the preparation of the resolution and bringing it to the attention of the country.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] would each vote "yea."

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURKE], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senators from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND and Mr. STENNIS], the Senators from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN and Mr. LENNON], the Senators from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT and Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] are absent on official business.

I announce further that if present and voting, each of the Senators whose absence I have announced would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 69, nays 1, as follows:

YEAS—69

Aiken	Byrd	Ellender
Anderson	Carlson	Ferguson
Barrett	Case	Flanders
Bennett	Clements	Frear
Bowring	Cooper	George
Bricker	Cordon	Gillette
Bridges	Daniel	Goldwater
Bush	Dirksen	Gore
Butler, Nebr.	Dworshak	Green

Hayden	Kuchel	Pastore
Hendrickson	Lehman	Payne
Hickenlooper	Long	Potter
Hill	Magnuson	Purtell
Holland	Mansfield	Robertson
Ives	Martin	Saltonstall
Jackson	Maybank	Schoeppel
Johnson, Colo.	McCarran	Smith, Maine
Johnson, Tex.	Millikin	Smith, N. J.
Johnston, S. C.	Monroney	Sparkman
Kefauver	Morse	Thye
Kennedy	Mundt	Upton
Kilgore	Murray	Watkins
Knowland	Neely	Williams

NAYS—1

Langer

NOT VOTING—25

Beall	Fulbright	Russell
Burke	Hennings	Smathers
Butler, Md.	Humphrey	Stennis
Capehart	Jenner	Symington
Chavez	Kerr	Welker
Douglas	Lennon	Wiley
Duff	Malone	Young
Eastland	McCarthy	
Ervin	McClellan	

So the concurrent resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 91

Mr. MALONE subsequently said: Mr. President, I invite the attention of Senators to the fact that when the vote was taken on Senate Concurrent Resolution 91 the bells did not ring in at least three Senate offices, including my own. Some of us had been on the floor and had debated the resolution, and fully intended to vote for it. The junior Senator from Nevada intended to vote for the concurrent resolution.

I ask unanimous consent that my statement appear in the RECORD immediately following the vote on Senate Concurrent Resolution 91.

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

Mr. HENNINGS subsequently said: Mr. President, referring to Senate Concurrent Resolution 91, I am one of the Senators to whom the Senator from Nevada has referred. I came over from the Senate Office Building with the distinguished Senator from Nevada and the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ]. Because of some mechanical defect, the bells in our offices did not ring.

I had worked on the resolution. I helped in the preparation of it, and, of course, intended enthusiastically to support it and vote for it.

Mr. President, I make the same request as was made by the Senator from Nevada. I ask that my statement appear in the RECORD immediately following the vote.

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

Mr. CHAVEZ subsequently said: Mr. President, I was in the Chamber at the time the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] called up Senate Concurrent Resolution 91. I stated at that time that I was in favor of it and intended to vote for it. The record of today's proceedings will so indicate.

It so happened that at the time the roll was called I was in my office with a fine New Mexico constituent. I do not know whether there was a mechanical defect or not, but the bell did not ring in my office. I received a telephone call from the cloakroom informing me that the vote was in progress. I came from the Senate Office Building with the

Senator from Nevada and the Senator from Missouri.

I ask that my statement appear in the RECORD immediately following the vote.

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

The clerk will state amendments to the preamble proposed by the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The first amendment was, in the second whereas, line 2, to strike out "Soviet Communists," and insert "the international Communist movement"; on line 4, to strike out "Soviet" and insert "Communist"; and on line 5, to strike out "Soviet" and insert "Communist."

The amendments were agreed to.

The preamble, as amended, was agreed to.

The concurrent resolution and the preamble as agreed to are as follows:

Whereas for many years it has been the joint policy of the United States and the other States in the Western Hemisphere to act vigorously to prevent external interference in the affairs of the nations of the Western Hemisphere; and

Whereas in the recent past there has come to light strong evidence of intervention by the international Communist movement in the State of Guatemala, whereby government institutions have been infiltrated by Communist agents, weapons of war have been secretly shipped into that country, and the pattern of Communist conquest has become manifest; and

Whereas on Sunday, June 20, 1954, the Soviet Government vetoed in the United Nations Security Council a resolution to refer the matter of the recent outbreak of hostilities in Guatemala to the Organization of American States: Therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of Congress that the United States should reaffirm its support of the Caracas Declaration of solidarity of March 28, 1954, which is designed to prevent interference in Western Hemisphere affairs by the international Communist movement, and take all necessary and proper steps to support the Organization of American States in taking appropriate action to prevent any interference by the international Communist movement in the affairs of the states of the Western Hemisphere.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the concurrent resolution was agreed to be reconsidered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move that the motion of the Senator from Michigan be laid on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from California to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from Michigan.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE APPROPRIATIONS, 1955

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9447) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, have the committee amendments been acted on?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There has been no action on any committee amendments. The clerk will state the first committee amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. Under the heading "Title I—Department of Labor—Office of the Secretary," on page 2, line 11, after the word "public", it is proposed to strike out "\$1,300,000" and insert "\$1,354,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

PERSONAL STATEMENT BY SENATOR MORSE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I rise to a matter of personal privilege.

On June 15, 1954, on the call of the Unanimous Consent Calendar, when the bill (H. R. 8923), which had to do with a development of the Coosa River in Alabama and Georgia, came up for discussion, colloquy took place between the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH]. As appears on page 8223 of the RECORD, the senior Senator from Oregon asked the following question and there then took place the following debate:

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, may I make another inquiry of the Senator from Connecticut, the chairman of the subcommittee? Can the Senator advise as to whether there was a unanimous vote in the committee?

Mr. BUSH. There was no opposition to the bill in the committee, in the nature of any testimony in opposition to it. All the testimony was favorable.

My recollection, which is somewhat different from that of the staff director, is that there was no opposition; but I have been advised that there may have been one vote against the bill in committee.

Mr. CORDON. There was no record vote, then, I take it.

Mr. BUSH. I do not think a record vote was taken in committee, because the opposition was confined to one vote. I thought that that vote had been changed in the last analysis, but I cannot say positively that it was.

I wish to state for the record the facts as to what happened at the Public Works Committee. The junior Senator from Oregon not only voted against the bill, but he spoke against the bill in the committee, and the minutes of the Public Works Committee state very clearly the opposition of the junior Senator from Oregon to the Coosa River bill. There was an official rollcall vote on the Coosa bill. The record of the committee shows very clearly that I voted against the Coosa bill on a rollcall vote. There is not the slightest evidence in the record of the Public Works Committee which would justify the implication of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] that the junior Senator from Oregon changed his opinion or his vote on the Coosa bill.

I want the record to so disclose, because it is that kind of a statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which leads to the kind of smear article that appears in the Oregon press by Mr. Robert Smith, one of the correspondents for a series of Oregon newspapers. He is a

correspondent who has been barred from my office for over a year, for the simple reason that I have found him so unreliable in his reporting to the people of the State of Oregon that I will not permit him in my office. My excluding him from my office is based on the simple reason that I do not intend to sit down with any newspaper correspondent who gives me a feeling that I have to keep a stenotypist in the office to make a record of any conversation I have with him. Mr. Smith has circulated in his column in the press some very interesting misrepresentations as to the position taken by the junior Senator from Oregon in regard to the Coosa bill and other matters. In fact it is a habit with him. In his column, for example, he stated:

The bill was sponsored not by the administration or its spokesman in Congress, but by Democratic Senators LISTER HILL and JOHN SPARKMAN, with whom MORSE is usually allied on the various issues before the Senate.

When it came up, MORSE left the chamber. It was passed. He returned.

Did he oppose it in the committee as he had bucked Cougar?

Senator CORDON wanted to know that, too, apparently, when he asked Chairman BUSH during debate on the Coosa bill whether the vote in committee had been unanimous.

BUSH said he understood one vote against it had been cast, but this was not recorded so it could not be checked. A committee staff member reported that MORSE had cast a vote of opposition.

But BUSH told CORDON on the floor:

"I do not think a record vote was taken in committee, because the opposition was confined to one vote. I thought that vote had been changed in the last analysis, but I cannot say positively that it was."

Mr. President, I wish to make two points. First, not only did I oppose the Coosa bill in the Public Works Committee, but I spoke against the Coosa bill in the Public Works Committee. When I came to vote on the bill, on the rollcall vote in the Public Works Committee, I spoke even further against it. My colleagues will find that what I said in the Public Works Committee in explaining my negative vote at the very time I cast it, was to this effect: "I wish to say that, on this bill, I shall vote against it, because in my judgment we do not have the facts on it that we should have. Mr. Chairman, there has just been handed to the committee a report on the Coosa bill from the House of Representatives. The Senate Public Works Committee, as a committee, has not even had an opportunity to read the report. In my opinion there have not been adequate public hearings in the Senate committee on the Coosa bill. Therefore I shall vote against it."

Mr. President, the smear artist by the name of Smith, who writes a column for some Oregon newspapers seeks to leave the impression that I "ducked" on the question of voting on the Coosa bill when it reached the Senate. It is unfortunate that I was not on the floor of the Senate when that bill came up, because the Senators from Alabama know that I was opposed to that bill. But it so happens that for some weeks there has been a serious illness in my family. On that afternoon I was called from the floor of the Senate because of that illness in my family. As soon as I could return to

the floor of the Senate, I did so. In the meantime the Coosa bill had been passed.

Mr. President, I do not choose to refer further to the situation of illness in my family, except to state the fact that for some weeks my wife has been in a body cast. When my absence from the Senate is required because of that situation, I shall not be in attendance in the Senate, but shall be in attendance upon my wife.

In further reference to the Coosa bill I wish to point out, Mr. President, that we need to have full and complete hearings on these so-called partnership bills. Such hearings have not been had on the Coosa bill or on the Cougar bill insofar as consideration of those bills in the Senate Committee on Public Works is concerned. I point out that there is pending at the present time the Morse bills on the Cougar Dam and on the Green Peter Dam, and that bill is sponsored by approximately 15 Members of the Senate. For the benefit of Mr. Smith, I say today, on the floor of the Senate, that I shall continue to urge that we have full and complete hearings on these bills, because in my State there are great forces representing thousands and thousands of persons who believe it would be a tremendous mistake if the Cordon-Cougar Dam bill were passed. I am convinced that a large majority of the people of Oregon favor or will favor my bills on this partnership issue once they come to understand the facts. The Public Works Committee of the Senate has not conducted thorough hearings on the Cordon-Cougar Dam bill and no hearings at all on my Cougar Dam bill.

So I ask my colleagues in the Senate to obtain all the facts regarding those bills before they come to vote.

In fairness to myself, Mr. President, I have made this statement this afternoon, first, because the statement made on June 15 on the floor of the Senate by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] does not represent the facts in regard to what happened in the Public Works Committee; and second, because the statement by Mr. Smith, in seeking to imply that I "ducked" on the question of voting on the Coosa bill, is entirely incorrect.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. UPTON in the chair). Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. If the Senator from Oregon will hand me the marked copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to which he has called my attention, I wish to say that the Senator from Oregon has a good point. I simply said:

I do not think a record vote was taken in committee, because the opposition was confined to one vote.

I think the Senator from Oregon will agree that I recalled there was one vote in opposition.

Mr. MORSE. It would have been very helpful if the Senator from Connecticut had suggested who it was who voted in opposition. Also if he had checked the record and refreshed his memory about

the vote he would have recalled that there had been a record vote.

Mr. BUSH. I thought I was protecting the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Oh, Mr. President, the Senator never need worry about protecting me. I do not ask anyone for protection on any position, at any time. I shall always be willing to stand on my record.

Mr. BUSH. I shall accept the Senator's warning, and henceforth I shall not be so careful.

But I say to the Senator from Oregon that the reason I did not mention his name was that he was not on the floor, and I was not quite clear how he eventually voted.

I recalled that he had opposed the bill, but I did not wish to put him in an awkward position, I say frankly, with his friends, the Senators from Alabama, because I was not sure what his ultimate position on the matter was.

I wish to say to the Senator from Oregon that I am very, very sorry to have caused him any inconvenience or embarrassment, and I am perfectly willing to apologize, if he thinks that is necessary.

Mr. MORSE. Let me assure the Senator from Connecticut that I never ask for apologies. In my opinion, apologies are just matters of formality, anyway. They never right a wrong.

Mr. BUSH. In my judgment they are not entirely that; sometimes they are called for.

Mr. President, if the Senator from Oregon imputes that I had any intention of harming him or misrepresenting him, I wish to say that certainly was not the case. There was never any such intention. Indeed, I tried to be rather careful, and I thought I was being careful, not to put him in an embarrassing position.

I assure the Senator from Oregon that is my explanation of the matter.

I am very glad the Senator from Oregon has brought up this matter; I do not like to have things of that sort carried around under cover, and I am very glad he has brought it up. I can say absolutely to the Senate and to the Senator from Oregon that I had no intention of misquoting him or misrepresenting him. My only intention was to protect him. Perhaps I should have mentioned his name in connection with the debate on the Coosa bill. I see now that I should have done so. But I wish to make very clear that my only intention was to protect the Senator from Oregon because he was not then on the floor.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to thank the Senator from Connecticut for his statement, which bears out my statement of the facts in connection with the proceedings in the Public Works Committee.

I wish to state that the statement he made on July 15, to the effect that it was his understanding that the vote in opposition in the committee had been changed, was a mistaken statement on his part, because at no time was my vote in the committee modified any way whatsoever. The official record of the committee was available to the

Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], and I regret that he did not refer to it accurately on June 15.

Let me say to the Senator from Connecticut that he never has to be concerned about protecting me with my so-called liberal friends, or anyone else. My liberal friends know me well enough to know that when I disagree with them on a particular point I never hesitate to oppose them, either in committee or on the floor of the Senate. I think that on this case my liberal friends were on the wrong side of the issue. But I wish to say they knew I was opposed to their bill. I respected the honesty and sincerity of their position, but I disagreed with them, and opposed their views.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I wish to say that the distinguished Senator from Oregon came to the Senator from Alabama and said to the Senator from Alabama, "I am opposed to this bill. I have opposed it; and I voted against it this morning in the Public Works Committee." That was the day when the Senator from Oregon had opposed the bill and had voted against it.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] for confirming my opposition to his bill. Mr. President, I also wish to say to the Senator from Connecticut that, so far as he is concerned, I have made this statement, that involves him, for the purpose of correcting the record, for I knew he would wish to have the record corrected.

I have made the statement also because it gives me, once again, an opportunity to illustrate to the people of my State that when they read the Smith column in the Oregon newspapers, they should take it with a grain of salt, because they should take into consideration the motivation of this correspondent who writes for a group of Oregon newspapers. Insofar as the junior Senator from Oregon is concerned, Mr. Smith simply cannot get it out of his craw that he is denied admission to my office. He will continue to be denied admission to my office because of the kind of smear stuff and inaccuracies that is spread in his column is typical of his writings generally, when it comes to the junior Senator from Oregon.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I wish to say the same thing that my colleague, the senior Senator from Alabama, has said. The distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] came to me personally and stated his views on this measure, and I had an opportunity to discuss it briefly with him.

I am in thorough sympathy and I am fully in accord with his views, as he has frequently expressed them here on the floor of the Senate, with reference to the situation in his area and the power development there.

Although I was not successful in making the distinguished Senator from Oregon agree with me about the Coosa bill,

yet I do not believe that the Coosa situation and the situation in Oregon are at all parallel. For the benefit of the record, I should like to state, if I may, several things that I think differentiate those situations. One is that the Coosa River has no public development whatsoever on it. However, it does have dams and installations which were put there by the Alabama Power Co., and which have been operated by the power company for many years.

Second, there is no partnership involvement whatsoever. The entire project is to be a private enterprise project, operated by the Alabama Power Co.

Third, it is an operation in a territory which is served exclusively by the Alabama Power Co., so there is no conflict as between public and private interests.

Furthermore, it is a development which lies wholly within one State, the State of Alabama. I believe it is well to have the record show the facts which serve to differentiate this project from many projects in other parts of the country.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from Alabama for his comments. The point of view he has expressed with regard to Coosa Dam is the point of view which he expressed in conference with me and a point of view which was expressed before the Public Works Committee. It is a point of view with respect to which we have an honest difference of opinion. I certainly respect his sincerity and his point of view but I do not agree with him.

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE APPROPRIATIONS, 1955

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9447) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next committee amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 2, after the previous committee amendment, to strike out the comma and "of which not more than \$60,000 shall be for international labor affairs."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, at the beginning of line 11, to strike out "\$665,000" and insert "\$680,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, what happened to the amendment on page 3, line 11?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That amendment was agreed to.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, the chairman of the subcommittee was not aware that that amendment had been agreed to. If it is the announcement of the Chair that the amendment has been agreed to, I respectfully ask unanimous consent that the vote by which the committee amendment on page 3, line 11, was agreed to be reconsidered.

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

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 3, line 11, it is proposed to strike out "\$680,000" and to insert in lieu thereof "\$780,000."

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, there is an additional section of the Amendment that I should like to have stated also.

The CHIEF CLERK. The second amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky is, on page 2, line 24, after the semicolon, to insert the following "not to exceed \$100,000 for improving the conditions of migratory labor."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment just stated is not an amendment to the committee amendment but to the bill.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] has proposed an identical or similar amendment, and with his consent I should like to have him joined as a cosponsor of my amendment if it is satisfactory to the Senator from New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from New York will be added as a cosponsor of the amendment. The Chair states that the second amendment, on page 2, offered by the Senator from Kentucky, is an amendment to the bill, not to the committee amendment. Unanimous consent is necessary for its consideration at this time.

Mr. COOPER. I ask unanimous consent that it may be considered at this time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky give us an explanation of his amendment? What is the purpose of it?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Reserving my right to object, I should like to have a statement on the amendment.

Mr. COOPER. The purpose of the amendment is to place in the bill \$100,000 for the Bureau of Labor Standards, to be used as a beginning of an action program to improve the conditions of migratory labor within the United States. It has nothing to do with labor forces which are brought in from without the United States, such as Mexican labor. It is a program which has been twice proposed by President Eisenhower, and proposed by the Secretary of Labor, Mr. Mitchell.

If the Senator from Texas desires, I can elaborate on it at this time, but at the moment all I am asking is unanimous consent that the amendment be considered, and that the second part of the amendment, which describes the purpose of the \$100,000 also be considered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, the purpose of my inquiry is to ascertain if the amendment proposed to be offered by the Senator from Kentucky is the amendment in which several citizens of my State are interested.

Archbishop Lucey of my State has written me that he felt it was very important that the Senate give consideration to the appropriation of \$100,000 for the purpose of studying and improving the migratory labor situation all over the Nation. I understand that the Bureau of the Budget recommended this appropriation, but the House and Senate committees have turned it down. Is that the item to which the Senator addresses his amendment?

Mr. COOPER. That is correct. The President recommended it in his budget message. The House committee did not include it in the bill. There was a vote taken in the House, and I believe it was defeated by a vote of 91 to 87. The Senate committee likewise did not include it in the bill which is now before the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I believe the amendment should be considered by the Senate, and I hope it will be considered. I certainly have no objection to it. This is a matter which greatly concerns some of the great humanitarian leaders of my State. I urge the Senate to adopt the amendment.

Mr. COOPER. I thank the distinguished Senator from Texas.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I should like to speak on the amendment which has been offered by the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] and by the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN].

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Has unanimous consent been given to offer the amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It has not been given. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], that the second amendment offered by him, on page 2, be considered at this time, and that both amendments be considered en bloc?

Mr. THYE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair hears no objection, and it is so ordered. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. This amendment has been before the Appropriations Committee for the past 2 years, the House considered it a year ago, it was also considered by the House and Senate committees this year, and both committees rejected it. This year the House considered it and rejected it. The Senate Appropriations Committee—first the subcommittee and then the full committee—gave consideration to this entire question, and finally rejected the proposed amendment.

As chairman of the subcommittee, I must convey to the Senate the information that this question was discussed and studied in committee at considerable length, and that the final decision of the committee, supported by a large percentage of the members of the full committee, was to reject the \$100,000 item.

Certainly the amendment has merit, and I should say that possibly it would be desirable to have such a study made.

But many other items in the appropriation bill were more compelling. That is why the committee did not make the funds available in the bill. For that reason, I must object to it, because I feel that after the full committee has taken action, I must support vigorously the objection which the full committee registered to the item.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I should like to explain briefly why I consider this amendment to be important.

As the distinguished Senator from Texas has brought out by his inquiry, the purpose of the amendment would be to place in the appropriation bill \$100,000, to be used by the Bureau of Labor Standards in correlating the work of the various Federal agencies and also of initiating or encouraging programs within the States to deal with the problem of migratory labor within the United States.

I know that in the past years many of us have read many official Government reports on this program. Aside from that there is a great body of literature of fiction and of studies bearing upon the problem of migratory labor within the United States.

All that literature and all the reports show the same picture. It is one of low wages and irregular employment, child labor, the lack of health and welfare services, irregular and intermittent education for children, juvenile delinquency, and crime.

A great deal has been done by some of the States and by charitable and private organizations and by churches toward meeting these unfortunate and unhappy conditions. Within the Government itself, it must be admitted, there are several agencies which deal in some way with this problem.

The Department of Agriculture has a placement service. The Child Bureau in the Department of Labor has an interest in it, as has the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare through the Office of Education.

There are many other agencies that consider the problem in one way or another. The purpose of the amendment, which may not be clear to some because it is a beginning effort on the part of the Federal Government, is to take steps to correlate and to bring together the activities of various agencies within the Federal Government itself, and direct them toward this problem and the attendant consequences of the problem.

It is also designed to take action whereby there may be given to the various States information about the problem itself, which relates to the 1 million agricultural workers who are in constant migration and movement, of the social consequences of this movement, of the steps that certain States are taking in an advanced way to meet these consequences, and to advise and encourage the various States themselves to provide assistance.

I am certain that it is a program which, if initiated, would receive a wide response from the States and from church and religious organizations, and from many social organizations throughout the country. The point I

make is that this problem has been with us for a long time.

As I said, it has been the subject of much literature. There has been nothing done by the Federal Government in an organized way.

President Eisenhower recognized this need and this problem in his budget message last year. He asked, as I remember, for the sum of \$200,000 for the Department of Labor to begin this program. It was denied by the House and was denied by the Senate.

This year, in his budget message, he again called the attention of the Congress to this problem and made the statement which I now quote:

The social and economic plight of migratory farmworkers has been studied repeatedly. Up to now little positive action to better these conditions has been taken by the Federal Government. This budget includes the recommended appropriation of \$100,000 to enable the Department of Labor to provide leadership in establishing a cooperative Federal-State program in the fiscal year 1955.

I should like also to read a brief statement made by Hon. James P. Mitchell, Secretary of Labor, before the Senate committee, in the conduct of its hearings on March 8, 1954, because I believe it is a good statement of the purposes of this amendment:

This item of \$100,000 is essentially for the same kind of a program, affecting the welfare of about 1 million workers, as was proposed to Congress for 1954. With these workers moving from State to State to meet seasonal labor needs, it becomes the responsibility of the Federal Government, I believe, to provide leadership in improving the conditions under which they work. I believe that the Department of Labor should take the initiative in attempting to find and work out constructive ways to improve their working conditions. The need for consultation and assistance to the States in trying to achieve solutions to this vexing problem, I believe, is immediate. There is an opportunity to do something through this program which will pay real dividends to the economy of the country in more stable and efficient labor and in a better way of life for the migrant workers and their children. Through our farm-placement program we have been able to do a good deal in the orderly recruitment and placement of these seasonal farmworkers, but the Department has a responsibility to give leadership and help in seeking solutions to the broader problems of community attitudes, services, and working conditions. It is such a program that the Bureau of Labor Standards proposes. I believe it will make all of our Department services in this field more effective. It will give the farmer better workers and at the same time help to give this underprivileged group of American families more nearly the American way of life for themselves and their children. I hope your committee will give favorable consideration to it.

I point out 2 or 3 reasons for the amendment which I think should address themselves to the Senate.

First. It is for the benefit of 1 million migratory workers who constantly follow the sun, follow the seasonal crops, in order to produce food which we need and which we eat.

Second. It is designed to provide better social and educational conditions for those persons and their children.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee and I have had a discussion and a conference with reference to the proposed amendment, and we agree that we will take the amendment to conference, if that will be satisfactory to the sponsor of the amendment.

Mr. COOPER. I thank the distinguished Senator.

I hope the reasons which addressed themselves to the President of the United States and to the Secretary of Labor will be considered, and I know that when the amendment is taken to conference the Senate conferees will follow the vote of the Senate and make every effort to hold it in the appropriation bill.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I am very glad, indeed, to support as a co-sponsor the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky. I had previously submitted an identical amendment. I am very glad, indeed, that the committee has agreed to take this amendment to conference. I very much hope it will be agreed to.

I have had a great deal of experience in connection with this subject. Some of the States have established on a voluntary basis certain departmental agencies to care for this situation. There are more than a million farm-labor migrants in this country, and they are all American citizens. I do not want any misunderstanding or confusion to take place in regard to the position of these men and women as compared with that of the so-called wetbacks. These people are American citizens. Their children are today receiving less education than their fathers and grandfathers received generations ago. They are completely cut off from all community service because they are only temporary residents of a community.

In New York State we have done a great deal to take care of the situation. In most of the States of the Union, however, the communities have not been so fortunate.

I very much hope that the amendment will receive approval in conference, and I am grateful to the distinguished chairman of the committee.

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, I am indeed happy to note that the chairman of the committee has indicated that he will take this amendment to conference. I am certainly in full support of the amendment, because it will improve the conditions of migrant workers.

It is high time that our Department of Labor has a specific appropriation and program for this purpose.

Illiteracy, ill health, child labor, poverty, community neglect, and hostility are the lot of thousands of American farm workers' families. How can democracy function under such conditions as these? They could be the very breeding grounds upon which communism might feed at home as well as abroad.

We know that technical assistance helps to fight these very conditions which

insidiously undermine the growth of democracy in other lands. We appropriate funds to support it. I say we need a few drops of technical aid at home to patch up some of the holes in America's own dike of democracy.

This proposed \$100,000 for the Department of Labor's Bureau of Labor Standards to develop a program for American agricultural migrant families is the few drops we need now, and need badly. We cannot afford not to spend these few thousand dollars to get rid of some of the conditions which breed despair and destruction of democracy within our own house.

For years there have been studies and surveys, and committees and commissions have been making recommendations, pointing out the sore spots in our agricultural economy. But the Government has done nothing, and the danger to our democracy grows worse. This appropriation item gives us a chance to demonstrate that the Congress really cares about the most downtrodden group of workers in the United States.

I am sure the committee will see to it that this \$100,000 appropriation is retained in the bill.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I am delighted to align myself in this instance with the junior Senator from Kentucky and the junior Senator from New York. I recognize the difficulties under which the Appropriations Committee and its subcommittees are laboring because of the multiplicity of recommendations and requests that come to them, but in this instance I should like to say that the Eisenhower administration has made a recommendation which should receive favorable consideration of the Congress with respect to caring for the million or more American citizens migrating, as they do, from one State to another, seeking gainful employment and taking part in the harvesting of our agricultural products.

We have the opportunity by approving the appropriation of \$100,000 to assist in the programs of the States of the American Union in alleviating the conditions under which American citizens who are classified as migrants and their families are living today. One hundred thousand dollars is a small enough start to take care of a million American citizens. It amounts to approximately 10 cents a head, on the basis of \$100,000, to be applied to a million individuals who are taking part in the production of agricultural commodities for the people of the United States.

So I very much hope, Mr. President, that the amendment will be adopted by the Senate, taken to conference, and finally retained in the bill, and thus, to the limited extent provided, the Federal Government will recognize a continuing problem faced by people who are poor, who have no homes, who are required, as was suggested earlier, to follow the sun from one State to another in order to earn a livelihood for themselves and for their families. Thus, we shall lead the way in improving the tragic lot of American migratory labor.

I very much hope the Senate will adopt the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing en bloc to the amendment to the bill on page 2, and to the committee amendment on page 3, offered by the Senator from Kentucky.

The amendments were agreed to. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Employment Security," on page 4, line 14, after the figures "\$1,100,000", to strike out "shall" and insert "may."

The amendment was agreed to. Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I call up my amendment designated "6-24-54-E," which is as follows: On page 4, line 13, delete "\$4,650,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$5,050,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona is not an amendment to a committee amendment. The committee amendments are still pending.

Mr. HAYDEN. I have no objection to the adoption of the committee amendments, but I should like to have my amendment disposed of now. I do not understand that there has been an agreement to consider committee amendments first.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Amendments to the bill may not be considered until after the committee amendments have been acted upon.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I may say that the Senator from Arizona has a very heavy schedule of attendance on conference committees. Therefore, in order to accommodate him, I should be perfectly willing, by unanimous consent, to agree to have his amendment considered now, rather than to have him wait until all committee amendments are disposed of. The item to which the Senator from Arizona refers is not a committee amendment. The \$4,650,000 in the Senate bill is the same figure as was passed by the House.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct. Mr. THYE. As I understand, the Senator from Arizona desires to offer an amendment which would increase the amount by \$400,000, so as to make the appropriation \$5,050,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona? The Chair hears none.

The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 4, line 13, it is proposed to delete "\$4,650,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$5,050,000."

Mr. HAYDEN. The Bureau of the Budget now admits that a mistake was made in reducing the appropriation for the Veterans' Employment Service by \$400,000, which would require it to reduce its personnel to the lowest point since before World War II.

The Veterans' Employment Service workload is increasing. There are now more than 20 million veterans. The number of veterans is increasing at the rate of from 75,000 to 100,000 a month.

Many veterans, particularly the Korean veterans, are experiencing difficulty in securing employment in the current labor market, or in otherwise making satisfactory adjustment to civilian life, and are requiring more specialized assistance from the Veterans' Employment Service.

The House reduced the amount requested in the budget by \$110,000 and then directed that the \$400,000 for the Veterans' Employment Service be taken from other activities of the Department of Labor. I have a statement from the Bureau of the Budget which shows what the effect of such action would be. To do so would eliminate the interstate farm information program which directs domestic migrant farm workers according to crop conditions.

It would eliminate labor market analysis, which shows current and near future employment by industry, and would restrict area labor market analysis solely to large areas. No analysis will be possible for smaller areas.

It would prevent a planned intensive drive against fraudulent claims payments and a proposed study of the adequacy of unemployment compensation benefits.

It would curtail Federal guidance on placement activities by the States and Federal clearinghouse operations.

It would create a backlog in audit of State operations.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the statement which I have obtained from the Bureau of the Budget be printed in full at this point in the RECORD.

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

The following tabulation compares the 1954 and 1955 budgets for the Bureau of Employment Security, salaries and expenses:

	Adjusted 1954	1955		1955 change House over budget
		Budget	House	
Veterans' Employment Service.....	\$1,073,400	\$700,000	\$1,100,000	+\$400,000
Remaining programs.....	4,200,000	4,060,000	3,550,000	-510,000
Total salaries and expenses.....	5,273,400	4,760,000	4,650,000	-110,000

While the total House cut is but \$110,000 the distribution reduces the non-Veterans Employment Service operations by \$510,000. The House action provides \$400,000 additional to the VES program at the expense of high-priority activities. The House figure: 1. Eliminates the interstate farm information program which directs domestic

migrant farm workers according to crop conditions.

2. Eliminates labor-market analysis which shows current and near future employment by industry; restricts area labor market analysis solely to large areas. No analysis will be possible for smaller areas; wipes out Federal assistance to local community

employment programs. These activities are especially pertinent, currently for programs seeking to decrease local unemployment.

3. Prevents a planned intensive drive against fraudulent claims payment and a proposed study on adequacy of unemployment compensation benefits.

4. Curtails Federal guidance on placement activities by the States and Federal clearinghouse operations under which one State's decisions and procedures are made available to all other States.

5. Creates a backlog in audit of State operations and requires heavy overtime in analysis and review of State budget requests.

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

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator from Arizona has made a statement that the Bureau of the Budget has made a mistake. Certainly that was not the evidence before our committee, as the Senator will remember. Does the Senator have a letter from the Bureau, or upon what authority does he make the statement. I should like to know if the Senator has an unsigned memorandum or a signed letter. Also, I desire to know if the Bureau of the Budget stands behind the statement of the Senator that the Bureau has made a mistake.

Mr. HAYDEN. I made inquiry as to what the effect of the change would be, and this is its statement.

Mr. BRIDGES. I am not questioning the Senator's word, as he well knows. Certainly, anything he says in serious vein, I believe. But I wish to know something about the situation.

Has the Senator from Arizona any communication from the Bureau of the Budget, in writing, which could be used in the committee of conference or anywhere else, which states that the Bureau has made a mistake?

Mr. HAYDEN. I have placed this statement in the RECORD. If the Senator from New Hampshire inquires of the Bureau of the Budget in regard to it, he will find that the Bureau will stand behind the statement.

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

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. THYE. The Senator from Arizona has stated that the Bureau of the Budget is willing to agree that it made a mistake in its budget recommendation. The subcommittee which conducted hearings on the question had no such information.

In the bill as it came from the House it was specifically stated that \$1,100,000 was for a Veterans' Administration fund, and contained the word "shall." The Senate committee struck out the word "shall" and inserted in lieu thereof the word "may."

Mr. HAYDEN. That change from "shall" to "may" helps some, but it does not take care of the entire situation.

Mr. THYE. Yes. But the subcommittee which held hearings did not receive information that the Bureau of the Budget had made an error. This is the language of the request made to the committee:

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the general administration of the employment service and unemployment compensation programs, including tempor-

ary employment of persons, without regard to the civil-service laws, for the farm placement migratory-labor program; and not to exceed \$10,000 for services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a).

Following that is a recommendation that the amount should be changed from \$4,650,000 to \$4,760,000.

That information was received by us simply as a departmental recommendation; we received no evidence that the Bureau of the Budget had conceded they had made a mistake.

Mr. HAYDEN. I understand; but when the Bureau of the Budget learned of the action taken by the House, and became aware of what the effect of that action would be, they made a statement which I have placed in the RECORD, and which can be verified by contacting the Bureau of the Budget.

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

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. I have a letter from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget dated June 21, 1954, which is a very recent letter. I should like to have the attention of Senators while I read it, because it is not in accordance with the statement which the Senator from Arizona has made. It reads as follows:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE
OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D. C., June 21, 1954.

HON. STYLES BRIDGES,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR BRIDGES: In the course of marking up the 1955 appropriation bill for the Department of Labor, you may wish to give consideration to the effects of the House action on the salaries and expenses of the Bureau of Employment Security. A brief statement is enclosed which summarizes these effects.

The Secretary of Labor feels that if the House action stands, as compared with the President's budget, the work of the Bureau will be crippled very seriously in a number of basic activities. As you know, the major costs in the Department's budget are those associated with the employment service and unemployment compensation programs, and it would seem very important to continue the basic work which affects the soundness of these large operations. The recommendations shown in the President's budget reflected our best judgment on the priorities.

Sincerely yours,

ROWLAND HUGHES,
Director.

In other words, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget still stands on his statement made before the committee with respect to the original budget. That is what has bothered me, in connection with what the Senator from Arizona seeks to do.

Mr. HAYDEN. That may be, but the Bureau of the Budget confesses, in the letter which the Senator from New Hampshire has read and in the statement which I have presented, that the reduction would have very adverse effects on a number of activities of the Department of Labor.

Mr. BRIDGES. In the letter to me the Bureau does not make such a concession; it says it stands on the original budget.

Mr. HAYDEN. What can be done is to take my amendment to conference; then the conferees can take up the question with the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. BRIDGES. If that is done, it will give us an opportunity to ascertain exactly where the Bureau of the Budget stands. But certainly the committee acted in good faith.

Mr. HAYDEN. I am not charging anyone with bad faith.

Mr. BRIDGES. I understand that. The Senator from Arizona and I may differ on questions, but we never will challenge anyone's good faith. In this instance, the Senator has information different from that which the committee received.

Mr. HAYDEN. I have already placed the memorandum from the Bureau of the Budget in the RECORD.

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

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. If I understand correctly, the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona would increase the amount for the Bureau of Employment Security \$400,000?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

Mr. CARLSON. I am somewhat familiar, of course, with the problems of the Appropriations Committee, and I sympathize with it, and therefore I do not like to come on the floor of the Senate and urge increases. However, I have made an investigation of the Bureau of Employment Security and I believe the effect on it of the reduced appropriation would be most unfortunate. I sincerely hope the committee will take the amendment to conference and consider it. I urge the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. THYE. The Budget Bureau recommended \$110,000 more than the House committee or the Senate committee were willing to approve. I should like to have the attention of the distinguished Senator from Arizona. I will be very frank and state that as chairman of the subcommittee I put a question mark on the item as I carried it from the subcommittee to the full committee. I personally feel we were conservative in appropriating for the item. I make that statement in all frankness. However, I do not believe that we should go to the extent of adopting the full increase proposed by the Senator from Arizona, because the Senator is proposing to increase the item by \$400,000, and the Budget Bureau recommended an increase of only \$110,000 above what both the House and Senate committees agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. I am sure that the Senator from Minnesota will agree with me that we do not wish to have anything happen to the other divisions of the Labor Department which will seriously cripple their ability to perform the duties imposed upon them by law. I suggest that the amendment increasing the item \$400,000 be agreed to, which will restore the \$110,000 cut made by the committees of both Houses. It will provide \$75,000 with which to pay terminal leave costs due to reduction in personnel. As opposed to the cut by the Bureau of the Budget of \$1,100,000 for the Employment

Service, it would give the Secretary of Labor maximum flexibility.

If the amount is taken to conference and a compromise is reached on a figure anywhere between \$110,000 and \$400,000, the Senator from Arizona will be satisfied.

Mr. THYE. The Senator from Arizona means, as I understand, that he desires that we go above the Budget Bureau recommendation, and take the full \$400,000 increase to conference?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. THYE. Of course, the Senator from Arizona will be one of the conferees.

Mr. HAYDEN. No, I will not, I am not a member of the subcommittee which considered this bill.

Mr. THYE. The Senator is correct. The Senator from Arizona is on so many conferences that I thought he would be on this one.

Mr. HAYDEN. No; I shall not be. The pending item was brought to my attention, and it certainly is worthy of the attention of the conferees, in view of the reductions in clerical force which would take place which would affect persons who had been employed there for more than 10 years. If the reduction in appropriation is adhered to, \$75,000 will have to be paid in terminal leave benefits. I am sure the Senate does not want that to happen. When the increased amount is taken to conference, I am sure that contact can be made with representatives of the Department of Labor and the Bureau of the Budget to the end that no undue hardship will be incurred for lack of necessary funds.

Mr. THYE. I must call to the Senator's attention the fact that the \$400,000 increase which the Senator proposes is \$290,000 above the Budget Bureau's recommendation in the first instance. That would make it exceedingly difficult for me, as subcommittee chairman, to take such a sum to conference.

I should be perfectly satisfied and agreeable if the Senator from Arizona would modify his amendment so that the increase would be in the amount recommended by the Budget Bureau, \$110,000, because, as I have frankly stated, I had a question mark on this item when I carried it from the subcommittee to the full committee. I felt that the subcommittee had been too conservative. However, for me to state that I would be willing to take to conference an item which is \$290,000 above the recommendation of the Budget Bureau would be inconsistent with a subcommittee chairman's responsibility to the full committee.

Mr. HAYDEN. If the Senator from Minnesota feels that way about it, I modify my amendment by proposing to increase the amount \$110,000, instead of \$400,000.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I shall be very happy to take the item to conference with that increase, because we would not be exceeding the Budget Bureau's recommendation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Arizona, as modified.

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next committee amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 5, line 7, after the word "which", to strike out "\$16,400,000" and insert "\$6,000,000." The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, line 11, after the word "paid", to insert "or salary costs resulting from changes in compensation plans."

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, the subcommittee chairman, will recall that we had a discussion as to what the meaning of this language was.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I do not like to interfere, but I should like to state that this is an amendment in which the Senator from New Hampshire suggested 2 or 3 words. Then a member of the committee very quickly moved to add to the language suggested. The Senator from New Hampshire did not exactly know at that time what the legal interpretation of the additional words would be. The Senator from New Hampshire now thinks that the original language would be better than that of the committee amendment.

Mr. HILL. I wish to say to the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire that the Senator from Alabama rose to make that very statement. He thinks that the original language of the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire is the proper language. The words "or salary costs" are what we seek to have in the bill.

Mr. President, I move to amend the committee amendment on page 5, line 11, by striking out after the word "costs" the words "resulting from changes in compensation plans."

As I think the Senator from New Hampshire implied, if the Senate agrees to the amendment there will be adopted what was in the mind of the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire and what was the intention of the committee at the time the committee reported the bill.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, the amendment to the amendment is perfectly agreeable to me, because the author of the amendment concedes that there was some doubt as to the legal interpretation of the additional words.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment to the committee amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In the committee amendment on page 5, in lines 11 and 12, it is proposed to strike out the words "resulting from changes in compensation plans."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next committee amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 8, line 3, to strike out "\$1,521,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,581,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 10, line 17, to strike out "\$6,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$6,100,000."

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, I call up my amendment to the committee amendment, which is designated 6-24-54-H.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment to the committee amendment proposed by the Senator from Maine.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 10, line 17, it is proposed to strike out "\$6,100,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$6,233,000."

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, I should like to speak briefly on behalf of my amendment to restore the fiscal 1955 appropriations for the Wage and Hour Division, Department of Labor, to \$6,233,000, the amount recommended by the Bureau of the Budget.

It was with genuine concern that I saw Congress last year approve a sizable reduction in operating funds for this Division charged with proper enforcement of the laws that insure minimum labor standards and wages to the American workman and woman. It is with even greater concern that I again see this year the moneys recommended by the Bureau of the Budget for this Division being reduced by congressional action.

The Wage and Hour Division has jurisdiction and primary responsibility for the enforcement of the Fair Labor Standards Act, which insures to the American worker a minimum wage, the Davis-Bacon Construction Act and the Walsh-Healey Public Contract Act which insure to the American worker engaged on Government contracts comparable standards and wages to those prevailing in similar private industries and construction companies.

The appropriations for this Division since 1951, the year of its highest appropriation, are as follows:

For 1951, \$9,396,400.

For 1952, \$8,510,000.

For 1953, \$7,639,139.

For 1954, \$6,250,000.

For 1955, \$6,000,000 passed by the House, \$6,100,000 reported out by the Senate Appropriations Committee, contrasted with \$6,233,000 approved by the Budget Bureau and identical with the amount of my amendment.

Last year the reduction of over \$1 million in the appropriation resulted in the closing of 22 field offices of this Division and the dismissal of over 300 employees.

If the proposed reduction occurs, the current employment of this Division—of 1,043 people—will be reduced to an alltime low of 1,009 people. This compares with the maximum employment of 1951 of over 1,800 people.

The brunt of this year's reduction in force will be borne by the Investigation Division, which has been making the inspections for possible law violations. According to figures of the Department of Labor, the number of Wage and Hour Investigators—who also do Walsh-Healey inspection—is down to 493 during the current fiscal year, as compared to 852 in 1951, 740 in 1952, and 612 in 1953. The 493 figure is even lower than the number in 1942, when there were 529 inspectors. Two years ago, some 40,000 inspections were made. Last year despite reductions, about the same total

was reached, except that—very significantly—the inspections had to be of the short-cut type, meaning limited employee interviews and a cursory inspection of the plant. From the division's viewpoint, this is a very unsatisfactory way of finding out whether the law is being obeyed. It should be emphasized here that roughly about one-half of these inspections show violations of the minimum-wage requirements.

STATISTICS

In 1941, about 48,500 firms were inspected, and more than 31,000 were found in violation, with more than 18,000 requiring restitution of wages. This pattern has held up fairly consistently throughout the years, with more than 50 percent of the inspected firms being found in violation—in some years in major violation—of the act.

In 1949, before the 75-cent-minimum rate became effective, there were more than 32,000 inspections, and more than 18,000 firms were found in violation. In 1951, there were more than 26,000 inspections, with almost 19,000 firms being found in violation of the act—more than 6,000 in violation of the minimum wage. The same generally was true in 1952 and 1953, with 24,000 out of 41,000 and 20,000 out of 38,000 found in violation. In these 2 years the minimum-wage violations were over 7,000 and over 4,000, respectively. The same trend continues into 1954.

In 1941, Congress expressed the opinion, that at least 14 or 15 percent of covered firms should be inspected. This percentage has never been reached. Twelve percent was reached in 1 year, but this amount gradually sank to around 4 percent in 1950, and now is scarcely more than 5 percent. Only 5 percent of the covered firms are inspected within any 1 year.

And now, with enforcement personnel being reduced, the number of firms and employees to be inspected has increased appreciably, adding to the difficulties of proper enforcement. In 1940, 250,000 firms, with 12,652,700 employees, were covered by the Wage and Hour Act. Today, more than 715,000 firms, with around 21 million employees are covered by the act.

Also of particular concern this year will be the serious effect of these reductions upon the enforcement of these laws in Puerto Rico, where the Territorial government as well as industry on that island have been requesting action regarding substandard wage conditions. If this reduction is carried out, the present system of using two industrial committees on the island—of 9 members each: 3 from labor, 3 from management, and 3 from the general public—will be reduced to 1 industrial committee. This will mean, contrary to the express provisions of section 8 of the Fair Labor Standards Act, that the minimum wage rates for a particular industry in Puerto Rico could be reviewed on an average of only once every 7 years. This time lag in reviewing will exist at a time when many Puerto Rican workers are receiving minimum wages of 30 cents and even 18 cents an hour, in industries competing with industries on the mainland.

The maximum effect of this proposed reduction will, therefore, be felt in enforcing one of our basic labor laws—the minimum-wage law. The effect would also be felt in enforcing the Davis-Bacon and Walsh-Healey Acts.

In 1950, Reorganization Plan No. 14 clearly contemplated enforcement of the Davis-Bacon Public Contracts Act by a Labor Department staff especially trained for that purpose, instead of the unsatisfactory practice of relying upon contracting officers and investigating only 2 or 3 of the more aggravated violations a year. Despite the plan and despite repeated requests for modest appropriations to train a specialized inspecting staff, nothing more has been done to execute the intent of this reorganization plan, because funds have not been made available.

The change from a total of over \$9¼ million, 5 years ago, and over 1,800 employees to less than two-thirds of this amount and one-half the number of employees, shows the gradual, almost systematic destruction of the effectiveness of this Division of the Department of Labor in protecting the standards and safeguarding the minimum wages of the American working man and woman.

My amendment would put into law the judgment and recommendation of the Bureau of the Budget as to what funds are necessary to operate this department in the coming year. At the same time, my amendment would make more certain that the capable, hard-working staff of the Wage and Hour Division can do the work Congress intended it should do, namely, the proper enforcement of the Fair Labor Standards Act, the Davis-Bacon Act, and the Walsh-Healey Act.

For these reasons, Mr. President, I sincerely hope that those of my colleagues who believe in the continuation of an effective Wage and Hour Division will support my amendment to increase this appropriation to the amount recommended by the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. President, if we are to continue on the statute books the laws passed by Congress, then we, in turn, must give the departments and agencies we charge with the responsibility of carrying out those laws, adequate tools with which to work.

It is foolish to cripple an agency, by stripping it of the means of carrying out a law. Better it is to eliminate the law from the statute books. So, Mr. President, I hope very much that my amendment to the committee amendment will be adopted.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I wish to say to the distinguished Senator from Maine that the testimony the subcommittee received at the hearings supports the contention of the Senator from Maine that the amount appropriated by the bill is too small. I am aware of the fact that, as chairman of the subcommittee, I have the responsibility of supporting the action taken by the full committee, as well as the action taken by the subcommittee. Nevertheless, judging from the testimony we received in the hearings, I felt that the House of Representatives had been too conservative in this respect, and I recommended to the subcommittee and also to the full

committee that the full amount recommended by the Bureau of the Budget namely, \$6,233,000, be allowed.

Therefore, Mr. President, I am willing to take to conference the amendment of the Senator from Maine, for the reason that, judging from the testimony given at the hearings, we recognize that the amount voted by the House of Representatives was a very conservative one and might result in handicapping the Department in connection with its making of the necessary inspections to enforce the acts Congress previously has placed on the statute books, and has charged the Department with the responsibility of enforcing. From the testimony we received at the hearings, I recognize that situation. Therefore, I am willing to accept the amendment and take it to conference, even though I am not unmindful of the fact that, as chairman of the subcommittee, I have the responsibility of upholding the judgment of the full committee.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, I should like to express my thanks and appreciation to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, as a member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I wish to express my thanks to the chairman of the subcommittee, who is in charge of the pending bill, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], who not only has indicated a desire to be cooperative, but also has indicated that he wishes to see this sum restored.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Maine to the committee amendment on page 10, line 17.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

LOBBYING WITH APPROPRIATED MONEYS

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, title XVIII of the United States Code, on the subject of Crimes and Criminal Procedure, reads as follows:

UNITED STATES CODE, TITLE 18, CRIMES AND CRIMINAL PROCEDURE

SEC. 1913. Lobbying with appropriated moneys: No part of the money appropriated by any enactment of Congress shall, in the absence of express authorization by Congress, be used directly or indirectly to pay for any personal service, advertisement, telegram, telephone, letter, printed or written matter, or other device, intended or designed to influence in any manner a Member of Congress, to favor or oppose, by vote or otherwise, any legislation or appropriation by Congress, whether before or after the introduction of any bill or resolution proposing such legislation or appropriation; but this shall not prevent officers or employees of the United States or of its departments or agencies from communicating to Members of Congress, through the proper official channels, requests for legislation or appropriations which they deem necessary for the efficient conduct of the public business.

Whoever, being an officer or employee of the United States or of any department or agency thereof, violates or attempts to violate this section, shall be fined not more than \$500 or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both; and after notice and hearing by the

superior officer vested with the power of removing him, shall be removed from office or employment (June 25, 1948, ch. 645, sec. 1, 62 Stat. 792, effective Sept. 1, 1948).

Mr. President, last week I offered an amendment to one of the appropriation bills. The purpose of the amendment was to limit the use of Government funds for the expansion of the commercial-broiler industry. The amendment was adopted by the Senate, without opposition. I was very much surprised to find that, under date of June 22, 1954, 5 telegrams, costing an average of over \$25 apiece, were sent by a Government agency to the conferees and also to the chairmen of the respective committees, all at Government expense. The telegrams are too lengthy to be printed in the RECORD, but they express opposition to the amendment. The telegrams were sent by Mr. J. B. E. LaPlante, general agent, Farm Credit Administration, of Louisville, Ky. Mr. President, that represented \$125 worth of telegrams—5 telegrams—any one of which could have been sent by airmail and would have arrived practically as soon.

At any rate, the telegrams were sent for the direct purpose—as can be noted from their contents—of influencing the action of the conferees on this particular amendment.

I am referring this matter to both the Civil Service Commission and the Department of Justice, because I think we might just as well establish whether the Government agencies can use Government funds to send \$25 telegrams for the purpose of influencing the decisions of Congress. I have checked with Mr. Young, Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, and have been advised that the employees of the Federal Credit Bank, the employees of the Federal intermediate banks, the employees of the Production Credit Bank, the Bank for Cooperatives, and Federal land banks, are all under schedule A, and as such are accepted as civil-service employees. About 10 or 12 positions in the Farm Credit Administration are under schedule C. These are primarily jobs in Washington. All regional directors are under schedule C. They are still eligible for civil-service retirement and practically all are under retirement. So there is no question that these were employees of the Government and were recognized as such.

I fully recognize the responsibility of these agents and men in the field to express their opinions, whether they are for or against any legislation which happens to be pending, and I will defend that right. At the same time, I think it is a little out of line when they send \$25 telegrams and charge them to the American taxpayers.

The conferees dropped this amendment, not because of this telegram, since it did not arrive until about 6 hours after the conference committee had agreed. I am not here to criticize the conference committee or its action, even though I disagree with its decision. However, I wish to point out one misrepresentation in connection with this amendment; and that is, that it involves such great danger and would cause such great hardship

to the many little farmers scattered throughout the country.

The substance of this telegram is that there is a vast majority of little farmers who would be affected by the amendment and that they should be safeguarded. It is said that the private farm must be protected. I agree with that but what is overlooked entirely is the fact that the amendment excluded 85 percent of all the loans made by any of the agencies affected.

It is said that some of the small farmers would have been put out of business if the amendment had been adopted. I wish to outline briefly a description of some of the poor little fellows who are up against it so desperately and who are using some of this Government money.

One of these little fellows who obtained a loan from the Farm Credit Administration is Mr. Otto Zurcher, of Arapahoe, Colo. Mr. Zurcher borrowed \$58,100 from the Farm Credit Administration. In listing his sources of income other than his farming operations he indicated that for the next 6 months perhaps he might make \$2,600.

The Department in approving the loan states very clearly that the loan was granted to help this individual pay off his creditors, who were pressing him for immediate payment of their bills. This particular man evidently was up against the wall and would not be able to continue his operations without this particular loan.

What was not explained at the time was that the loan was largely used to pay off a loan which the same man had with another Government agency. He was borrowing money from one Government agency to pay another.

Also it was not brought out at the time that this so-called little farmer was operating quite a construction business through the Federal Housing Administration guaranty on loans under title I. He was building several houses and had received Government guaranties on more than \$1 million in mortgages.

Speaking further of this same little fellow, after he obtained this loan to assist him in order that he might continue as a little farmer, he built a restaurant. He is also operating a rather elaborate tourist camp supposedly all with Government funds.

So I think we might as well get it straight as to who is interested in whom and that it is not the little farmers who are protesting the adoption of this amendment.

On reading an application for another of these loans that happened to be granted in the same agency which is protesting so strenuously this particular amendment, I find that another gentleman applied for a loan of \$16,675. He, too, is very hard up. He is up against the wall, and he required this loan in order to continue his necessary farming operations. I notice that in his application he lists his average yearly professional income at \$12,000 a year. He happens to be a doctor. He lists his income at \$12,000 a year, but I suppose the Department of Agriculture thought it necessary in this age of surpluses to finance this doctor, who lists his income

at \$12,000 a year, in order that he may operate a farm in competition with bona fide farmers who are actually dependent upon farm income.

I suppose they thought there was some justification in this particular case because in reviewing this doctor's financial statement we find that the doctor was down to his last Cadillac. He listed only 1 jeep and 1 Cadillac. I suppose that is another little fellow the officials in the Department had in mind when they opposed my amendment.

They keep emphasizing that the average amount of loan is very small. They claim that 85 percent of all the loans made go to the little fellows. That is true; but if we examine the statistics we find that this 85 percent representing so-called small borrowers is getting only about 5 or 10 percent of the money which is being loaned. Furthermore, this 85 percent would not be affected by my amendment.

In examining the loans made by the same agency which is protesting against the amendment, I ran across another interesting case. Three loans for commercial broiler expansion were made in the State of Ohio. It was said that the average of the three loans was \$11,721. However, one can prove almost anything with figures. It is rather interesting to examine the breakdown in that particular case. We find that there were only three loans involved. One man obtained a loan for \$1,550, another for \$2,230, neither of which would have been affected by the amendment I offered. However, the third loan was for \$31,384—making the average loan \$11,721.

An interesting fact about the \$31,384 loan was that again it was not an individual who was operating his own farm who received the loan. This man was not connected with the medical profession nor was he a builder. At the time he obtained his loan, he was working in the Department of Agriculture in the city of Washington. He borrowed the money to build a \$36,000 broiler house on his farm in the State of Ohio. The loan was for the construction of broiler houses which it is estimated would provide a capacity for producing about 100,000 broilers every 3 or 4 months.

At the same time the Agriculture Department approved this loan, the Department of Agriculture was sending out instructions to other broiler-producing areas urging farmers to cut back their production on the basis there was a great oversupply.

The official to whom I have reference is J. Frank Kendrick. In 1951, at the time he obtained this loan, Mr. Kendrick was working for the Department of Agriculture here in the city of Washington, in the Dairy Herd Improvement Investigations Division of the Bureau of Dairy Industry, Agricultural Research Administration. He was drawing \$8,400 a year. Mr. Kendrick was later promoted, and today he is serving as the head of the Regional Experiment Stations, Dairy Herd Improvement Investigations Division of the Bureau of Dairy Industry, Agricultural Research Administration, in Washington, D. C., and is drawing \$9,360 a year. It is he who urged the

recommendation of his own loan by another lending division in the same Department, whereby he received this loan of \$31,384 for the construction of commercial broiler-producing houses in order that he could compete, with the help of Government money, against the same farmers for whom he has expressed such great sympathy.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a letter from Mr. R. B. McLeaish, Administrator of the Farmers' Home Administration, in which he confirms this particular case.

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

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., June 22, 1954.
Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: This is in preliminary reply to your letter of June 14 requesting a report of any instances which have come to my attention wherein Government funds for the expansion of the poultry industry have been loaned either direct to Federal employees or to companies in which they were affiliated.

We are undertaking a field survey to secure the answer to your question and, incidentally, are taking the opportunity to find out how many loans might have been made to Federal employees for any purpose. The only loan made to a Federal employee that has come to my personal attention, I discovered as a result of your earlier inquiry concerning loans to anyone to engage in the business of commercial broiler production. This particular loan is one which should never have been made, and I am grateful to you for raising questions which brought it to my attention. The loan was made on March 14, 1951, to an individual employed by the Department of Agriculture in Washington in the amount of \$27,000 under title V of the Housing Act of 1949. The loan was made by our county office at Troy, Ohio, on a farm the individual owns in Champaign County, Ohio. With the proceeds of the loan, plus additional funds and materials which he contributed, a commercial broiler house costing \$31,384 and a house costing \$6,258 were constructed.

My investigation of the case indicates that the applicant had assets of about \$62,000 with no debts, and should not have been given the loan under the existing instructions of the agency, though it appears to have been legally permissible. The loan file discloses a letter written from the Washington office to the State director in Ohio criticizing the making of the loan, and asking that the State director call upon the borrower to refinance the loan as soon as possible. The authority to require the borrower to refinance when he is able to do so is part of the note. Since this matter has come to my attention, I have personally talked to the borrower and have called upon him to refinance his loan which he has agreed to do, if possible, within a 30-day period. Among other things, I pointed out that the making of this loan resulted in denying loans to 5 or 6 applicants who were deserving of assistance. The payments on the loan are current. Of course, it is a long-term 20-year loan and \$24,589 is still outstanding.

We expect to have our field survey completed within a few weeks and we will make a complete reply to your letter at that time.
Sincerely yours,

R. B. MCLEAISH,
Administrator.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I wish to emphasize at this point that I am not criticizing Mr. McLeaish for his administration of his agency. These loans took place prior to his appointment. In fact, it is only through the cooperation of men like Mr. McLeaish that we have been able to uncover the fact that large sums of money are being used to finance excessive loans for the construction of commercial broiler houses.

Mr. President, it seems rather strange to find an agency of the Government using Government funds for the purpose of protesting the adoption of an amendment which unquestionably has the endorsement of 90 percent of the farmers in our area and I venture to say in every other area of the country so far as legitimate farming operations are concerned.

Again I pay my respects to Mr. McLeaish for the prompt action which he took in stopping this unsound practice in his agency. I hope other administrators will reexamine their own policy and likewise take action to protect the real farmers of this country.

I am referring this case both to the Civil Service Commission and to the Department of Justice, and I believe it should receive their very careful study.

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE APPROPRIATIONS, 1955

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9447) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] may offer an amendment to the bill at this time, out of order, because he must meet a commitment elsewhere.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from West Virginia may offer his amendment.

Mr. NEELY. I send the amendment to the desk and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from West Virginia will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 12, line 18, it is proposed to strike out the figure "\$5,100,000" and to insert in lieu thereof the figure "\$5,200,000."

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, the purpose of this amendment is to restore the \$100,000 which the House slashed from the amount recommended by the Bureau of the Budget. It is necessary to enable the efficient and indispensable Food and Drug Administration to discharge its duty in a proper manner.

It is my hope that the amendment will be unanimously adopted.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I wish to support the proposed amendment and say that testimony given before the subcommittee would completely justify the Food and Drug Administration having appropriated to it the sum of \$5,200,000. The additional \$100,000, of course, would

be for the Food and Drug Inspection Service.

The question is one which the Committee on Appropriations had considered at some length, but finally the committee had to agree to the sum of \$5,100,000. I am willing to take the amendment to conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] on page 12, line 18.

The amendment was agreed to.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next committee amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "General Provisions," on page 10, after line 24, to insert:

SEC. 103. Not to exceed 5 percent of any appropriation in this title available for salaries and expenses may be transferred to any other such appropriation, but no such appropriation shall be increased by more than 5 percent by any such transfer: *Provided*, That no such transfer shall be used for creation of new functions within the Department, nor shall the total amount transferred in fiscal year 1955 exceed \$100,000.

The amendment was agreed to.
The next amendment was, under the heading "Title II—Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—American Printing House for the Blind," on page 11, line 14, after "(20 U. S. C. 101)", to strike out "\$175,000" and insert "\$205,000."

The amendment was agreed to.
The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office of Education," on page 16, line 22, after the word "amended", to strike out "\$55,000,000" and insert "\$58,500,000"; and in line 24, after the word "act", to insert a colon and "*Provided further*, That the 3 percent deduction provided for in section 3 (c) (1) of Public Law 874, 81st Congress, as amended, shall not take effect for any fiscal year beginning prior to July 1, 1955."

The amendment was agreed to.
The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office of Vocational Rehabilitation," on page 19, line 10, to strike out "\$620,000" and insert "\$650,000."

The amendment was agreed to.
The next amendment was, under the subhead "Public Health Service," on page 19, line 17, after the word "Corps", to insert "and expenses for primary and secondary schooling for dependents of personnel of the service stationed outside the continental limits of the United States in amounts not exceeding \$225 per student when the Surgeon General finds that schools available in the locality are unable to provide adequately for the education of such dependents."

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, at the time the committee gave consideration to this item there was a bill before the Subcommittee on Armed Services of the Committee on Appropriations, and the committee agreed that we would modify and amend the appropriation bill so as to be consistent with the bill which would be reported from that subcommittee.

So I offer an amendment to the committee amendment to increase the sum of \$225 per student to the sum of \$235.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered

by the Senator from Minnesota to the committee amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 19, line 20, it is proposed to strike "\$225" and insert "\$235."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next committee amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 20, line 22, after the figures "\$6,000,000", to insert "of which not less than \$4,500,000 shall be available only for grants to States, to be matched by an equal amount of State funds expended for the same purpose, for direct expenses of case-finding projects, including salaries, fees, and travel of personnel directly engaged in case finding and the necessary equipment and supplies used directly in case-finding operations, but excluding the purchase of care in hospitals and sanatoria."

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, let me say to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota that I am sure the committee had no intention or design to do anything which might be harmful to the tuberculosis programs in the various States. I know the committee wanted to help to encourage those programs. We try to see to it that the States and local communities do their fair part. I think the committee amendment as now written might result in a great harm.

To the committee amendment I should like to offer an amendment to insert on page 20, line 24, after the word "State", the words "and local," so that the matching would be not only of State funds, but of State and local funds.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I have no objections to the addition of the words "and local." The question has been studied and discussed, and the amendment is perfectly agreeable.

Mr. HILL. On page 21, line 3, I should like to insert after the word "in" the words "prevention and", so that the language would read "directly in prevention and case-finding operations."

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I have no objection to that amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendments offered by the Senator from Alabama to the committee amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the committee amendment it is proposed to insert in line 24, on page 20, after the word "State", the words "and local", and on page 21, line 3, to insert after the word "in", the words "prevention and."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments to the committee amendment.

The amendments to the amendment were agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is now on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, there are a number of amendments to which I think there will be no objection. I wonder if the Senator from Minnesota does not want to follow what has become more or less the usual practice, to have all the committee amendments agreed to with the understanding that reconsideration can be had.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, the only reason I have not suggested that is because I wanted Senators who had some commitments to have an opportunity to offer their amendments out of order.

Mr. HILL. I was suggesting that we follow the procedure which is often followed where there are a number of minor amendments to which there is no objection, and agree to the amendments en bloc with the understanding that any Senator can offer an amendment to any of the committee amendments.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, the only reason why I did not make such a request is because there are certain amendments in the bill which should be called to the attention of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 22, line 11, after the figures "\$1,125,000", to strike out the comma and "of which not less than \$160,000 shall be available only for the activation and operation of the two immobilized marine health units "Health" and "Hygiene."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 22, line 23, after the word "amended", to strike out "\$750,000" and insert "\$950,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 25, line 2, after the word "act", to strike out "\$21,237,000" and insert "\$22,737,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 25, line 6, to strike out "\$13,460,000" and insert "\$14,460,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 25, line 9, to strike out "\$16,168,000" and insert "\$17,168,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 25, line 13, after the word "conditions", to strike out "\$1,740,000" and insert "\$1,990,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 25, line 16, after the word "diseases", to strike out "\$7,270,000" and insert "\$9,270,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 25, line 21, to strike out "\$5,930,000" and insert "\$6,430,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 25, line 24, after the word "blindness", to strike out "\$6,913,000" and insert "\$8,413,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "St. Elizabeths Hospital," on page 27, line 14, after the word "Administration", to insert a colon and "Provided further, That the services financed

by this appropriation shall be included in the term "care" as used in section 2 of the act of August 4, 1947 (24 U. S. C. 168a)."

The amendment was agreed to. The next amendment was, on page 27, after line 17, to insert:

Construction, maximum security building: For the preparation of tentative drawings for a maximum security building at Saint Elizabeths Hospital, \$110,000: *Provided*, That with respect to construction of new facilities hereafter authorized the per diem rate calculated for the District of Columbia pursuant to section 2 of the act of August 4, 1947 (24 U. S. C. 168a), shall include a proportionate share of the annual increment of the depreciated total cost of such construction, such depreciation to be based on the estimated life, not exceeding 40 years, of such construction, to be determined by the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, beginning with the fiscal year following completion of construction, and such proportionate share shall be deposited in the Treasury to the credit of miscellaneous receipts.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Social Security Administration," on page 28, line 13, after the word "than", to strike out "\$64,150,000" and insert "\$64,650,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 28, line 23, after the word "year", to insert a colon and "Provided, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for payments to a State under titles I, IV, and X for administration of the State plan in excess of 7 percent of the Federal share of assistance payments under each such plan."

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, we are still considering committee amendments and are endeavoring to get through with all the committee amendments.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I desire to know whether upon adoption of the amendment now pending, Senators will have the right subsequently to offer amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will advise the Senator that once an amendment is agreed to it cannot be amended without reconsideration.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL] be permitted to offer an amendment to the amendment now pending, rather than to pass the amendment over at this time. I want to keep them in order, because some Senators who have amendments to offer have left the floor. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Connecticut may be permitted to offer his amendment.

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

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, I first wish to compliment the committee on the fine work it has done in its report and in connection with the proposed amendments. However, to the proviso on page 28, line 24, I must object and ask that it

not be agreed to, for the reason that if it is adopted and enforced it will adversely affect approximately from 25 to 27 States and will benefit no State. If 7 percent is the maximum percentage provided for under the proposed amendment it will mean that many States will have much less money on which to operate than they presently have. In the case of California, it will deny that State \$2,633,000.

In the State of Massachusetts it will reduce the sum available by \$1,740,000.

In the case of New York, by \$6,963,000.

In Pennsylvania, by \$1,360,000.

In my own State it will reduce the amount from \$854,000 to \$617,000.

I should like to point out that under the language of the proviso not more than 7 percent may be used for administrative costs. Let me point out that many times the administrative costs determine the caseloads. There may be high administrative costs, but low caseloads.

In the case of Connecticut I think the number receiving old-age assistance is 84 persons out of 1,000. Some States, with low administrative costs have several times that many persons per thousand presently enjoying old-age assistance.

So in an area which has high administrative costs it may be that the area needs specific study, and I think time should be allowed for such a study.

I think any action at this time will cause disruption in many States which are presently engaged in making plans for old-age assistance and also, I may say, for aid to dependent children and aid to the blind.

So I hope this particular provision of the amendment will be rejected.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will my colleague yield to me?

Mr. PURTELL. I am happy to yield to the distinguished senior Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BUSH. I congratulate my distinguished colleague upon his remarks on the amendment. I join with him in urging the Senate to reject the amendment.

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

Mr. PURTELL. I have yielded to the senior Senator from Connecticut. I shall be happy to yield to the Senator from South Carolina when the Senator from Connecticut has finished.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a letter addressed to me by the commissioner of welfare of the State of Connecticut relating to this subject.

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

JUNE 24, 1954.

HON. PRESCOTT BUSH,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Senate Report No. 1623 accompanying House of Representatives bill No. 9447 contains a provision concerning administrative costs which would be most unfair to the State of Connecticut. The proposal is that the percentage of administrative costs in relation to the Federal share of assistance payments among the several States shall be no higher than 7 percent.

In actual dollars Connecticut would lose \$236,567 per year under this arbitrary limitation. Connecticut would of necessity have to raise this money from Connecticut taxes or reduce staff.

The alarming thing about this Senate report is that on page 12 the report uses as an argument the range in administrative costs from 2.4 percent in Texas to 14.1 percent in New York. This points up some very faulty reasoning.

You will note on the enclosed chart that Texas has 383 people out of every 1,000 population over 65 years of age on old-age assistance. New York has only 78, the national average is 190, and Connecticut has only 84. Careful analysis of this chart will show that such States as Connecticut, New York, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey, which try successfully to keep ineligible people off the public assistance rolls, have the highest administrative costs. I am convinced that there is a definite correlation between high administrative cost percentage-wise and low incidence on the public-assistance programs. In contrast to the Northern States mentioned above you will find Texas, Louisiana, and most of the Southern States operating mainly on a pension idea. They, therefore, have very large percentages of their populations on assistance, which of course costs the Federal Government money in assistance grants.

An arbitrary 7 percent limitation seems to me to be very discriminatory against those States which do an honest job in granting assistance only to those people deserving of it.

I sincerely hope that this part of Report No. 1623 can be defeated on the Senate floor.

Respectfully yours,

HOWARD E. HOUSTON,
Commissioner of Welfare.

P. S.—An identical letter has been sent to Senator PURTELL.

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

Mr. PURTELL. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. I wish to make an explanation which may probably allay some of the concerns and fears that a number of Senators have expressed to those of us who serve on the committee, because since the committee's action on the bill, we have heard from State welfare directors and, in some instances, the administrators and governors of many States. For that reason, I desire to make an explanation as to why the committee took the action it did in restricting the item to not to exceed 7 percent, because the item came before the committee in the third supplemental appropriation bill, H. R. 8481.

The House had imposed a modest cut in the supplemental request for \$58 million, and had added a limitation on the amount which could be used for administrative costs. The Senate committee restored the House cut and struck out the limitation, but in its report called attention to the variances among the several States in the costs of administration, and promised that the matter would have further attention during the consideration of the regular appropriation bill for the Department. The amendment under discussion was the outcome of this consideration.

Since the committee report was filed, I have received numerous inquiries from my colleagues, as have other members of our committee, including the chairman, the distinguished Senator from

New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. A number of Senators have asked that the committee amendment be not adopted.

I think the attention of the Senate and of State administrative officials has been forcefully called to the problem, and that serious study will be given to remedying any defects which may exist.

I shall expect the staff of the committee to make a thorough study and investigation of the variations in the administrative costs among the several States, and I hope that the chairman of the committee will approve of such action.

I may say that I have discussed the subject with the Senator from New Hampshire, who has stated that he will instruct the staff of the Committee on Appropriations to make a complete study of the problem, because an examination of the percentages in the so-called administrative costs in the various States discloses a range from a low of 2.4 percent to a high of 14.1 percent. It was that factor which impelled the House to make a restriction in the first instance. Then the Senate committee, in a sense, restored the cut in the supplemental bill. But it was agreed that the Senate would go into the question further. So the 7 percent limitation was included for no other purpose than to call the situation to the attention of the Senate, in order to bring up the question for discussion and study, because if there were any undue administrative expense charged to the fund, the committee ultimately would have information about it and would correct the situation.

I wish to say that there is no intention on the part of the chairman of the full committee or the chairman of the subcommittee to resist the effort to have the amendment, which is simply a language amendment, stricken. It was for that reason that I did not desire to have the amendments agreed to en bloc. I wanted Senators to have the benefit of propounding questions and entering into a discussion of the situation.

The committee is ready to aid Senators in striking the amendment, because the amendment has accomplished the purpose of calling everyone's attention to the inconsistency in the administrative expenses of the various States.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield?

Mr. PURTELL. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I wish to express my commendation of the sentiments just expressed by the distinguished Senator from Minnesota. I have received a complaint from the agency, in which they were not speaking of the 7 percent, but agreed with the substitute as suggested by the Senator. They think that the basic social-security law should reflect the final decision reached.

I am not at this moment making any claim of conflicting jurisdiction, but I may say that the Committee on Finance is now holding hearings on social security, and it will always be appropriate to bring up the subject before the committee. It might be appropriate to consider the question in connection with the basic law, rather than in relation to an appropriation bill.

I express my appreciation of the willingness of the Senator from Minnesota to drop the amendment for the time being.

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

Mr. PURTELL. I am happy to yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I desire to commend the Senator from Connecticut for bringing the matter before the Senate. I think if Senators will read pages 1177, 1178, 1179, and 1180 of the hearings, they will observe that the committee had good reason to act as it did in this particular bill. Some of the costs of administration are almost unbelievable. They go as high as 44.9 percent. While many of the costs of administration are low, I think it will be found, overall, that many run very high.

In the different departments, the administrative cost varies from State to State. That is true with respect to aid to the blind. The same will be found in the case of aid to dependent children. Similarly, the costs vary in the cases of old-age assistance and aid to the disabled. There is a large discrepancy in administrative costs from State to State in the different categories.

I think the proper course of action is to do as the committee, on the floor, has now agreed to do, namely, to make a study of the cause of great discrepancy, in order to see if the problem cannot be solved.

Again, I wish to commend the Senator from Connecticut for bringing the subject to our attention, and to thank the Senator from Minnesota for agreeing to strike out the proviso at this time.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield?

Mr. PURTELL. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. I, too, wish to thank the Senator from Connecticut for having presented the amendment, because in some of the States this item has worked a hardship, with respect to some of the titles. It happens that in my State it has worked fairly well in connection with some titles, but title IV was an exception.

I especially wish to thank the Senator from Minnesota and the Senator from Connecticut for their cooperative attitude and splendid work in connection with the preparation of the entire bill. It is one of the finest, most constructive pieces of legislation on which I have worked, and which I have ever seen a subcommittee undertake.

Mr. THYE. I wish to express my appreciation to the Senator from Mississippi for his kind remarks. This is a bill as to which it is difficult to be certain when sufficient funds have been provided and when amounts should be cut, because it deals principally with human beings and their welfare and benefits. It is not like an appropriation for road construction, or something of that kind. In this instance, we are dealing with factors which affect human beings, whether it is for research or for administrative funds affecting their welfare. It is difficult to carry this bill through the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President—

Mr. PURTELL. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, first of all, I should like to say, on behalf of the people of California, that they, too, wish to express their thanks for the generous and fair acquiescence of the chairman of the subcommittee, the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, in recognizing the virtues of the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut, whom I wish to congratulate for bringing the matter before the Senate today.

As is the case with many of the Senators sitting in the Chamber this afternoon, I too, have received urgent communications from the director of social welfare of the State of California, as well as from those representing county governments in California. It is true that had a restrictive amendment such as this with respect to administrative costs been adopted by the Senate and had it become the law, it would have materially handicapped many of the States in finding moneys to carry on the entire program of social security.

I wish to have the RECORD indicate that, in the case of California, had the amendment been adopted there would have been almost a 50-percent decrease in the Federal participation in the administration of the program in California. At the present time the Federal share in administrative costs to California is \$5,238,809 annually. Under the proposed amendment this share would be reduced to \$2,604,821—a reduction and loss to my State of \$2,633,988 annually.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, in order that the record may be perfectly clear, I wish to state that the provision related only to the administrative expense, and did not deny one cent of Federal funds in matching any official funds which would be available. The only reason why the provision was inserted in the bill was that we wanted to call the attention of everyone to the effect of the language. The provision would have affected my State just as much as it would have affected every other State which has been mentioned. In my State the welfare director immediately wrote me, because it would have affected my State not only in the one item, but in three items regarding the welfare program.

There was need for the Senate to give thought to the question. Therefore, we left the language in the bill in order to provoke this very discussion and study. As chairman of the subcommittee, acting for the full committee, I am agreeing that the Senate should not act favorably on the amendment. It has served its purpose.

Mr. President, if there is insistence on rejection of the committee amendment, my colleagues, will find no opposition on my part to such a suggestion.

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, I urge that the committee amendment be rejected, and I wish to thank the Senator from Minnesota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I shall not detain the Senate for very long. I

merely wish to say that the Senate does have the power to consider changing the law with respect to administrative expenses and funds which are granted to the States under the old-age insurance program or any other type of program in which the Federal Government participates. The States of the American Union, and those who administer the program in the several States, should have ample knowledge so that they may put their houses in order fiscal-wise.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 23, beginning in line 24.

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 29, line 6, to strike "\$1,450,000" and insert "\$1,550,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office of the Secretary," on page 31, line 9, after the word "Secretary", to strike out "\$1,075,000" and insert "\$1,150,000", and in line 12, after the word "fund", to strike out the colon and "Provided, That not more than \$200,000 additional may be transferred to this head from other appropriations."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 31, line 18, after the word "Audits", to strike out "\$1,775,000" and insert "\$1,835,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 32, after line 8, to insert:

Working capital fund: The working capital fund established in the Federal Security Agency Appropriation Act, 1953 (66 Stat. 369), shall be available for financing the additional functions of central accounting service and central internal audit service.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 33, line 1, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$75,000" and insert "\$105,000, of which \$45,000 shall be available only to the National Institutes of Health."

The amendment was agreed to.

PROPOSED COUGAR DAM

Mr. MORSE obtained the floor.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield, so that I may address an inquiry to him?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. THYE. Is the Senator from Oregon going to take some time?

Mr. MORSE. Only half a minute.

Mr. THYE. I was about to inform the Senator that we are almost through with action on the amendments.

Mr. MORSE. I shall take only about half a minute, in order to make an insertion in the RECORD.

Mr. THYE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, at an appropriate place, a telegram which I received today from the Eugene Water Board in regard to the proposed Cougar Dam, and a telegram setting forth my answer of opposition to the Eugene Water Board's position on the Cougar Dam, with a

request in the message that the Eugene Water Board provide me at an early date with an analysis of the Eugene Water Board's contract with the Bonneville Power Administration in respect to the effect of the April 7 order of the Secretary of the Interior on that contract.

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

EUGENE, OREG., June 21, 1954.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building:

Your statement in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 17, opposing Eugene Water and Electric Board plans to construct and operate the power facilities in the Cougar project has been called to our attention. We wish to call your attention to the following facts concerning our participation in the Cougar project.

Extensive and comprehensive economic studies of the feasibility of adding power facilities to the Cougar flood-control dam were made by the water board staff and by expert outside consultants before we submitted the partnership proposal embodied in the present Cougar legislation. The outside consultants were Cornell, Howland, Hayes & Merrifield, of Corvallis, Oreg.; Morrison Knudson Contractors, of Boise, Idaho; the International Engineering Co., of San Francisco.

The proposed installed capacity of 39,000 kilowatts will be firm power in our system. Please note that firm power is distinguished from prime power. Prime power is available continuously. Cougar will supply firm power for approximately 10 hours per day. The operation of the project would be geared to the needs of irrigation, the maintenance of stream flow, and of the available water during the dry season. The powerplant could be shut down during weekends to conserve water if necessary.

We do have definite preliminary estimates of the cost of power from Cougar. We have not yet supplied these figures to the Bonneville Power Administration. We have made definite arrangements to do this in the immediate future. The cost of firm energy from Cougar under water board operation is estimated to be 3.7 mills per kilowatt-hour under present costs and plans. The cost to us of equivalent firm energy from the Bonneville Power Administration would be 4.2 mills per kilowatt-hour at present Bonneville rates.

Cougar project was recommended for construction by Corps of Engineers as a part of the integrated development of the Columbia Basin. Construction and operation of the power facilities by the Eugene Water and Electric Board would in no way adversely affect the integrated plan but would accelerate its progress.

Operation of space for flood control and release of water for downstream benefits would be under the direction of the Corps of Engineers in any case.

Power generated would be a benefit to the entire area including the Northwest power pool. Regarding the operation of the Northwest power pool, Eugene's system is permanently connected to the pool and the capacity of our municipal electric generating facilities would simply add to the supply available in the Northwest. If the power available to other utilities power which Eugene does not draw from the pool, the chairman of the Pacific Northwest Utilities conference committee, the operating arm of the pool, has submitted a statement to Congress which emphatically says the operation of the Cougar power plant by the Eugene Water and Electric Board would materially increase the effectiveness of the pool.

As of this date we have spent approximately \$41,000 on this project. Our proposal has been submitted to Congress with the

firm conviction that the construction and operation of the Cougar power facilities by the Eugene Water and Electric Board will in part meet the needs of this rapidly growing area and is sound from engineering, economic, and financial standpoints.

Copies of this telegram are being sent Senator EDWARD MARTIN, chairman of the Senate Public Works Committee, and to Senator CORDON. Other copies will be released locally.

EUGENE WATER AND ELECTRIC BOARD,
LIONEL W. TROMMLITZ, President.

JUNE 25, 1954.

EUGENE WATER AND ELECTRIC BOARD,
Eugene, Oreg.:

Thank you for your wire of June 22. I shall place it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD today and shall also submit it to the Senate Public Works Committee. It in no way answers the point which I raised in my Senate statement on June 17. You are asking for construction approval of a project before you submit to the Congress accurate and full information on comparative costs and comparative rates as between your proposed partnership plan and construction of the entire project by the Federal Government with power sales through Bonneville. You do not meet the issue of the effect of McKay's April 7 order on new projects such as the proposed Cougar project. I respectfully request that you submit to me at an early date an analysis of your contract with Bonneville as it relates to the April 7 order. It is my judgment that the Cougar Dam bill you are urging, in its present form, is not in the best interest of the people of the Eugene area to be served by the project or the State of Oregon. The Cougar Dam bill which I have introduced keeps faith with the long-established Federal power policy, and I regret that interests in my home community are proposing a plan which, in my judgment, will serve as a precedent for turning over the rivers of our State to selfish interests thereby jeopardizing the possibility of providing the people of our State with more cheap power.

WAYNE MORSE.

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WEL- FARE APPROPRIATIONS, 1955

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9447), making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was on page 33, after line 21, to insert:

SEC. 207. In order to more effectively administer the programs and functions of the Department, the Secretary is authorized to transfer not to exceed 1 percent of any appropriation in this title available for salaries and expenses to any other such appropriation but no such appropriation shall be increased by more than 1 percent by any such transfer: *Provided*, That no such transfers shall be used for the creation of new functions within the Department, nor shall the total amount transferred in fiscal year 1955 exceed \$100,000.

The next amendment was, on page 35, line 13, after "(5 U. S. C. 55a)", to strike out "\$422,000" and insert "\$429,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, that completes the committee amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there further amendments to be offered?

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I have discussed with the chairman of the subcommittee the amendment I am about to propose.

I offer an amendment on page 21, in line 19, to strike out "\$3,295,000", and insert in lieu thereof "\$3,565,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 21, in line 19, it is proposed to strike out "\$3,295,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$3,565,000."

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, as I understand, the amount would be increased by \$270,000?

Mr. BRICKER. Yes; and it is for the purpose of carrying out the intention of the Congress to create a memorial for the late distinguished majority leader and my colleague, Senator Taft.

Mr. THYE. It is recognized that the House made a reduction in that item; and that if the reduction were adhered to and funds were taken from administrative funds, it would leave the administrative funds—

Mr. BRICKER. In a depleted condition.

Mr. THYE. Yes.

Mr. BRICKER. And the memorial could not be a complete operating unit and have an adequate staff.

Mr. THYE. That is true. There is, however, a question involved concerning the entire structure, which is that the construction is going to be more expensive than it was anticipated it would be when the first authorization was approved.

Mr. BRICKER. That is true, and it is due to the increased costs of construction being encountered.

Mr. THYE. Also, a little broader use of the building in general is to be made than was at first anticipated.

Mr. BRICKER. That is true.

Mr. THYE. That is one reason why I have no objection to the amendment. The understanding was that if \$270,000 more were to be expended for the construction of the building there would be a reduction in other administrative funds. If such reduction were imposed upon the administrative funds, the activities of the division involved would be curtailed to the point where the service would be greatly reduced. Therefore, I am willing to take the amendment to conference.

Mr. BRICKER. I appreciate the statement of the Senator from Minnesota, and, on behalf of the people of Ohio, I thank him for the tribute to my distinguished late colleague.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a statement I have prepared.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BRICKER

Last year this body joined with the House in voting that a great new laboratory at Cincinnati, Ohio, which is devoted to improving the health of this Nation through research, should be named for that illustrious son of Cincinnati, our late colleague and friend, Bob Taft.

This laboratory of the Public Health Service is now known as Robert A. Taft Sanitary Engineering Center.

On page 21 of the bill the item of "engineering, sanitation, and industrial hygiene" carries funds for this work and some other activities.

This laboratory, authorized in 1948, was caught in the squeeze on construction costs occasioned by the Korean war. Its fourth floor was left uncompleted. One elevator was omitted although the shaft was constructed.

The House wisely wished to see this building completed.

Its method, however, leaves something to be desired. It wrote into its bill that some of these operating funds for "engineering, sanitation, and industrial hygiene" should be used to complete the building.

I am told that the only new item in this sum is one of \$132,500 to increase the staff to man Taft Center. Mr. President, I do not have to remind my colleagues that when a budget is cut it is a new item which comes out.

Indeed I am told that if the bill remains as written, the agency will find itself compelled not only to forgo plans for expanding its staff to fit the big new building but actually to cut back on what it now has.

I understand, also, that there were difficulties about bringing this situation to the attention of the Senate committee. The subcommittee headed by the distinguished Senator from Minnesota had completed its hearings on this item when the House committee reported and the House acted, making it difficult for the Senate committee to be told the full effects.

Mr. President, I do not believe I need remind my colleagues that I seldom come before this body to ask for increased spending.

On the other hand, it seems to me highly illogical that we should name a great laboratory for so logical a man as Bob Taft, then complete it but leave it half empty.

My amendment would simply add enough money to complete the building while leaving the operating funds intact.

I hope my friends of the committee will join me in seeing that Taft Center not only is completed but is operated fully.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment on page 21, line 19, proposed by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER].

The amendment was agreed to.

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

If there is 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 to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 9447) was read the third time and passed.

Mr. THYE. 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 appointed Mr. THYE, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. RUSSELL, and Mr. HILL conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the votes by which the amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time and passed be reconsidered, so that I may offer an important amendment which has been on my desk. The amendment proposes to change the Administrator of the Old-Age Assistance Act from a rating of GS-16 to a rating

of GS-18. The amendment was discussed with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service; and I wish to have the amendment considered and acted upon, for it would be an injustice not to do so.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Minnesota? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I thank the Senate; and I now offer and send to the desk the amendment to which I have referred.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

THE LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 28, in line 15, after the word "fund", it is proposed to insert the following:

Provided, That the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare hereafter is authorized, subject to the procedures prescribed by section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949, to place the position of Director, Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance, in grade GS-18 in the General Schedule established by the Classification Act of 1949, and such position shall be in addition to those positions in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare presently allocated in grade GS-18: Provided further, That this proviso shall be effective only upon enactment into law, during the second session of the 83d Congress, of S. 2665: Provided further, That the position described herein shall be allocated to the numerical limitations contained in S. 2665."

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota.

The amendment was agreed to.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. 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 to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 9447) was read the third time and passed.

Mr. THYE. 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 appointed Mr. THYE, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. RUSSELL, and Mr. HILL conferees on the part of the Senate.

ACCURACY AND PURPOSE OF CERTAIN FIGURES AND AMENDMENTS IN CONNECTION WITH REA APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, on June 1, when the Senate was considering the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] offered an amendment to increase by the amount of \$35 million the appropriation for the REA; and he coupled the amendment with a sharp attack upon the REA Administrator, Mr. Ancher Nelsen, and also the Eisenhower administration.

At that time I seriously questioned the accuracy of the figures which were be-

ing used by the Senator from Illinois and which, according to his statement, he had received from the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association. I also indicated that in my opinion politics was involved in the maneuvering that was going on, inasmuch as both the Senate and the House Appropriations Committees had stated plainly that such an additional appropriation for the REA for the fiscal year 1955 was unnecessary.

My fears that the amendment proposed by the Senator from Illinois would be used for political purposes, for the purpose of establishing a criterion on which to attempt to show whether each Member was for or against the REA, were fully justified. For—almost immediately thereafter—there appeared in the American Federation of Labor Newsletter a sharp attack upon the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], who voted against this unnecessary appropriation of funds, as proposed; and in the Newsletter the statement is made that that is one reason why the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] should be defeated in his campaign for reelection to the Senate, and why his Democratic opponent in the State of Oregon should be elected to the Senate. So my fears that the amendment of the Senator from Illinois was being used for political purposes were well founded.

I care not how much anyone may undertake to build up the REA record of the Senator from Illinois; but I do object seriously to the use of an amendment such as the one he proposed as a criterion on which to judge the position of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] or the position of any other Member of the Senate.

As I have said, I questioned both the accuracy of the figures used—I thought they were misleading; and they were—and the use of the amendment for political purposes.

Several days later, I had a visit from two young men from the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, here in Washington, Mr. Fain and Mr. Kabat. I had made reference to certain telegrams that, over the name of Mr. Ellis, were sent to managers of REA cooperatives throughout the country, asking them to send telegrams to their Members of Congress. Mr. Fain informed me that he took full responsibility for that action; that he had sent the telegrams without the knowledge of Mr. Ellis, although he thought Mr. Ellis would approve of them; and I think he did.

Mr. Kabat said he was responsible for the figures which were submitted to Congress in an effort to gain further large appropriations—unnecessary appropriations, Mr. President—for the REA for the fiscal year 1955.

I may say that Mr. Ellis was with me in my office after the two young men left. Apparently they were a little unsatisfied; and Mr. Ellis visited me and wanted me to make a correction and to withdraw any intimation that he would be involved in politics in that way.

Later on, under date of June 18, he wrote a letter, addressed to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] and myself, in which Mr. Ellis appealed to us as statesmen to do the proper thing by him.

Yesterday, the Senator from Illinois inserted the letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and also inserted a statement which Mr. Ellis furnished him, which was intended to justify the figures Mr. Ellis had submitted, for his organization, to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees.

The Senator from Illinois also inserted that statement from Mr. Ellis in the RECORD, as of yesterday.

I have prepared a documented reply to the statement of Mr. Ellis, executive manager of NRECA, which was inserted in yesterday's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I ask unanimous consent to have this documented reply printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks, because this reply will show conclusively that the figures which were submitted by Mr. Ellis and his assistant, Mr. Kabat, to the Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate, were misleading, and that they presented an erroneous picture of the situation. I feel that the position which they took should be put in its proper light before the Congress and the people of the country.

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

Refer to page 151 of the House hearings. Also, refer to page 1094 and 1095 of the Senate hearings.

On these pages there is a tabulation which was cited and is now cited as an example of the misleading picture that can be created in the indiscriminate use of 18-month and 12-month figures.

Examination of the tabulation will reveal that it is a fact that figures representing applications for an 18-month period are compared to loan funds available for 12 months. Whether so intended or not, this phony comparison tended to overemphasize the real need for loan funds.

There is no intention to impugn the honesty and integrity of the NRECA board members who appeared before the Appropriations Committee. It is obvious to everybody they did not compile the tabulation and for anyone to imply that a questioning of the phony comparison is an attack on the sound and public-spirited men who represent the REA cooperatives cannot be anything but a smokescreen.

Before both the Senate and the House Appropriations Committee Mr. Kabat, representing Mr. Ellis, presented data by States on applications pending in the field and in Washington, and compared the total to the maximum amount which could be made available to each State during fiscal year 1955. This comparison overlooks the amounts to be loaned in each State during the remainder of fiscal year 1954 from 1954 funds. These are considerable amounts in many of the States. The following data are presented by NRECA for 7 States on page 151 of the House hearings:

State	Total applications pending in both Washington and in the field	Total amount which can be made available to State according to provision of REA Act and budgetary request of REA
Alabama.....	\$7,215,000	\$12,294,500
Colorado.....	16,710,000	9,884,750
Illinois.....	17,367,000	10,442,300
Missouri.....	15,550,000	11,615,550
New Mexico.....	13,781,000	10,091,750
Tennessee.....	7,380,500	11,149,000
Texas.....	20,405,425	13,214,650

These figures indicate that the funds available are not sufficient to satisfy applications from Colorado, Illinois, Missouri, New Mexico, and Texas. This is true if 1955 funds are considered the only funds available. But the fact is, that to satisfy the applications here mentioned, funds also are available from half of the fiscal year 1954—from January 1 through June 30. On that basis the funds available—that is, for the last half of 1954 and all of 1955—actually exceed total applications pending as reported by Mr. Kabat for each of the seven States. This is shown in the following table:

State	Total applications pending in the field and in Washington as reported by NRECA	Total amount available Jan. 1, 1954, to June 30, 1955, under 1955 printed budget plus unobligated 1954 funds	Excess of amount available over total applications pending as reported by NRECA
Alabama.....	\$7,215,000	\$28,399,420	\$21,184,420
Colorado.....	16,710,000	22,617,170	5,907,170
Illinois.....	17,367,000	25,037,820	7,670,820
Missouri.....	15,550,000	28,190,570	12,640,570
New Mexico.....	13,781,000	22,653,170	8,872,170
Tennessee.....	7,380,500	27,541,020	20,160,520
Texas.....	20,405,425	25,662,870	5,257,445

Mr. Ellis says that the calculations in the tabulations were made to point up inequities in the allotment formula of the Rural Electrification Act. Irrespective of the purpose, comparing 18-month and 12-month figures is inexcusable. It is clear that the purpose of such a comparison was to indicate an alleged need for a substantial increase in loan authorizations for fiscal year 1955.

Refer to page 1098 of the Senate hearings for testimony that Mr. Kabat in his effort to establish a shortage of funds, ignored funds available for the last half of fiscal year 1954. He says:

"For instance, in the State of Missouri, they had applications pending totaling \$15½ million. But under the REA budget request they could get only \$11½ million in loan funds. Under our request they could get \$23½ million. Under the amount approved by the House they could get \$15 million.

"In other words, they would be short both under the REA budget request and the amount approved by the House, assuming all those loans are actually valid."

The fact is that the total amount available to the State of Missouri for the 18-month period, as estimated by REA, is \$28,190,000, or an excess of \$12,640,570 over pending applications as estimated by Mr. Kabat.

Refer to page 151 of the House hearings where shortage of funds is again stressed. Mr. Kabat says:

"Colorado has applications pending totaling almost \$17 million—\$16,710,000. According to the funds REA has available and provisions of the act, Colorado could get almost \$10 million in loan funds—in other words, there would be a deficiency of almost \$7 million.

"And then I can go on down the table and point out the position of some of these others, and you can see that this REA budget request is a pretty serious matter."

The fact is that the total amount available to the State of Colorado for the 18-month period, as estimated by REA, is \$22,617,170, or an excess of \$5,907,170 over pending applications as estimated by Mr. Kabat.

The above statements by Mr. Kabat would seem to be at variance with certain statements of Mr. Ellis in the attachment to his letter to Senators AIKEN and DOUGLAS dated June 18, 1954. Mr. Ellis says:

"The answer to this charge is that this second table was not the basis for NRECA's request for loan funds and was not so used. This table had no relationship to the amount of NRECA loan-fund request. Nor is it er-

roneous. This table showed only the effect of the restrictive provisions of the State allocations formula in the REA Act assuming congressional approval of the various budgetary request (REA or NRECA) or of the amount approved by the House. The only purpose of this table was to show how the outmoded restrictive provisions of this formula in the REA Act would limit, State by State, the amount of funds which could be borrowed in those States under a given amount of loan authorizations."

Mr. Kabat used the table to plead for more money. Mr. Ellis said the table had no relationship with his budget request. Certainly they cannot both be right.

Mr. Ellis has tried to picture his loan application survey figures as conservative.

Let us refer to page 7404 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 1, 1954. There in the second column a tabulation is printed entitled, "Applications estimated by the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association annual survey compared with applications actually received by the REA—selected years."

An examination of the testimony Mr. Ellis gave to the Appropriations Committees in those "selected years" reveals that for some reason or other, he did not give a breakdown of his survey figures, with one exception, until this year. This exception was on March 10, 1949.

On March 10, 1949, as revealed on page 997 of part II of the hearings before the House Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations for the agricultural appropriation bill for 1950, Mr. Ellis stated:

"We would make additional applications during the balance of this fiscal year (Jan. 1, 1949—June 30, 1949) totaling about \$180 million. We would make further applications during the next fiscal year (July 1, 1949—June 30, 1950) totaling approximately \$350 million."

Add these two figures together. The total is \$530 million. That is the figure used on March 10, 1949, as representing "applications which the rural electric expect to make."

In May 1954 Mr. Ellis compiled a table going back to January 1, 1949.

This same item—the applications which the rural electric expect to make January 1, 1949—June 30, 1950—now appears in the tabulation on page 7404 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 1, 1954. But this time the total of the applications for the period in question is \$368,227,400.

In 1949—530 million. In 1954—368 million. Somewhere we dropped off 162 million.

However, it must be remembered that in 1949 the figure was used to impress the Congress with how much money was needed. In 1954 the object was to prove how conservative the survey is.

Testimony for the intervening years makes numerous references to the loan-application survey. But detailed figures are not revealed. In the interests of preserving the sanctity of the survey and its conservatism, no doubt this approach was wise.

The method used by NRECA in establishing loan needs by States is faulty in several respects.

Accurate data on loan needs by States can be established accurately only by estimating the applications to be on hand in REA at the beginning of the fiscal year, adding the estimated applications to be received during the fiscal year, and deducting from this sum the applications which it is estimated will be abandoned, withdrawn or returned to the field for reworking during the year. Failure by NRECA to adjust for the applications abandoned, withdrawn or returned to the field results in a substantial overstatement of the loan demand. In fiscal year 1952, these applications amounted to more than \$95 million; in 1953, more than \$47 million; and it appears that the amount for 1954 will exceed \$30 million. This partially accounts

for the puzzlement which some persons have experienced in attempting to make sense out of the NRECA requests since World War II. These requests, which were predicated on the total applications for consideration aggregate \$2,869 million for the period 1945-1954, while loans made during the period aggregate \$2,425 million. Superficially, it would appear from these figures that REA must have a backlog of loan applications of approximately \$444 million, whereas the backlog at the present time is \$128 million.

Mr. Ellis has not always had such great confidence in the accuracy of his forecasts. For the fiscal year 1949, for example, he told the Senate that his estimates on what might happen with regard to loan demand varied over a mere \$225 million range. However, he was not disturbed at supporting a request by a Democratic administration—in fact, he said he was happy to do so—which fell short of the possible demand by \$255 million. These goings-on are set forth in the Senate hearings on the 1949 Agriculture Appropriation bill at pages 713 and 714.

Now the figures that NRECA uses on applications received are not bad figures in themselves. The trouble occurs when Mr. Ellis and his associates get to bandying them about in an effort to educate the administration and the Senate as to the real needs of the REA program. For example, let's take a look at the way the figures would stack up for the period January 2, 1953, through April 2, 1954, as Mr. Ellis would see them.

Applications on hand in REA, Jan. 2, 1953.....	\$191,785,215
Applications received in REA, Jan. 2, 1953-June 30, 1954.....	209,499,854
Total for consideration.....	401,285,069
Less amounts loaned, Jan. 2, 1953-June 30, 1954.....	205,948,362
So the applications on hand (NRECA style) ought to be.....	195,336,707
But the applications on hand actually were.....	161,920,000
So the NRECA method would overstate loan demand by.....	33,416,707

The problem here is that NRECA statisticians overlooked a great many considerations, such as abandonment, withdrawal, and return to field of applications. When borrowers withdraw an application, and later submit it in revised form, care must be exercised not to count it both times. Certainly figures such as the above indicate that there is more than a little such double counting in the NRECA method.

Mr. Ellis vigorously denies that he is trying to inject politics into the REA program.

If that is so, why did he, in March 1952, when a Democratic administration was in power, urge the Congress to authorize only \$50 million for new loans for the next fiscal year, and a year later increase the request several times over?

Was it to make an issue for the new administration?

The answer you will get will, of course, be that the 18-month conservative survey Mr. Ellis operates annually now shows a greater need. Let us see how the survey worked in March 1952.

Applications on hand, Dec. 29, 1951.....	\$169,442,800
Applications to be received to June 30, 1953.....	153,401,468
Total for consideration.....	322,844,268
Less: Unobligated funds Dec. 31, 1951.....	225,484,456
New authorization required.....	97,359,812

A total of \$97 million is what the Ellis method of calculations (1954 model) comes

up with. You would expect that \$97 million would be what Mr. Ellis asked the Congress for in 1952. No. He did not.

He asked for only \$50 million, the same figure that the Truman Budget Bureau had requested.

In 1954 there was no Truman. Consequently there was no adjusting of the calculations to the budget request. That would not have created an issue.

Mr. AIKEN. It so happens that on June 1, when the amendment was first proposed, the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] spoke on it. In the course of his speech he used and inserted in the RECORD a copy of a letter which was written to Mr. Ancher Nelsen, Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration, by Mr. Gus Norwood, executive secretary of the Northwest Public Power Association, Inc., 1311 Columbia Street, Vancouver, Wash. This letter, which the Senator from Oregon used in his speech—and I am sure he used it in good faith—was dated May 27. The Senator from Oregon spoke and used the letter on June 1. The letter, as received by Mr. Nelsen at the Rural Electrification Administration, showed a postmark of 7:30 p. m., June 2. In other words, evidently it was sent to the Senator from Oregon sometime before it was sent to Mr. Nelsen, the man to whom it was addressed. So I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks the letter which Mr. Norwood wrote to Mr. Nelsen, and Mr. Nelsen's reply to Mr. Norwood under date of June 14, 1954.

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

NORTHWEST PUBLIC POWER ASSOCIATION,
Vancouver, Wash., May 27, 1954.

MR. ANCHER NELSEN,
Administrator, Rural Electrification Administration, Washington, D. C.

DEAR ANCHER: The REA news release of May 21 relative to future load growth of REA borrower systems constitutes one of the greatest mistakes which I have seen made by the Rural Electrification Administration. The estimate that power needs of the REA borrower will "nearly double by 1963" is just about the understatement of the year. If the future policies of the Rural Electrification Administration are premised on this ridiculously low rate of growth, then this whole program is headed for serious trouble.

My purpose in writing you is, of course, to urge an immediate withdrawal of this news release and, secondly, the making of an adequate study of the problem.

Now let me outline some indicators which cause us in the Pacific Northwest to view these estimates with alarm.

In the past 5 years the electric loads of REA borrowers have increased from 3.3 billion kilowatt-hours in 1947 to 11.4 billion in 1952 or more than triple in these 5 years. During the past 10 years the increase has been tenfold. Yet for the next 10 years your news release can only predict that the load will "almost double."

Perhaps someone will claim that the program is leveling off. We know that and are allowing for it. Here is a case in point. In 1948 the Lincoln Electric Cooperative at Davenport, Wash., had 895 rural and residential consumers using an average of 7,436 kilowatt-hours or a total of 6,655,646 kilowatt-hours. In 1952 the 1,010 consumers averaged 10,306 kilowatt-hours or a total of 10,409,306 kilowatt-hours. This is an example of a mature or leveling-off cooperative.

Yet in 4 years they had a 50 percent load growth. Just their additional use per consumer has jumped from 7,436 to 10,306 or 2,870 kilowatt-hours in 4 years. The increase alone is more than the total average power use for residential purposes in the Nation.

The 33d annual report of FPC for June 30, 1953, states on pages 61, 62, and 64:

	Peak load (million kilowatts)	Energy (billion kilowatt-hours)
1950.....	64.3	329
1953.....	83.6	443
1950 estimate.....	130.0	660
1975 estimate.....	365.0	1,800

A long-range idea of trends is shown in the load growth for the Nation from 37.2 billion kilowatt-hours in 1921 to 370.2 in 1951, a tenfold jump in 30 years.

The Paley Commission Report anticipates a load increase of 350 percent from 1950 to 1975. The FPC estimate of load increase from 1953 to 1975 is 320 percent, yet REA in dealing with a more dynamic sector of the economy visualizes only a 200 percent load growth in the next 22 years from 1953 to 1975.

Prophecy, we all know, is hazardous and we have the right to be conservative in making estimates for the future. But a conservative approach from the viewpoint of an electric consumer is one which insures an adequate supply of power for all purposes and a reasonable reserve. A scarcity policy of too little and too late is not conservative from the standpoint of the public interest.

The load growth for REA borrowers in the State of Washington is estimated by REA to be only 18.6 percent over the next 10 years. We have had regionwide peak load growth of 21.2 percent in 1941, 14.2 percent in 1942, 20.9 percent in 1943-44, 18.2 percent in 1946-47, 14.3 percent in 1947-48, 11.6 percent in 1948-49, 14.5 percent in 1949-50, and 10.7 percent in 1950-51 and we are now in a period when many new generators are being installed. We have had annual regionwide load growth greater than the 18.6 percent from 338.7 million kilowatt-hours in 1953 to 402 in 1963 which your load estimator allowed for the State of Washington for a whole decade.

I very much hope for the sake of the whole REA program that this mess can be cleaned up. Obviously these low estimates are not a reasonable premise on which to plan the future of REA.

Best personal regards.

Sincerely,

NORTHWEST PUBLIC POWER ASSOCIATION,
GUS NORWOOD,
Executive Secretary.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., June 14, 1954.

MR. GUS NORWOOD,
Executive Secretary, Northwest Public Power Association, Inc., Vancouver, Wash.

DEAR MR. NORWOOD: We have received your letter dated May 27 in which you take exception to our estimates of future power requirements of REA borrowers. It distresses us that the letter somehow came to serve the purposes of a debate on the Senate floor on June 1, well over a day before it was dispatched to us at 7:30 p. m., June 2, from Vancouver, Wash. However, we are glad to tell you the basis on which we made the estimates and we will appreciate any information helpful in doing the job better.

The estimates of future power requirements of REA borrowers were made by methods which were selected to yield reliable figures for REA borrowers as a whole; that is, the primary purpose of the estimate was to produce accurate, realistic figures for the United States. We believe our estimates of

total kilowatt-hour requirements of all REA borrowers are realistic and that they make full allowance for the prospective load growth of rural consumers as a group, particularly in light of the developing trends in the connection of rural consumers and in their use of electricity.

For the most part, the future rate of increase in total energy requirements of REA borrowers will be determined by the increase in kilowatt-hour consumption per consumer. The addition of consumers will, in contrast with the past 10 years, add only a small increment to the total requirements each year. During the period 1946 through 1953, REA borrowers connected 2,600,000 consumers, or an average of 325,000 per year. During calendar year 1953, the borrowers connected 171,000 consumers; this was the smallest number connected in any year since 1944. The number to be connected in future years is expected to decline sharply. In other words, the initial connection of the now-existing rural establishments in REA borrowers' service areas is virtually completed, and after 1957 additional connections will be almost entirely newly built rural establishments.

Since the annual rate of increase in future total energy requirements will depend in large part on increased kilowatt-hour consumption, the estimates were made with due regard to the past trends in kilowatt-hour consumption and to the extent to which the factors which have affected consumption in the past will affect it in the future. The consumers served by REA borrowers used an average of 3,036 kilowatt-hours during 1953. In 1943 they used an average of 1,599 kilowatt-hours. It has taken 10 years for the average kilowatt-hour consumption of REA borrowers' consumers to increase 90 percent; despite the favorable economic conditions and other circumstances which prevailed during the period. We fully recognize, of course, the dilution effect on the average kilowatt-hour consumption resulting from the connection of large numbers of new consumers each year; if all the consumers connected since 1943 could have been connected simultaneously in 1943, the average kilowatt-hour consumption might have doubled by 1950 or 1951. Nevertheless, this increase in kilowatt-hour consumption occurred during a period when most of the new consumers who were connected were able to purchase almost immediately a great many electrical appliances and items of electrical equipment. The pent-up purchasing power of rural people receiving initial electric service was translated quickly into appliances to modernize homes and to save labor around the farmstead. This initial surge of equipment and appliance buying continued as one good crop year succeeded another and farm incomes remained at high levels. It seems reasonable to assume that at the present stage of technology there is a practical limit to the amount of electricity a farm or residence can and will use at a given time, and that once that limit, which increases with time, has been caught up with, the initial phenomenal climb in kilowatt-hour consumption will tend to taper off; from that point of time forward, the increase in consumption will continue at a decreasing rate. Our studies show that for some of the older REA borrowers in Ohio, Indiana, and Oregon, this point has been reached, and inevitably it will be reached in many sections of the country within a few years. We wish to emphasize that we do not expect the annual rate of increase in kilowatt-hour consumption to fall to zero, nor even to any figure approaching zero; this has never occurred in the history of electric usage, and it appears extremely unlikely that man's uses of electricity will ever be completely satiated. We do say, however, that it is unrealistic to expect the use of electricity by REA borrowers' consumers to increase ad

infinitum, or even through 1975, at the same rate which has been experienced since World War II. We believe the rate of increase will continue into the future at a fairly stable or perhaps at a slightly decreasing rate until such time as technological advances in the use of electricity or in the production of it, or both, bring about circumstances which will radically alter the trend and create a new era in the expanded use. Whether this will occur by 1975 is of course a matter of speculation.

We note your comparison of the REA estimates with those for the period 1950-75, made by the Federal Power Commission and the President's Materials Policy Commission.

We wish to point out that the Federal Power Commission, at page 61 of their 33d annual report, gave 2 estimates of energy production for 1975, based on different assumptions. The increase you cite is the higher one suggested by the Federal Power Commission. The statement reads as follows:

"If the same assumption regarding the rate of load growth is applied to the more distant future, say to the year 1975, electric load requirements will reach almost unbelievable heights. Thus, the above assumption gives a 1975 load of 365 million kilowatts and an energy production of 1,860 billion kilowatt-hours per year. Even the relatively conservative assumption of a 'straight line' annual growth from 1960 to 1975, equivalent to the projected average annual growth between 1950 and 1960, gives a peak load of 225 million kilowatts and energy production of 1,150 billion kilowatt-hours in 1975."

We have set out in the table below the REA estimates and those of FPC and the Materials Policy Commission (the Paley Commission):

[In billions of kilowatt-hours]			
	1953 estimate	1975 estimate	Ratio of 1975 estimate to 1953
REA estimate of total energy requirements of its borrowers.....	14.14	45	3.2
Materials Policy Commission estimate of total energy production.....	525.78	1,400	2.7
Federal Power Commission estimate of total energy production:			
(a) High.....	443.00	1,860	4.2
(b) Low.....	443.00	1,150	2.6

¹ This is a straight-line interpolation for 1953 based on the Commission data for 1950 and 1955 which appear at p. 128 of vol. II of the Commission's report.

It is apparent that our estimate anticipates a greater increase during the period 1953-75 than is the case with the estimate of the Materials Policy Commission and the lower-limit estimate made by FPC. The greatest increase occurs in the FPC high estimate, i. e., the estimate which FPC apparently believes to be a maximum or upper limit. The REA estimates of power requirements for 1975 amount to an average consumption of more than 9,000 kilowatt-hours per year per consumer; in 1953 the average was 3,036 kilowatt-hours. In light of the considerations we have described, we believe our estimates of total power requirements through 1975 are as accurate as they can be made with the facts and data we now have; certainly, they do not constitute "the understatement of the year."

With respect to the estimates for individual States, we reiterate that the estimate was made for the primary purpose of gaging the future load growth of REA borrowers nationwide. The estimates of aggregate national requirements were arrived at by use of two independent methods, with consideration given to other Government and industry

estimates for consumer groups comparable to the rural consumers of REA borrowers. One method employed trends of average kilowatt-hour usage per consumer throughout the Nation and estimates of total consumer numbers. Estimates of consumer numbers were based on the assumption of service to virtually all of the present number of farms in borrower areas by 1963. In addition, allowance was made for growth in the number of other rural consumers. The other method was based on samples of detailed power requirement studies for individual systems. These samples were selected by separate river basin areas and other groups of States having similar characteristics with respect to use of electricity.

It was not possible, with the data at hand and the time available, to make estimates for individual States, which might be aggregated to arrive at the figure for the United States. We had need of tentative estimates by States, primarily in order to arrive at estimates by FPC power-market areas which include several States or parts of States. For this reason, the estimates for the United States derived by the methods described above were distributed to the individual States in accordance with the varying rates of increase for different geographic areas as indicated by the samples of individual borrower power requirement studies. Obviously, this method could be expected to produce estimates for individual States which would vary in their accuracy, despite the accuracy of the national estimates. In our judgment this posed no serious problem, since the State figures as such were not intended to be used in any way as a basis for program planning for individual States or individual borrowers. We checked these derived State estimates with the electric input of borrowers in each State during 1951, that being the latest State input data available at the time, and the estimates were in line with those figures. Since the estimate was made, the 1952 input data by States have become available, and we have estimated the 1953 input by States. The 1952 data indicated that some of our State figures were high, others were low, and at the time these data became available we began studies of the kilowatt-hour requirements by individual States based on the aggregation of the detailed studies we have made or are making of individual borrowers' future power requirements. Such an undertaking is time-consuming as you will realize, but we hope to complete it within the next 6 months. It will give us more accurate estimates of REA borrowers' future power requirements by States. These estimates will be released when they are completed. We believe that our present estimate of the future power requirements of all REA borrowers in the United States is accurate, and it is unlikely that it will be changed significantly by the summarization of the estimates for the individual borrowers.

We appreciate your interest in this matter, and assure you that it is our intent that the REA borrowers' future power needs be accurately anticipated and adequately provided for.

Sincerely yours,

ANCHER NELSEN,
Administrator.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I believe it is unfortunate that in his letter to the Senator from Illinois and myself, Mr. Ellis stated, in the very first line:

On June 11, 1954, Senator GEORGE AIKEN, of Vermont, made certain charges on the Senate floor against the rural electric systems and their national organization.

It is unfortunate that Mr. Ellis started the letter with a complete misstatement,

because I have never made any charges against the REA cooperatives. I make my charges against the people whom they hire, and who do not give them an honest picture of the situation. So I am still unconvinced that no politics are involved. I leave that for everyone to decide for himself. I am perfectly convinced that the figures which Mr. Kabat says he prepared for Mr. Ellis to present to the committees of the House and Senate are incorrect. The figures themselves are correct, but the picture they present is very incorrect, as will be seen from the material which I have asked to have inserted in the RECORD.

TRANSFER OF HOSPITAL AND HEALTH FACILITIES FOR INDIANS

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1541, House bill 303, to transfer the maintenance and operation of hospital and health facilities for Indians to the Public Health Service, and for other purposes.

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

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 303) to transfer the maintenance and operation of hospital and health facilities for Indians to the Public Health Service, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does any Senator care to be heard on the bill?

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, let me ask the distinguished Senator from Utah whether he desires to have a quorum call at this time.

Mr. WATKINS. Yes, that will be desirable, I believe, inasmuch as certain Senators who are opposed to the bill are not on the floor at this moment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, under the heading of "Treaties."

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

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

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Charles E. Saltzman, of New York, to be Under Secretary of State for Administration, vice Donald B. Lourie, resigned;

Arthur Hollis Edens, of North Carolina, to be a member of the United States Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange;

Anna L. Rose Hawkes, of Vermont, to be a member of the United States Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange;

Rufus H. Fitzgerald, of Pennsylvania, to be a member of the United States Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange;

Arthur A. Hauck, of Maine, to be a member of the United States Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange; and

Armin H. Meyer, of Illinois, and sundry other persons, for appointment and promotion in the Foreign Service.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, from the Committee on Armed Services, I report a block of routine nominations of military officers in the Army and Air Force. These nominations are all within prescribed totals and are submitted pursuant to the existing law governing selection procedures and the existing law governing grade distributions. No objections have been received to any officers in this group.

In view of the large number involved—some 4,500—I ask unanimous consent that they be permitted to lie on the table rather than be printed in the RECORD for the second time, and be taken up at the next call of the Executive Calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Massachusetts? The Chair hears none.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, the Senate received today the nomination of Waldemar J. Gallman, of New York, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, now Ambassador to the Union of South Africa, to be Ambassador to Iraq. Notice is hereby given that the nomination will be considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations at the expiration of 6 days in accordance with the committee rule.

THE UNIVERSAL COPYRIGHT CONVENTION OF 1952

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the convention (Executive M, 83d Cong., 1st sess.), the Universal Copyright Convention of 1952, and three related protocols signed at Geneva, Switzerland, under date of September 6, 1952, which was read the second time, as follows:

UNIVERSAL COPYRIGHT CONVENTION

The Contracting States,

Moved by the desire to assure in all countries copyright protection of literary, scientific and artistic works,

Convinced that a system of copyright protection appropriate to all nations of the world and expressed in a universal convention, additional to, and without impairing international systems already in force, will ensure respect for the rights of the individual and encourage the development of literature, the sciences and the arts,

Persuaded that such a universal copyright system will facilitate a wider dissemination of works of the human mind and increase international understanding,

Have agreed as follows:

ARTICLE I

Each Contracting State undertakes to provide for the adequate and effective protection of the rights of authors and other copyright proprietors in literary, scientific, and artistic works, including writings, musical, dramatic and cinematographic works, and paintings, engravings and sculpture.

ARTICLE II

1. Published works of nationals of any Contracting State and works first published in that State shall enjoy in each other Contracting State the same protection as that other State accords to works of its nationals first published in its own territory.

2. Unpublished works of nationals of each Contracting State shall enjoy in each other Contracting State the same protection as that other State accords to unpublished works of its own nationals.

3. For the purpose of this Convention any Contracting State may, by domestic legislation, assimilate to its own nationals any person domiciled in that State.

ARTICLE III

1. Any Contracting State which, under its domestic law, requires as a condition of copyright, compliance with formalities such as deposit, registration, notice, notarial certificates, payment of fees or manufacture or publication in that Contracting State, shall regard these requirements as satisfied with respect to all workers protected in accordance with this Convention and first published outside its territory and the author of which is not one of its nationals, if from the time of the first publication all the copies of the work published with the authority of the author or other copyright proprietor bear the symbol © accompanied by the name of the copyright proprietor and the year of first publication placed in such manner and location as to give reasonable notice of claim of copyright.

2. The provisions of paragraph 1 of this article shall not preclude any Contracting State from requiring formalities or other conditions for the acquisition and enjoyment of copyright in respect of works first published in its territory or works of its nationals wherever published.

3. The provisions of paragraph 1 of this article shall not preclude any Contracting State from providing that a person seeking judicial relief must, in bringing the action, comply with procedural requirements, such as that the complainant must appear through domestic counsel or that the complainant must deposit with the court or an administrative office, or both, a copy of the work involved in the litigation; provided that failure to comply with such requirements shall not affect the validity of the copyright, nor shall any such requirement be imposed upon a national of another Contracting State if such requirement is not imposed on nationals of the State in which protection is claimed.

4. In each Contracting State there shall be legal means of protecting without formalities the unpublished works of nationals of other Contracting States.

5. If a Contracting State grants protection for more than one term of copyright and the first term is for a period longer than one of the minimum periods prescribed in Article IV, such State shall not be required to comply with the provisions of paragraph 1 of this Article III in respect of the second or any subsequent term of copyright.

ARTICLE IV

1. The duration of protection of a work shall be governed, in accordance with the

provisions of Article II and this article, by the law of the Contracting State in which protection is claimed.

2. The term of protection for works protected under this Convention shall not be less than the life of the author and 25 years after his death.

However, any Contracting State which, on the effective date of this Convention in that State, has limited this term for certain classes of works to a period computed from the first publication of the work, shall be entitled to maintain these exceptions and to extend them to other classes of works. For all these classes the term of protection shall not be less than 25 years from the date of first publication.

Any Contracting State which, upon the effective date of this Convention in that State, does not compute the term of protection upon the basis of the life of the author, shall be entitled to compute the term of protection from the date of the first publication of the work or from its registration prior to publication, as the case may be, provided the term of protection shall not be less than 25 years from the date of first publication or from its registration prior to publication, as the case may be.

If the legislation of a Contracting State grants two or more successive terms of protection, the duration of the first term shall not be less than one of the minimum periods specified above.

3. The provisions of paragraph 2 of this article shall not apply to photographic works or to works of applied art; provided, however, that the term of protection in those Contracting States which protect photographic works, or works of applied art in so far as they are protected as artistic works, shall not be less than ten years for each of said classes of works.

4. No Contracting State shall be obliged to grant protection to a work for a period longer than that fixed for the class of works to which the work in question belongs, in the case of unpublished works by the law of the Contracting State of which the author is a national, and in the case of published works by the law of the Contracting State in which the work has been first published.

For the purposes of the application of the preceding provision, if the law of any Contracting State grants two or more successive terms of protection, the period of protection of that State shall be considered to be the aggregate of those terms. However, if a specified work is not protected by such State during the second or any subsequent term for any reason, the other Contracting States shall not be obliged to protect it during the second or any subsequent term.

5. For the purposes of the application of paragraph 4 of this article, the work of a national of a Contracting State, first published in a non-Contracting State, shall be treated as though first published in the Contracting State of which the author is a national.

6. For the purposes of the application of paragraph 4 of this article, in case of simultaneous publication in two or more Contracting States, the work shall be treated as though first published in the State which affords the shortest term; any work published in two or more Contracting States within thirty days of its first publication shall be considered as having been published simultaneously in said Contracting States.

ARTICLE V

1. Copyright shall include the exclusive right of the author to make, publish, and authorize the making and publication of translations of works protected under this Convention.

2. However, any Contracting State may, by its domestic legislation, restrict the right of translation of writings, but only subject to the following provisions:

If, after the expiration of a period of seven years from the date of the first publication of a writing, a translation of such writing has not been published in the national language or languages, as the case may be, of the Contracting State, by the owner of the right of translation or with his authorization, any national of such Contracting State may obtain a non-exclusive license from the competent authority thereof to translate the work and publish the work so translated in any of the national languages in which it has not been published; provided that such national, in accordance with the procedure of the State concerned, establishes either that he has requested, and been denied, authorization by the proprietor of the right to make and publish the translation, or that, after due diligence on his part, he was unable to find the owner of the right. A license may also be granted on the same conditions if all previous editions of a translation in such language are out of print.

If the owner of the right of translation cannot be found, then the applicant for a license shall send copies of his application to the publisher whose name appears on the work and, if the nationality of the owner of the right of translation is known, to the diplomatic or consular representative of the State of which such owner is a national, or to the organization which may have been designated by the government of that State. The license shall not be granted before the expiration of a period of two months from the date of the dispatch of the copies of the application.

Due provision shall be made by domestic legislation to assure to the owner of the right of translation a compensation which is just and conforms to international standards, to assure payment and transmittal of such compensation, and to assure a correct translation of the work.

The original title and the name of the author of the work shall be printed on all copies of the published translation. The license shall be valid only for publication of the translation in the territory of the Contracting State where it has been applied for. Copies so published may be imported and sold in another Contracting State if one of the national languages of such other State is the same language as that into which the work has been so translated, and if the domestic law in such other State makes provision for such licenses and does not prohibit such importation and sale. Where the foregoing conditions do not exist, the importation and sale of such copies in a Contracting State shall be governed by its domestic law and its agreements. The license shall not be transferred by the licensee.

The license shall not be granted when the author has withdrawn from circulation all copies of the work.

ARTICLE VI

"Publication", as used in this Convention, means the reproduction in tangible form and the general distribution to the public of copies of a work from which it can be read or otherwise visually perceived.

ARTICLE VII

This Convention shall not apply to works or rights in works which, at the effective date of the Convention in a Contracting State where protection is claimed, are permanently in the public domain in the said Contracting State.

ARTICLE VIII

1. This Convention, which shall bear the date of September 6, 1952, shall be deposited with the Director-General of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization and shall remain open for signature by all States for a period of 120 days after that date. It shall be subject to ratification or acceptance by the signatory States.

2. Any State which has not signed this Convention may accede thereto.

3. Ratification, acceptance or accession shall be effected by the deposit of an instrument to that effect with the Director-General of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.

ARTICLE IX

1. This Convention shall come into force three months after the deposit of twelve instruments of ratification, acceptance or accession, among which there shall be those of four States which are not members of the International Union for the Protection of Literary and Artistic Works.

2. Subsequently, this Convention shall come into force in respect of each State three months after that State has deposited its instrument of ratification, acceptance or accession.

ARTICLE X

1. Each State party to this Convention undertakes to adopt, in accordance with its Constitution, such measures as are necessary to ensure the application of this Convention.

2. It is understood, however, that at the time an instrument of ratification, acceptance or accession is deposited on behalf of any State, such State must be in a position under its domestic law to give effect to the terms of this Convention.

ARTICLE XI

1. An Intergovernmental Committee is hereby established with the following duties:

(a) to study the problems concerning the application and operation of this Convention;

(b) to make preparation for periodic revisions of this Convention;

(c) to study any other problems concerning the international protection of copyright, in cooperation with the various interested international organizations, such as the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, the International Union for the Protection of Literary and Artistic Works and the Organization of American States;

(d) to inform the Contracting States as to its activities.

2. The Committee shall consist of the representatives of twelve Contracting States to be selected with due consideration to fair geographical representation and in conformity with the Resolution relating to this article, annexed to this Convention.

The Director-General of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, the Director of the Bureau of the International Union for the Protection of Literary and Artistic Works and the Secretary-General of the Organization of American States, or their representatives, may attend meetings of the Committee in an advisory capacity.

ARTICLE XII

The Intergovernmental Committee shall convene a conference for revision of this Convention whenever it deems necessary, or at the request of at least ten Contracting States, or of a majority of the Contracting States if there are less than twenty Contracting States.

ARTICLE XIII

Any Contracting State may, at the time of deposit of its instrument of ratification, acceptance or accession, or at any time thereafter, declare by notification addressed to the Director-General of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization that this Convention shall apply to all or any of the countries or territories for the international relations of which it is responsible and this Convention shall thereupon apply to the countries or territories named in such notification after the expiration of the term of three months provided for in Article IX. In the absence of such notification, this Convention shall not apply to any such country or territory.

ARTICLE XIV

1. Any Contracting State may denounce this Convention in its own name or on behalf of all or any of the countries or territories as to which a notification has been given under Article XIII. The denunciation shall be made by notification addressed to the Director-General of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.

2. Such denunciation shall operate only in respect of the State or of the country or territory on whose behalf it was made and shall not take effect until twelve months after the date of receipt of the notification.

ARTICLE XV

A dispute between two or more Contracting States concerning the interpretation or application of this Convention, not settled by negotiation, shall, unless the States concerned agree on some other method of settlement, be brought before the International Court of Justice for determination by it.

ARTICLE XVI

1. This Convention shall be established in English, French and Spanish. The three texts shall be signed and shall be equally authoritative.

2. Official texts of this Convention shall be established in German, Italian and Portuguese.

Any Contracting State or group of Contracting States shall be entitled to have established by the Director-General of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization other texts in the language of its choice by arrangement with the Director-General.

All such texts shall be annexed to the signed texts of this Convention.

ARTICLE XVII

1. This Convention shall not in any way affect the provisions of the Berne Convention for the Protection of Literary and Artistic Works or membership in the Union created by that Convention.

2. In application of the foregoing paragraph, a Declaration has been annexed to the present article. This Declaration is an integral part of this Convention for the States bound by the Berne Convention on January 1, 1951, or which have or may become bound to it at a later date. The signature of this Convention by such States shall also constitute signature of the said Declaration, and ratification, acceptance or accession by such States shall include the Declaration as well as the Convention.

ARTICLE XVIII

This Convention shall not abrogate multilateral or bilateral copyright conventions or arrangements that are or may be in effect exclusively between two or more American Republics. In the event of any difference either between the provisions of such existing conventions or arrangements and those of the provisions of this Convention, or between the provisions of this Convention and those of any new convention or arrangement which may be formulated between two or more American Republics after this Convention comes into force, the convention or arrangement most recently formulated shall prevail between the parties thereto. Rights in works acquired in any Contracting State under existing conventions or arrangements before the date this Convention comes into force in such State shall not be affected.

ARTICLE XIX

This Convention shall not abrogate multilateral or bilateral conventions or arrangements in effect between two or more Contracting States. In the event of any difference between the provisions of such existing conventions or arrangements and the provisions of this Convention, the provisions of this Convention shall prevail. Rights in

works acquired in any Contracting State under existing conventions or arrangements before the date on which this Convention comes into force in such State shall not be affected. Nothing in this article shall affect the provisions of Articles XVII and XVIII of this Convention.

ARTICLE XX

Reservations to this Convention shall not be permitted.

ARTICLE XXI

The Director-General of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization shall send duly certified copies of this Convention to the States interested, to the Swiss Federal Council and to the Secretary-General of the United Nations for registration by him.

He shall also inform all interested States of the ratifications, acceptances and accessions which have been deposited, the date on which this Convention comes into force, the notifications under Article XIII of this Convention, and denunciations under Article XIV.

APPENDIX DECLARATION RELATING TO ARTICLE XVII

The States which are members of the International Union for the Protection of Literary and Artistic Works, and which are signatories to the Universal Copyright Convention.

Desiring to reinforce their mutual relations on the basis of the said Union and to avoid any conflict which might result from the co-existence of the Convention of Berne and the Universal Convention,

Have, by common agreement, accepted the terms of the following declaration:

(a) Works which, according to the Berne Convention, have as their country of origin a country which has withdrawn from the International Union created by the said Convention, after January 1, 1951, shall not be protected by the Universal Copyright Convention in the countries of the Berne Union;

(b) The Universal Copyright Convention shall not be applicable to the relationships among countries of the Berne Union insofar as it relates to the protection of works having as their country of origin, within the meaning of the Berne Convention, a country of the International Union created by the said Convention.

RESOLUTION CONCERNING ARTICLE XI

The Intergovernmental Copyright Conference

Having considered the problems relating to the Intergovernmental Committee provided for in Article XI of the Universal Copyright Convention

Resolves

1. The first members of the Committee shall be representatives of the following twelve States, each of those States designating one representative and an alternate: Argentine, Brazil, France, Germany, India, Italy, Japan, Mexico, Spain, Switzerland, United Kingdom, and United States of America.

2. The Committee shall be constituted as soon as the Convention comes into force in accordance with Article XI of this Convention;

3. The Committee shall elect its Chairman and one Vice-Chairman. It shall establish its rules of procedure having regard to the following principles:

(a) The normal duration of the term of office of the representatives shall be six years; with one-third retiring every two years;

(b) before the expiration of the term of office of any members, the Committee shall decide which States shall cease to be represented on it and which States shall be called upon to designate representatives; the representatives of those States which have not ratified, accepted or acceded shall be the first to retire;

(c) the different parts of the world shall be fairly represented; and express the wish

that the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization provide its Secretariat.

In faith whereof the undersigned, having deposited their respective full powers, have signed this Convention.

Done at Geneva, this sixth day of September 1952, in a single copy.

For Afghanistan:
For the People's Republic of Albania:
For the German Federal Republic:
HOLZAPFEL.

For Andorra:
MARCEL PLAISANT.
J. DE ERICE.
M. DE LA CALZADA.
PUGET.

For the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia:
For the Argentine Republic:
E. MENDILAHARZU.

For the Federation of Australia:
H. R. WILMOT ad ref.

For Austria:
Dr. KURT FRIEBERGER.

For Belgium:
For the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic:
For the Union of Burma:
For Bolivia:
For Brazil:
ILDEFONSO MASCARENHAS DA SILVA.
For the Bulgarian People's Republic:
For the Kingdom of Cambodia:
For Canada:
DR. VICTOR L. DORÉ.
C. STEIN.
G. G. BECKETT.

For Ceylon:
For Chile:
GALLIANO.

For China:
For the Republic of Colombia:
For the Republic of Korea:
For Costa Rica:
For Cuba:
J. J. REMOS.
N. CHEDIAK.
HILDA LABRADA BERNAL.

For Denmark:
TORBEN LUND.

For the Dominican Republic:
For Egypt:
For the Republic of El Salvador:
H. ESCOBAR SERRANO.
AMT.

For Ecuador:
For Spain:
J. DE ERICE.
M. DE LA CALZADA.

For the United States of America:
LUTHER H. EVANS.

For Ethiopia:
For Finland:
Y. J. HAKULINEN.

For France:
MARCEL PLAISANT.
PUGET.
J. ESCARRA.
MARCEL BOUTET.

For Greece:
For Guatemala ad referendum:
ALB. DUPONT-WILLEMEN.

For the Republic of Haiti:
A. ADDOR.

For the Republic of Honduras:
BASILIO DE TELEPNEF.

For the Hungarian People's Republic:
For India:
B. N. LOKUR.

For the Republic of Indonesia:
For Iran:
For Iraq:
For Ireland:
EDWARD A. CLEARY.
PATRICK J. MCKENNA.

For Iceland:
For the State of Israel:
For Italy:
ANTONIO PENNETTA.
FILIPPO PASQUERA.

For Japan:
 For the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan:
 For the Kingdom of Laos:
 For Lebanon:
 For Liberia:

NAT. MASSAQUOI.
 J. ALB. JONES.

For Libya:
 For Liechtenstein:
 For Luxembourg:

J. STURM.

For Mexico:
 For Monaco:

G. FERNÁNDEZ DEL CASTILLO.
 SOLAMITO
 C. BARREIRA.

For Nepal:
 For Nicaragua:
 For Norway:

MULLHAUPT.
 EILIF MOE.

For New Zealand:
 For Pakistan:
 For Panama:
 For Paraguay:
 For the Netherlands:

G. H. C. BODENHAUSEN.

For Peru:
 For the Republic of the Philippines:
 For the Republic of Poland:
 For Portugal:

JÚLIO DANTAS.
 JOSÉ GALHARDO.

For the Rumanian People's Republic:
 For the United Kingdom of Great Britain
 and Northern Ireland:

J. L. BLAKE.

For the Republic of San Marino ad refer-
 endum:

Dr. B. LIFSCHITZ.

For the Holy See:

CH. COMTE.
 J. PAUL BUENSOD.

For Sweden:

STURE PETRÉN.
 ERIK HEDFELDT.

For the Confederation of Switzerland:
 For the Republic of Syria:
 For Czechoslovakia:
 For Thailand:
 For Turkey:
 For the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Re-
 public:
 For the Union of South Africa:
 For the Union of Soviet Socialist Re-
 publics:
 For the Oriental Republic of Uruguay:
 For the United States of Venezuela:
 For the State of Viet-Nam:
 For Yemen:
 For the Federal People's Republic of
 Yugoslavia:

PLINIO BOLLA.
 HANS MORF.
 HENRI THÉVENAZ.

JULIÁN NOGUEIRA.
 IT EDUARDO PEROTTI.

Dr. BERTHOLD EISNER.

Certified a true and complete copy of the original Universal Copyright Convention, signed at Geneva on 6 September 1952, and of a declaration annexed thereto relating to Article XVII thereof, and of a resolution concerning Article XI thereof, annexed thereto. Paris, 3 November 1952.

HANNA SABA,
*Legal Adviser of the United Nations
 Educational, Scientific and Cultural
 Organization.*

PROTOCOL 1 ANNEXED TO THE UNIVERSAL COPY-
 RIGHT CONVENTION CONCERNING THE APPLI-
 CATION OF THAT CONVENTION TO THE WORKS
 OF STATELESS PERSONS AND REFUGEES

The States parties hereto, being also parties to the Universal Copyright Convention (hereinafter referred to as the "Convention") have accepted the following provisions:

1. Stateless persons and refugees who have their habitual residence in a State party to this Protocol shall, for the purposes of the Convention, be assimilated to the nationals of that State.

2. (a) This Protocol shall be signed and shall be subject to ratification or acceptance, or may be acceded to, as if the provisions of Article VIII of the Convention applied hereto.

(b) This Protocol shall enter into force in respect of each State, on the date of deposit of the instrument of ratification, acceptance or accession of the State concerned or on the date of entry into force of the Convention with respect to such State, whichever is the later.

In faith whereof the undersigned, being duly authorised thereto, have signed this Protocol.

Done at Geneva this sixth day of September 1952, in the English, French and Spanish languages, the three texts being equally authoritative, in a single copy which shall be deposited with the Director-General of Unesco. The Director-General shall send certified copies to the signatory States, to the Swiss Federal Council and to the Secretary-General of the United Nations for registration.

For Afghanistan:
 For the People's Republic of Albania:
 For the German Federal Republic:

HOLZAPFEL.

For Andorra:
 For the Kingdom of Saudi-Arabia:
 For the Argentine Republic:
 For the Federation of Australia:
 For Austria:
 For Belgium:
 For the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Re-
 public:
 For the Union of Burma:
 For Bolivia:
 For Brazil:
 For the Bulgarian People's Republic:
 For the Kingdom of Cambodia:
 For Canada:
 For Ceylon:
 For Chile:
 For China:
 For the Republic of Colombia:
 For the Republic of Korea:
 For Costa Rica:
 For Cuba:
 For Denmark:
 For the Dominican Republic:
 For Egypt:
 For the Republic of El Salvador:
 For Ecuador:
 For Spain:
 For the United States of America:
 For Ethiopia:
 For Finland:
 For France:
 For Greece:
 For Guatemala ad referendum:
 For the Republic of Haiti:
 For the Republic of Honduras:
 For the People's Republic of Albania:
 For the German Federal Republic:
 For Andorra:
 For the Kingdom of Saudi-Arabia:
 For the Argentine Republic:
 For the Federation of Australia:
 For Austria:
 For Belgium:
 For the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Re-
 public:
 For the Union of Burma:
 For Bolivia:
 For Brazil:
 For the Bulgarian People's Republic:
 For the Kingdom of Cambodia:
 For Canada:
 For Ceylon:
 For Chile:
 For China:
 For the Republic of Colombia:
 For the Republic of Korea:
 For Costa Rica:
 For Cuba:
 For Denmark:
 For the Dominican Republic:
 For Egypt:
 For the Republic of El Salvador:
 For Ecuador:
 For Spain:
 For the United States of America:
 For Ethiopia:
 For Finland:
 For France:
 For Greece:
 For Guatemala ad referendum:
 For the Republic of Haiti:
 For the Republic of Honduras:

MARCEL PLAISANT.
 PUGET.
 J. ESCARRA.
 MARCEL BOUTET.

ALB. DUPONT-WILLEMIN.

A. ADDOR.
 BASILIO DE TELEPNEF.

MARCEL PLAISANT.
 PUGET.

DR. VICTOR L. DORÉ.
 C. STEIN.
 G. G. BECKETT.

DR. KURT FRIEBERGER.

ILDEFONSO MASCARENHAS DA SILVA.

DR. VICTOR L. DORÉ.
 C. STEIN.
 G. G. BECKETT.

TORBEN LUND.

H. ESCOBAR SERRANO,
 AMY.

LUTHER H. EVANS.

For the Hungarian People's Republic:
 For India:
 For the Republic of Indonesia:
 For Iran:
 For Iraq:
 For Ireland:
 For Iceland:
 For the State of Israel:
 For Italy:
 For Japan:
 For the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan:
 For the Kingdom of Laos:
 For Lebanon:
 For Liberia:
 For Libya:
 For Liechtenstein:
 For Luxembourg:
 For Mexico:
 For Monaco:
 For Nepal:
 For Nicaragua:
 For Norway:
 For New Zealand:
 For Pakistan:
 For Panama:
 For Paraguay:
 For the Netherlands:
 For Peru:
 For the Republic of the Philippines:
 For the Republic of Poland:
 For Portugal:
 For the Rumanian People's Republic:
 For the United Kingdom of Great Britain
 and Northern Ireland:
 For the Republic of San Marino ad refer-
 endum:
 For the Holy See:
 For Sweden:
 For the Confederation of Switzerland:
 For the Republic of Syria:
 For Czechoslovakia:
 For Thailand:
 For Turkey:
 For the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Re-
 public:
 For the Union of South Africa:
 For the Union of Soviet Socialist Re-
 publics:
 For the Oriental Republic of Uruguay:
 For the United States of Venezuela:
 For the State of Viet-Nam:
 For Yemen:
 For the Federal People's Republic of Yugo-
 slavia:
 Certified a true and complete copy of the original protocol 1 annexed to the Universal Copyright Convention concerning the application of that Convention to the works of stateless persons and refugees. Paris, 3 November 1952.

B. N. LOKUR.

EDWARD A. CLEARY.
 PATRICK J. MCKENNA.

ANTONIO PENNETTA.
 FILIPPO PASQUERA.

J. STURM.

SOLAMITO
 C. BARREIRA.

MULLHAUPT.

EILIF MOE.

J. L. BLAKE.

LIFSCHITZ.

CH. COMTE.
 J. PAUL BUENSOD.

STURE PETRÉN.
 ERIK HEDFELDT.

PLINIO BOLLA.
 HANS MORF.
 HENRI THÉVENAZ.

JULIÁN NOGUEIRA.
 IT EDUARDO PEROTTI.

Dr. BERTHOLD EISNER.

HANNA SABA,
*Legal Adviser of the United Nations
 Educational, Scientific and Cultural
 Organization.*

PROTOCOL 2 ANNEXED TO THE UNIVERSAL COPYRIGHT CONVENTION, CONCERNING THE APPLICATION OF THAT CONVENTION TO THE WORKS OF CERTAIN INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

The State parties hereto, being also parties to the Universal Copyright Convention (hereinafter referred to as the "Convention"),

Have accepted the following provisions:

1. (a) The protection provided for in Article II (1) of the Convention shall apply to works published for the first time by the United Nations, by the Specialized Agencies in relationship therewith, or by the Organization of American States;

(b) Similarly, Article II (2) of the Convention shall apply to the said organization or agencies.

2. (a) This Protocol shall be signed and shall be subject to ratification or acceptance, or may be acceded to, as if the provisions of Article VIII of the Convention applied hereto.

(b) This Protocol shall enter into force for each State on the date of deposit of the instrument of ratification, acceptance or accession of the State concerned or on the date of entry into force of the Convention with respect to such State, whichever is the later.

In faith whereof the undersigned, being duly authorized thereto, have signed this Protocol.

Done at Geneva, this sixth day of September 1952, in the English, French and Spanish languages, the three texts being equally authoritative, in a single copy which shall be deposited with the Director-General of Unesco.

The Director-General shall send certified copies to the signatory States, to the Swiss Federal Council, and to the Secretary-General of the United Nations for registration.

For Afghanistan:

For the People's Republic of Albania:

For the German Federal Republic:

HOLZAPFEL.

For Andorra:

MARCEL PLAISANT.

J. DE ERICE.

M. DE LA CALZADA.

PUGET.

For the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia:

For the Argentine Republic:

E. MENDILAHARZU.

For the Federation of Australia:

H. R. WILMOT

ad ref.

For Austria:

DR. KURT FRIEBERGER.

For Belgium:

For the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic:

For the Union of Burma:

For Bolivia:

For Brazil:

ILDEFONSO MASCARENHAS DA SILVA.

For the Bulgarian People's Republic:

For the Kingdom of Cambodia:

For Canada:

DR. VICTOR L. DORÉ.

C. STEIN.

G. G. BECKETT.

For Ceylon:

For Chile:

GALLIANO.

For China:

For the Republic of Colombia:

For the Republic of Korea:

For Costa Rica:

For Cuba:

J. J. REMOS.

N. CHEDIAK.

HILDA LABRADA BERNAL.

For Denmark:

TORBEN LUND.

For the Dominican Republic:

For Egypt:

For the Republic of El Salvador:

H. ESCOBAR SERRANO.

ARMY

For Ecuador:

For Spain:

J. DE ERICE.

M. DE LA CALZADA.

For the United States of America:

LUTHER H. EVANS.

For Ethiopia:

For Finland:

Y. J. HAKULINEN.

For France:

MARCEL PLAISANT.

PUGET.

J. ESCARRA.

MARCEL BOUTET.

For Greece:

For Guatemala ad referendum:

ALB. DUPONT-WILLEMINE.

For the Republic of Haiti:

A. ADDOR.

For the Republic of Honduras:

BISILIO DE TELEPNEF.

For the Hungarian People's Republic:

For India:

B. N. LOKUR.

For the Republic of Indonesia:

For Iran:

For Iraq:

For Ireland:

EDWARD A. CLEARY.

PATRICK J. MCKENNA.

For Iceland:

For the State of Israel:

For Italy:

ANTONIO PENNETTA.

FILIPPO PASQUERA.

For Japan:

For the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan:

For the Kingdom of Laos:

For Lebanon:

For Liberia:

NAT. MASSAQUOL.

J. ALB. JONES.

For Libya:

For Liechtenstein:

For Luxemburg:

J. STURM.

For Mexico:

G. FERNÁNDEZ DEL CASTILLO.

For Monaco:

SOLAMITO.

C. BARREIRA.

For Nepal:

For Nicaragua:

MULLHAUPT.

For Norway:

ELIF MOE.

For New Zealand:

For Pakistan:

For Panama:

For Paraguay:

For the Netherlands:

For Peru:

For the Republic of the Philippines:

For the Republic of Poland:

For Portugal:

JÚLIO DANATAS.

JOSÉ GALHARDO.

For the Rumanian People's Republic:
For the United Kingdom of Great Britain
and Northern Ireland:

J. L. BLAKE.

For the Republic of San Marino ad referendum:

LIFSCHITZ.

For the Holy See:

CH. COMTE.

J. PAUL BUENSOD.

For Sweden:

STURE PETRÉN.

ERIK HEDFELDT.

For the Confederation of Switzerland:

PLINIO BOLLA.

HANS MORF.

HENRI THÉVENAZ.

For the Republic of Syria:

For Czechoslovakia:

For Thailand:

For Turkey:

For the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic:

For the Union of South Africa:

For the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics:

For the Oriental Republic of Uruguay:

JULIAN NOGUEIRA.

IT EDUARDO PEROTTI.

For the United States of Venezuela:

For the State of Viet-Nam:

For Yemen:

For the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia:

DR. BERTHOLD EISNER.

Certified a true and complete copy of the original Protocol 2 annexed to the Universal Copyright Convention concerning the application of that Convention to the works of certain international organizations.

Paris, 3 November 1952.

HANNA SABA,

*Legal Adviser of the United Nations
Educational, Scientific and Cultural
Organization.*

PROTOCOL 3 ANNEXED TO THE UNIVERSAL COPYRIGHT CONVENTION CONCERNING THE EFFECTIVE DATE OF INSTRUMENTS OF RATIFICATION OR ACCEPTANCE OF OR ACCESSION TO THAT CONVENTION

States parties hereto

Recognizing that the application of the Universal Copyright Convention (hereinafter referred to as the "Convention") to States participating in all the international copyright systems already in force will contribute greatly to the value of the Convention;

Have agreed as follows:

1. Any State party hereto may, on depositing its instrument of ratification or acceptance or accession to the Convention, notify the Director-General of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (hereinafter referred to as "Director-General") that that instrument shall not take effect for the purposes of Article IX of the Convention until any other State named in such notification shall have deposited its instrument.

2. The notification referred to in paragraph 1 above shall accompany the instrument to which it relates.

3. The Director-General shall inform all States signatory or which have then acceded to the Convention of any notifications received in accordance with this Protocol.

4. This Protocol shall bear the same date and shall remain open for signature for the same period as the Convention.

5. It shall be subject to ratification or acceptance by the signatory States. Any State which has not signed this Protocol may accede thereto.

6. (a) Ratification or acceptance or accession shall be effected by the deposit of an instrument to that effect with the Director-General.

(b) This Protocol shall enter into force on the date of deposit of not less than four instruments of ratification or acceptance or accession. The Director-General shall inform all interested States of this date. Instruments deposited after such date shall take effect on the date of their deposit.

In faith whereof the undersigned, being duly authorized thereto, have signed this Protocol.

Done at Geneva, this sixth day of September 1952, in the English, French and the Spanish languages, the three texts being equally authoritative, in a single copy which shall be annexed to the original copy of the Convention. The Director-General shall send certified copies to the signatory States to the Swiss Federal Council, and to the Secretary-General of United Nations for registration.

- For Afghanistan:
For the People's Republic of Albania:
For the German Federal Republic:
HOLZAPFEL.
- For Andorra:
MARCEL PAISANT.
PUGET.
- For the Kingdom of Saudi-Arabia:
For the Argentine Republic:
For the Federation of Australia:
H. R. WILMOT ad ref.
- For Austria:
Dr. KURT FRIEBERGER.
- For Belgium:
For the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic:
For the Union of Burma:
For Bolivia:
For Brazil:
ILDEFONSO MASCARENHAS DA SILVA.
- For the Bulgarian People's Republic:
For the Kingdom of Cambodia:
For Canada:
Dr. VICTOR L. DORÉ.
C. STEIN.
G. G. BECKETT.
- For Ceylon:
For Chile:
For China:
For the Republic of Colombia:
For the Republic of Korea:
For Costa Rica:
For Cuba:
For Denmark:
TORBEN LUND.
- For the Dominican Republic:
For Egypt:
For the Republic of El Salvador:
H. ESCOBAR SERRANO.
AMY.
- For Ecuador:
For Spain:
For the United States of America:
LUTHER H. EVANS.
- For Ethiopia:
For Finland:
Y. J. HAKULINEN.
- For France:
MARCEL PLAISANT.
PUGET.
J. ESCARRA.
MARCEL BOUTET.
- For Greece:
For Guatemala ad referendum:
ALB. DUPONT-WILLEMEN.
- For the Republic of Haiti:
A. ADDOR.
- For the Republic of Honduras:
BASILIO DE TELEPNEF.
- For the Hungarian People's Republic:
For India:
For the Republic of Indonesia:
For Iran:
For Iraq:
For Ireland:
EDWARD A. CLEARY.
PATRICK J. MCKENNA.
- For Iceland:
For the State of Israel:
For Italy:
ANTONIO PENNETTA.
FILIPPO PASQUERA.
- For Japan:
For the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan:
For the Kingdom of Laos:
For the Lebanon:
For Liberia:
For Libya:
For Liechtenstein:
For Luxembourg:
J. STURM.
- For Mexico:
For Monaco:
For Nepal:
For Nicaragua:
MULLHAUPT.
- For Norway:
ELIF MOE.
- For New Zealand:
For Pakistan:
For Panama:
For Paraguay:
For the Netherlands:
G. H. C. BODENHAUSEN.
- For Peru:
For the Republic of the Philippines:
For the Republic of Poland:
For Portugal:
JÚLIO DANTAS.
JOSÉ GALHARDO.
- For the Rumanian People's Republic:
For the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland:
J. L. BLAKE.
- For the Republic of San Marino ad referendum:
LIFSCHITZ.
- For the Holy See:
CH. COMTE.
J. PAUL BUENSOD.
- For Sweden:
STURE PETRÉN.
ERIK HEDFELDT.
- For the Confederation of Switzerland:
For the Republic of Syria:
For Czechoslovakia:
For Thailand:
For Turkey:
For the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic:
For the Union of South Africa:
For the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics:
For the Oriental Republic of Uruguay:
JULIÁN NOGUEIRA.
IT EDUARDO PEROTTI.
- For the United States of Venezuela:
For the State of Viet-Nam:
For Yemen:
For the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia:
Dr. BERTHOLD EISNER.

Certified a true and complete copy of the original Protocol 3 annexed to the Universal Copyright Convention concerning the effective date of instruments of ratification or acceptance or of accession to that Convention. Paris, 3 November 1952.

HANNA SABA,
*Legal Adviser of the United Nations
Education, Scientific and Cultural
Organization.*

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, before the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] explains the Universal Copyright Convention I wish to remind Senators that under the standard operating procedure, since this is a treaty, there will be a yea-and-nay vote. So I ask all Senators to bear in mind that there will be a rollcall on ratification of the convention.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, the pending business before the Senate is the question of advising and consenting to the Universal Copyright Convention, which has been entered into and submitted as a treaty by the President.

I will say at the outset that I know of no objection on the part of any Member of the Senate to the ratification of the treaty. However, because it is an important treaty, because it has far-reaching effects on the arts and on scientific activities in this country, because it protects the genius of our writers and producers, and because the subject matter has brought about grave controversy for several years past, I believe it is necessary, in connection with its congressional history, to make a short statement.

Mr. President, on Thursday, May 20, the Committee on Foreign Relations ordered reported to the Senate the Universal Copyright Convention and three related protocols—Executive M, 83d Congress, 2d session—signed at Geneva on September 6, 1952. The committee was unanimous in recommending that the Senate give its advice and consent to ratification of this important and desirable document.

Few treaties which have been presented to the Senate have had such widespread endorsement by so many different elements of the American public as this convention has received. At the hearings, testimony was presented by representatives of virtually all segments of industry which might be interested in or affected by the convention and the implementing legislation—S. 2559, 83d Congress, 2d session.

This testimony, with the exception of that by spokesmen on behalf of the typographical unions, constituted an overwhelming and enthusiastic demonstration of the favor in which the convention is held. It established most convincingly that there is a real need for an international agreement to protect the rights of American authors, composers, artists, sculptors, and scientists against unauthorized use and piracy of their creative works.

The Universal Copyright Convention achieves that goal without economic or other prejudice to any American group, either in labor or industry.

The convention has been drafted with the greatest of care and skill. Its clauses were painstakingly developed in extensive consultations between copyright experts here and abroad. Copyright committees of several bar associations in the United States participated in the preliminary formulation of the draft; and the text which was adopted at the Geneva Conference has since been the object of their most careful scrutiny.

The result of that conference was a document which not only embodies the most acceptable concepts of American and European practice, but which recognizes the basic principles governing the law of copyright in the United States. For the first time, the Senate has before it a copyright convention which avoids the objectionable features of the Berne Convention of 1886, and which this Government can unqualifiedly accept.

Mr. President, the purpose of the Universal Copyright Convention is to provide a sounder and more adequate basis than now exists for copyright protection in foreign countries of United States books and periodicals, motion pictures, musical, artistic, and similar cultural and scientific creations.

Such protection as American citizens have enjoyed in the past has had to be sought either in our bilateral arrangements with other countries, or in the Berne Convention to which we are not even a party. The bilaterals have proven to be inadequate, complicated, and administratively expensive for the individual. They impose burdensome and technical requirements on an American author, frequently out of proportion

to the advantages he seeks. Every time he writes a new work, or composes a new song, he has to comply with the requirements of 40 different countries to obtain copyright protection abroad. For this he must incur clerical and legal expenses.

We have, however, been able to take advantage until now of a provision in the Berne Convention under which any work published in a member state by a national or a nonnational of such state enjoys both within that state and all other member countries the rights granted by the convention. Because of this "side-door" entrance to Berne, our people have been able to secure copyright protection throughout much of the world by the device of merely sending copies of their works to a Canadian city for sale on the same day that they are published in the United States. This publication procedure then provides automatic copyright protection in all of the 43 Berne countries.

But no reciprocal benefits are extended under our law to the citizens of the Berne nations. We enjoy protection only at the sufferance of those nations, because under the Berne Convention such protection can be withdrawn at any time when a member government finds that a nonmember fails to protect adequately the authors of a Berne union country. Shadows have been cast, in litigation abroad, over the validity of the simultaneous sale procedure as a true publication within the meaning of the convention. Several authorities, including officials of the Department of State, have expressed the conviction that there is a real danger that the "side-door" privilege may be withdrawn, and that retaliatory action has been deferred pending consideration of the present convention by non-Berne countries.

Such action, Mr. President, would be quite understandable, inasmuch as we have been enjoying the fruits of a convention for over 50 years without assuming any of its obligations.

One of the principal sources of irritation to Berne countries has been the manufacturing clause in our law—17th United States Code, section 16—which denies copyright protection to a foreign author of a book or periodical written in English unless his work is printed from type set in the United States. While he may get a temporary or ad interim protection, once that expires he may find his work being pirated. He may find it made the basis of a play or motion picture without being entitled to a penny of royalty. He loses what he has created. The convention before us corrects this injustice.

We have been unable to adhere to the Berne Convention because it contained a number of concepts which conflicted with basic American copyright law. Involved were such matters as the automatic recognition of copyright without any formalities, the protection of so-called moral rights, and the retroactivity of copyright protection with respect to works which are already in the public domain of the United States. On the other hand, it was claimed that Berne's protection of oral works, such as speeches, would have conflicted with

article I, section 8 of the Constitution, which refers only to writings as material to be protected.

It was because these concepts are fundamental in the European system that it proved so difficult to draft a text which would reconcile that system with our own. The Universal Copyright Convention successfully bridges the two systems, making it possible for all governments to accept its provisions.

I should like now, Mr. President, to discuss briefly how the present convention operates.

The underlying principle of the convention is that of national treatment. In other words, what the convention does, basically, is to provide that every state shall grant copyright protection to the works of subjects of other parties to the same degree and on the same basis as that which it provides for its own nationals. This principle applies both to published and unpublished works.

Each contracting state undertakes to provide for the adequate and effective protection of the rights of authors and other copyright proprietors in literary, scientific and artistic works, including writings, musical, dramatic and cinematographic works, as well as paintings, engravings, and sculpture. (Art. I.) The formalities for obtaining copyright protection in the other contracting states are greatly simplified. Thus, in those states which now require certain formalities, such as deposit, registration fee, local manufacture, and so on, exemption from such requirements will be given to works first published elsewhere which bear the symbol ©, accompanied by the name of the copyright proprietor, placed in the work in such a manner as to give reasonable notice of the claim of copyright. Satisfactory provisions concerning the duration of copyright protection are contained in article IV. Copyright under the convention also covers translation rights which are of the greatest value to American authors.

Protocols 1 and 2 annexed to the convention would extend its protection to stateless persons and refugees who habitually reside in a member state, and to works published for the first time by the United Nations or the Organization of American States. Protocol 3 permits any state, upon depositing its ratification, to give notice that its ratification will not be effective until any other given state named shall likewise have deposited its instrument.

Under article X of the convention each state undertakes to adopt, in accordance with its constitution, such measures as are necessary to insure application of the convention in its territory. Moreover, each state must be in a position under its domestic law to give effect to the instrument at the time its ratification is deposited. In other words, the convention is not self-executing. It specifically contemplates as a preliminary condition that any provisions of domestic law which are inconsistent with it will be repealed before the convention becomes effective.

There are only a few formal and technical changes which have to be made in our law in order to comply with article

X. First of all, a separate Presidential proclamation with respect to mechanical recordation rights would be dispensed with. Secondly, the initial deposit of copies of the work in the copyright office would not be required, although such copies would still have to be deposited as a prerequisite to bringing suit. Third, the provisions of title 17, section 19, of the United States Code concerning the notice of copyright which must be inserted in the work to claim protection would be modified under the convention and implementing legislation in S. 2559 to permit the author or publisher to utilize the symbol © as an alternative to the present statutory notice. Such works would then be exempted from the prohibition of section 107 of title 17 of the code against importation into the United States of copies manufactured abroad during the existence of American copyright. Finally, the requirement of manufacture within the United States of English-language books and periodicals of foreign origin as a prerequisite to obtaining copyright here (title 17, U. S. C., section 16) would also be eliminated.

Since virtually the entire opposition which has been manifested against the convention has been directed at this latter change—the modification of the manufacturing clause—it is necessary, Mr. President, to make several comments on this aspect of the convention and the proposed change. To begin with, as I observed earlier, the manufacturing clause now on the books bars copyright to all books or periodicals in the English language which are not printed from type set within the limits of the United States. In its present form it applies to all authors, foreign and American, whether residing inside or outside of the United States.

The change which is required to implement the convention applies only to the work of foreign authors. It does not touch the works of American authors, or of aliens residing here. They will still have to manufacture in the United States, and will not be free to replace American facilities by purportedly cheaper facilities elsewhere. Spokesmen for the typographical unions have manifested their apprehensions that the contemplated change in the manufacturing clause would be prejudicial to the workers in the book-manufacturing industry. The committee carefully explored the basis for these apprehensions and determined that they were completely without substance. On the contrary, the evidence before the committee tended to establish that American manufacturing may indeed gain through the possibility of increased exports, which benefits will accrue directly to workers in the industry. The problem is treated in some detail in the committee's report, at pages 12-14.

I may say parenthetically at this point, Mr. President, that the record clearly shows that the probabilities are that instead of decreasing employment, it would increase employment in the United States. Because of greater copyright protection for American works abroad against infringement—preventing the piracy which could compete with

our own publications in foreign countries—American manufacturing may indeed gain through the possibility of increased exports. The cost here is much less on issues running over 2,500 copies. As to issues running under 2,500 copies, there are a few places abroad where there is a slightly lower cost of publication. But works which have any wide currency run considerably more than 2,500 copies, and in those cases it is far cheaper to publish with our more efficient methods in the United States. There is, therefore, a prospect of more rather than less work in this country.

The committee's conclusions as to the economic effects of the implementing legislation are supported by statistical studies prepared by the Department of Commerce, the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, and an analysis submitted by the Book Publishers Council. Finally, it may be noted that the Congress of Industrial Organizations, in a statement submitted to the committee on April 14, 1954, declared:

After examining all of the economic arguments that appear to be involved in the consideration of this issue, it is the viewpoint of the CIO that there is no legitimate interest of American workers which is sufficiently threatened to justify any hesitation to proceed with this proposed legislation and secure for this Nation and other nations the great benefit which enactment of this proposed bill and of the Universal Copyright Convention would achieve.

Here, Mr. President, is a convention which is sound in substance and sound in its enacting procedure. There is no Missouri against Holland problem in this treaty. The treaty of itself makes no attempt to change our domestic law. It does require this country to modify that law in some respects if we want the benefits of the convention; but the implementing legislation falls squarely within the powers expressly granted to Congress under article I, section 8, of the Constitution. And the treaty cannot become effective for the United States until and unless that legislation is enacted.

This is a treaty which, from the copyright standpoint, has the overwhelming approval of the people of this country. It has the support of authors, composers, publishing companies, library associations, Catholic, Protestant, and Christian Science publication societies, radio and television organizations, and photographers' associations. It has the endorsement of virtually the entire organized copyright bar. And it was approved by the house of delegates of the American Bar Association on March 8, 1954.

Acceptance of this convention by the United States would mean that American authors would no longer need to rely on a tenuous side-door device to prevent piracy of their works. The fear that this avenue may be suddenly blocked off will no longer exist. The United States will at long last extend the friendly arm of protection to foreign authors in a workable international agreement. In return for this we receive a specific quid pro quo from every other party to the convention, through improved pro-

tection of literary and artistic creations by American citizens.

Authorship as such is safeguarded. Material values arising from American intellectual labor and art are preserved. Protection is furnished against abuse of the views of our citizens through mistranslation and misquotation. On the other hand, our continuously expanding foreign market for books and other materials will be strengthened.

At the same time, Mr. President, acceptance of the Universal Copyright Convention will permit the United States to join with other nations of the free world in an unmistakable recognition of spiritual values. We will, as a consequence, wipe away the irritation and resentments of over a century and a half at our discrimination against foreigners in this field.

The convention gives us much. The concessions we make are small. It merits the warm approbation of the Senate.

Mr. President, the committee which held hearings on this convention was a combined committee composed of a subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee and a subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee. We sat in combined hearings because the principal issues were largely the same. This convention has the unanimous approval of the subcommittees and of the Foreign Relations Committee.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. As I understand, this treaty has nothing whatsoever to do with jukeboxes?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Oh, no. The convention does not disturb the status of phonograph records under the American law of copyright, and in any event there is nothing in the convention with respect to jukeboxes in any way, shape, or form.

Mr. LANGER. It does not involve the bill now pending before the Judiciary Committee; does it?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. No; it does not affect it in any way whatsoever.

Mr. LANGER. That is my understanding, but I wanted to receive the assurance of the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Senate bill 2559 is now before the Judiciary Committee. This treaty has nothing to do with the measure S. 1106, to which the Senator from North Dakota alluded.

Mr. President, in the absence of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] who is chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee and also chairman of the subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee which sat on this matter, I ask unanimous consent to have placed in the Record at the close of my remarks a statement prepared by the Senator from Wisconsin.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I shall be happy to answer any questions which Senators may desire to ask. However, as I have said, I know of no objection to be raised to the convention on the floor of the Senate. I myself be-

lieve it is a step forward and will be very beneficial to the United States.

EXHIBIT 1

UNIVERSAL COPYRIGHT CONVENTION

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

Until the present time the United States has not participated in a worldwide arrangement which would soundly protect American literary, artistic, and cultural property from unauthorized use abroad.

The only major multipartite instrument to which we are a party is the Buenos Aires Convention of 1910. But this agreement falls far short of providing the sorely needed degree of protection. In the first place, it is closed to non-American countries. More important, it has been undermined by administrative and tariff restrictions curtailing imports of American books. Its substantive application has been whittled away by local practice and interpretation.

For the most part, the legal basis of international copyright protection for our citizens reposes in a complex network of bilateral agreements which provide an ineffective and largely theoretical protection. But at the same time, it can hardly be said that we in the United States have been solicitous about protecting the rights of foreign authors in this country.

In fact, for the greater portion of our history, from 1790 to 1891, it wasn't even possible for foreign writers to secure copyright here. This period has been well-named the age of literary piracy. There was no law to prevent thievery of the great works of that period. Dickens, Thackeray, Stevenson, and others were freely pirated, until public opinion mobilized to correct what in truth was a national sin. At long last, in 1891, a revision of the Copyright Act extended protection to foreign writers—on condition that they comply with all our formalities, including the requirement that their works be manufactured in the United States. This manufacturing clause extended to all foreign writers no matter what the language of their works. Finally, the requirement was removed with respect to foreigners abroad writing in a language other than English. Such is its present form.

There may have been a selfish reason early in our history to take that attitude. We were a young nation, an importing nation, without an established printing industry. It made some sense to say, "We will not grant copyright to foreign authors unless they manufacture here." We were free to pirate such works, and so we did. Dickens and other authors could claim no revenue from sales in the United States.

But today the situation has vastly changed. We are no longer an importing country in the literary and artistic field. We are an exporting country. And it is big business. Book exports alone account for almost \$25 million annually. Receipts from foreign showings of American motion pictures account for another \$175 million. It is now American authors, American music, American motion pictures that are desired overseas. It is now we who need protection against piracy and uncompensated use.

The intellectual creations of our citizens have a right to simpler and more effective protection than they now enjoy. On the other hand, aside from the material interests involved, our failure to join in a reciprocal, multipartite instrument to protect literary and cultural property has furnished ammunition to those who desire to spread the impression that we are not concerned with spiritual values. It has also left us in the unflattering company of the Iron Curtain countries which do not grant copyright protection to foreign authors. In parentheses it may be added that neither the Soviet Union nor any of the satellite countries either participated in the draft-

ing negotiations at Geneva, or has exhibited any interest in the convention since.

A few words should be said about the composition of the delegation which represented the United States at Geneva when the convention was finalized. Many American experts collaborated in drawing up the document which was placed before the negotiating conference. That document had been hammered out after consultations between the recognized copyright authorities in the publishing, motion picture, music, and radio fields. When the conference convened, the United States delegation included 4 leading copyright lawyers, and was accompanied by 2 congressional advisers, Representative CRUMPACKER and the late Representative Bryson from the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives.

The final text was signed by the United States and 39 other countries, including several signatories which do not appear in Executive M, namely, Belgium, Israel, Japan, and Peru.

Before concluding these few remarks, I wish to direct attention to a somewhat unusual provision in the convention which may perhaps be misconstrued if the reason for its inclusion is not understood. I refer to Article XX. That article provides that reservations to the convention shall not be permitted. This simply means that if we want the convention, we either take it as it is, or forget it. It is all or nothing.

There is a perfectly valid reason for this restriction. The United States delegation was put on notice at the conference that some of the other governments might wish to enter reservations with respect to translation rights. So far as we were concerned, such action would have emasculated the document. Translation rights are of the greatest value to the author of an English work; and testimony before the committee confirmed that our delegation would not have had any interest in signing the convention without them. We therefore insisted that Article XX be inserted in the instrument, to safeguard the rights of our own citizens. By so doing, the value of the convention itself has been enhanced in insuring uniformity of protection throughout the world without qualifications of its provisions through an indeterminate number of reservations.

The Universal Copyright Convention is a remarkable document; remarkable in that, while preserving our own principles of copyright protection intact, with a few minor changes, it nevertheless achieves international protection in such simple language and with such simple procedure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The convention is open to amendment.

If there be no amendment to be offered, and if there be no objection, the pending convention and three related protocols will be considered as having passed through their various parliamentary stages, up to the presentation of the resolution of ratification.

The clerk will read the resolution of ratification.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of Executive M, 83d Congress, 1st session, the Universal Copyright Convention, together with certified copies of three related protocols, signed at Geneva under date of September 6, 1952, by the respective plenipotentiaries of the United States of America and other States concerned.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution of ratification is open to reservation.

If there be no reservation to the resolution of ratification, the question is,

Will the Senate advise and consent to the resolution of ratification?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, first I ask for the yeas and nays; then I shall suggest the absence of a quorum.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HENDRICKSON in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the resolution of ratification? The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] would each vote "yea."

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURKE], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senators from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN and Mr. LENNON], the Senators from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT and Mr. McCLELLAN], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] are absent on official business.

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] would "each vote "yea."

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 65, nays 3, as follows:

YEAS—65

- | | | |
|----------|---------|----------|
| Alken | Bricker | Chavez |
| Anderson | Bridges | Clements |
| Barrett | Bush | Cooper |
| Bennett | Carlson | Cordon |
| Bowring | Case | Daniel |

- | | | |
|--------------|-----------------|--------------|
| Dirksen | Holland | Neely |
| Duff | Ives | Pastore |
| Dworshak | Jackson | Payne |
| Ellender | Johnson, Tex. | Potter |
| Ferguson | Johnston, S. C. | Purtell |
| Flanders | Kilgore | Robertson |
| Frear | Knowland | Saltonstall |
| George | Kuchel | Schoeppel |
| Gillette | Langer | Smith, Maine |
| Goldwater | Lehman | Smith, N. J. |
| Gore | Long | Sparkman |
| Green | Magnuson | Stennis |
| Hayden | Mansfield | Thye |
| Hendrickson | Maybank | Upton |
| Hennings | Millikin | Watkins |
| Hickenlooper | Monroney | Williams |
| Hill | Murray | |

NAYS—3

- | | | |
|--------|----------|-------|
| Malone | McCarran | Morse |
|--------|----------|-------|

NOT VOTING—27

- | | | |
|---------------|----------------|-----------|
| Beall | Fulbright | McCarthy |
| Burke | Humphrey | McClellan |
| Butler, Md. | Jenner | Mundt |
| Butler, Nebr. | Johnson, Colo. | Russell |
| Byrd | Kefauver | Smathers |
| Capehart | Kennedy | Symington |
| Douglas | Kerr | Welker |
| Eastland | Lennon | Wiley |
| Ervin | Martin | Young |

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Two-thirds of the Senators present having voted in the affirmative, the resolution of ratification is agreed to.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. KNOWLAND. Madam President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. BOWRING in the chair). The Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

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

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS, 1955

Mr. KNOWLAND. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the District of Columbia appropriation bill, which is H. R. 9517.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9517) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, I shall not long detain the Senate on the District of Columbia appropriation bill.

I may say, for the comfort and assurance of the Senate, that the bill received careful consideration by the House of Representatives and also by the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the District of Columbia of the Senate Appropriations Committee. There is no controversy about the amendments. Consequently, I shall ask that the amendments be considered en bloc.

One additional amendment will be offered, for the purpose of correcting

what I confess was an inadvertence at the time when the committee marked up the bill. However, that amendment does not involve any controversy.

Madam President, it occurs to me that some figures should be submitted at this time, in connection with the bill.

The total amount of the regular and supplemental estimates for District of Columbia appropriations for 1955 is \$172,650,626. That covers all estimates for the administrative and operating expenses of the District of Columbia and also for capital outlays, under the program now being carried on under legislation enacted by the Congress. That bill was piloted through the Senate by the District of Columbia legislative committee; and the bill sets up a 10-year program which includes provision for the construction of highways, schools, and also for almost all other activities coming in that category. The bill was an all-inclusive one, and it also included the necessary revenue provisions, so the District of Columbia can now proceed with its capital-expenditures program.

When the House of Representatives completed its action on the appropriation bill, it reduced the amount of the capital-outlay fund by somewhat less than \$1,500,000. The Commissioners did not request a restoration of that amount, when the bill came to the attention of the Senate committee.

On the operating side, a decrease of approximately \$2,700,000 was effectuated by the House of Representatives; and in that form the item was submitted to the committee for testimony and for further consideration.

Some modifications have been made in the bill, and I probably should highlight several of them.

Usually in the operating expense account, whatever reductions or increases are made fall into two broad categories, either personnel or supplies, equipment, and so forth. In justice to the bureau heads and the Commissioners, I think I should say that with a high degree of frugality they have conducted their various offices. They have not been unreasonable in their requests. For that reason, the committee decided to restore the funds in that regard.

We have also restored some funds relating to personnel. I cannot state precisely what the outcome will be; but in their request, they asked for an increase of 1,003 persons. The House of Representatives allowed 715; and a request for the restoration of 274 positions was submitted to the Senate committee. I would say, offhand, that probably in the final analysis we may have restored as many as 175 or 180.

There are only 1 or 2 other highlights and 1 or 2 encomiums that I think I should express—first of all, to Harold Merrick, who has so devotedly served as the secretary of the subcommittee, and over many years has become familiar and intimate with the problems of the District of Columbia. I think I can say as much, also, for Mr. Robert Albrook, who is attached to the office of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], and who has so unselfishly and unstintingly given of his time.

Madam President, the special items to which I wish to allude are the following:

This year the appropriation bill for the District of Columbia carries an item of \$25,000 in the nature of a guaranty for the American Legion, which will convene in national convention in the Nation's Capital. It has always been customary for the convention city—in one case, Miami; in another case, Chicago; in another case, Boston—to make a guaranty, so that if the expenditures of the convention exceed its receipts there will not be a deficit. So the bill carries a \$25,000 guaranty, with the understanding that if the receipts are exceeded by the expenditures this amount will be used to reimburse the account. Since it is the invariable experience of the American Legion that the income or receipts in connection with its conventions exceed the expenditures, I am confident that this amount will not be expended.

Another item is the one for municipal assistance, as I call it, in connection with the convention. It has always been customary to provide additional funds for what we call the maintenance of law and order. For instance, we have done that in connection with the appropriation of funds for the inaugural ceremonies every 4 years. I am afraid that probably has left the impression that at such conventions there is an undue amount of disturbance, beyond the normal habits of veterans' behavior. However, I have been a member of the American Legion for more than 30 years, and I have attended many of its State and national conventions. I believe it can be said that now, in the main, the veterans deserve the title of "old soldiers"; they have become far more docile and tractable at conventions; and in the last few years they have been exceedingly well demeaned. So I refer to this item as one for municipal assistance. The bill carries an item of approximately \$103,000; and it will be used mainly for traffic direction, some street signs, some extra work on the part of the Police Department in directing traffic, and so forth.

I think that, of course, we shall wish to welcome the American Legion to the Nation's Capital, where its members can absorb the traditions and the culture, and probably, if Congress is in session at that time, can renew their contacts, friendship, and acquaintance with the Members of the Senate and of the House.

Madam President, for a few minutes I should like to allude to the lump sum. In other years, under the statute we always carried in the appropriation bill for the District of Columbia an item of \$12 million as a Federal grant to the District of Columbia. Every Member of the Senate knows the difficulty in the articulation of a formula that seemed acceptable to the House of Representatives and the Senate, and that would reasonably express the displacement in taxes which ought to be compensated for, in the form of a lump sum.

I remember so well the Overton formula and the O'Mahoney formula and the formulas I sought to contrive when I was a member of the District of Columbia Committee in the House of Representatives and in the years when I was

the chairman of the legislative committee.

The lump sum has been permitted to languish on a somewhat arbitrary basis. So I was certainly delighted that the legislative committee, under the able direction of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], worked out an arrangement whereby the lump sum would be increased, and the increase over \$13 million would be earmarked for matching purposes, to be spent for capital outlays—for transportation, buildings, and the facilities which are so necessary for the articulation of municipal government in the District of Columbia.

In that connection, I could point out, Madam President, that it is rather interesting to contemplate the growth of the District of Columbia. It has been only 30 years since the time when Calvin Coolidge was President of the United States, at which time the general appropriations for the District of Columbia aggregated only \$22 million. Today, 30 years later, they are roughly \$137 million. There we have, at one and the same time, testimony as to inflation and testimony as to the growth of the city and the complexity of the many responsibilities it must undertake.

A table is to be found in the hearings, and also in the side slips, indicating, money wise, how the affairs of the District of Columbia have grown.

I shall allude to only one other matter in connection with this item. Madam President, there was also some controversy at the other end of the Capitol as to the amount that should be made available by way of a lump sum. In 1922, the Federal contribution was 40 percent of the total appropriations for the District of Columbia. From then on it receded rapidly, and at the lowest point it got down to 8.58 percent in 1952.

The reason was that the contribution was rigid. It was not increased, while the appropriations did increase materially. So in a small measure, at least, I think we have corrected this disparity through Public Law 364, passed by this Congress, under which there will be available a little more than \$21 million as a Federal contribution. I think we shall be able to take pride in what is accomplished in the way of capital outlay, for one thing; and, secondly the Federal contribution will ease the burden somewhat for the District of Columbia.

Perhaps I should make one allusion to funds. I was delighted to see that the District of Columbia bookkeeping under the reorganization plan has been pretty well consolidated and streamlined. The District of Columbia operates with only five funds: the general fund, which is made up mainly of revenue collections from the taxpayers, together with the Federal payment and whatever surplus remains from prior years; then there is the highway fund, the water fund, the sanitary sewage fund, and the motor-vehicle parking fund. Altogether it is estimated that roughly \$175 million in assorted revenues will be available for all purposes. So if the appropriations contained in the bill are approved there will be left a surplus of roughly \$4½

million; and on the basis of the amount involved in the overall appropriation, that surplus is by no means too large for any contingencies or emergency expenditures which may arise.

Perhaps I should allude to two other items. One relates to fringe parking. I believe I had some measure of responsibility for the enactment of a public law some years ago whereby it was made possible to purchase parking meters on the installment basis, the parking meters to be paid for in every case from revenues generated by each meter.

The District of Columbia has done very well in that respect. There is in the fund at the present time roughly \$1,343,000 which can be expended for no other purpose than functions which relate to traffic. So it is hoped that since the parking problem and the transportation problem are rather acute, we can now develop some fringe parking projects. That means nothing more than the development of areas away from the business center where people can park their cars, particularly those who are interested in all-day parking. They can then take a shuttle bus, a regular bus, or a streetcar, which will take them to their offices or businesses. At the end of the day they can get back to their cars after a short hop, and pay only a modest amount. This is a program which is carried on under a coined expression—"fringe parking." There is no other purpose for which these revenues can be expended except to improve the traffic and transport situation.

The Senate committee has written into the bill the necessary funds to inaugurate this program, and I am confident that, notwithstanding the action heretofore taken by the House, it should have some appeal to the conferees.

Perhaps I ought to make one further comment. In the report I thought it was well for us to pay tribute to the chief judge of the municipal court. For years I have given attention to the courts. I have watched the congested docket situation. Often I have wondered whether there would be money enough for additional judges, so that we could put the litigation and judicial affairs of the District of Columbia in such condition as to make the system worthy of a boast, a system which could serve as a model for courts everywhere in the country.

Judge Walsh who came before the committee, has done a superb job, in my opinion. I was delighted, indeed, to help provide a few additional employees in the form of motion clerks and employees to work on the docket, so that even the modest existing backlog can be quickly whittled down, and we can say in truth and in fact that the docket in the Nation's Capital will probably be in the best condition of any docket in any jurisdiction in the country.

One could highlight a great many items in the bill. I doubt the necessity for it. I am concerned that we meet the deadline of June 30, so I thought it might be well, even though the notice was short today, to consider the bill and get it into conference in time so that it can be disposed of and sent to the White House

for signature before the end of the fiscal year.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that all the committee amendments, on which there is no controversy whatsoever, be considered en bloc. Then I shall ask recognition for the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE] so that he may offer one amendment to cure the inadvertence to which I alluded a moment ago.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator request that the committee amendments be agreed to en bloc?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I so request; and I ask that the bill, as amended, be open to further amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Illinois? The Chair hears none, and it is ordered.

The amendments agreed to en bloc are as follows:

On page 3, line 9, after the word "Laws", to insert "and the National Capital Wing, Civil Air Patrol"; in line 18, after the word "expenses", to insert "development of a comprehensive program for slum clearance, by contract or otherwise, as may be determined by the Commissioners"; in line 23, after the word "investigations", to strike out "\$258,215" and insert "\$317,565, of which \$25,000 shall be available for expenditure by the American Legion 1954 Convention Corporation in connection with the 1954 National Convention of the American Legion, subject to reimbursement from the American Legion if receipts exceed expenses";

On page 4, line 11, after the word "Incorporated", to strike out "\$2,877,522" and insert "\$2,965,522";

On page 5, line 12, after the word "Columbia", to strike out "\$360,000" and insert "\$428,585";

On page 6, line 6, after the word "guards", to strike out "\$891,021" and insert "\$918,204";

On page 6, line 10, after the word "compensation", to insert "at rates to be fixed by the Commissioners";

On page 7, line 4, after the word "Committee", to strike out "\$225,000" and insert "\$264,000";

On page 8, line 6, after the word "equipment", to insert "and supplies"; in line 9, after the word "vehicles", to strike out "\$27,526,570" and insert "\$27,692,574";

On page 9, line 10, to strike out "\$1,598,500" and insert "\$1,611,000";

On page 9, line 14, to strike out "\$1,626,402" and insert "\$1,641,000";

On page 10, line 10, after the word "lieutenant", to insert "the lieutenant in charge of the Metropolitan Police Boys' Club with the rank and pay of captain";

On page 11, after line 20, to insert: "Metropolitan Police (additional municipal services, American Legion Convention), to enable the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to provide additional municipal services in said District from August 25 to September 7, 1954, both inclusive, including the employment of personal services, payment of allowances, payment at basic salary rates for services performed by members of the uniformed force in excess of 8 hours per day (but not to exceed a total of 12 hours overtime pay to any individual member performing service within such period), traveling expenses, hire of means of transportation, cost of removing and relocating streetcar loading platforms; and for the construction, rent, maintenance, and expenses incident to the operation of temporary public comfort stations, first-aid stations, and information booths, during the period aforesaid, and other incidental expenses in the discretion of the Commissioners; \$103,725."

On page 12, at the beginning of line 22, to strike out "\$6,259,641" and insert "\$6,309,000";

On page 13, line 6, after the word "recruitment", to insert "purchase of passenger motor vehicles, and a shelter survey by contract or otherwise, as may be determined by the Commissioners"; and in line 8, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out "\$75,000" and insert "\$179,048";

On page 13, line 25, after the word "Justice", to strike out "\$3,133,410" and insert "\$3,191,145";

On page 15, line 9, after the word "vocations", to insert "attendance without loss of pay or time at specialized medical or public health training courses or institutes, tuition and entrance fees, and travel expenses and fees for visiting lecturers or experts in public health and related fields";

On page 16, line 11, after the word "Home", to strike out "\$22,336,000" and insert "\$22,761,000";

On page 20, line 2, after the word "committed", to strike out "\$8,851,516" and insert "\$8,885,061"; and in line 5 after the word "placed", to strike out "anywhere in the States of Virginia and Maryland, and in other States to a distance not exceeding 100 miles beyond the limits of the District of Columbia" and insert "outside of the District of Columbia and the States of Virginia and Maryland";

On page 22, line 8, after the word "only", to strike out "\$1,175,000" and insert "\$1,336,284";

On page 23, line 8, after the word "which", to strike out "\$3,859,285" and insert "\$3,761,612";

On page 23, line 20, after the word "plates", to strike out "\$20,000" and insert "\$30,000";

On page 24, line 1, after the word "examiners", to strike out "\$1,124,365" and insert "\$1,343,365"; in the same line, after the word "which", to strike out "\$135,406" and insert "\$335,406"; in line 3, after the word "fund", to insert "and \$9,000 payable from the general fund"; and in line 18, after the word "purpose", to strike out the comma and "until such time as contracts of purchase have been paid, and thereafter such new meters or devices shall become the property of the government of the District of Columbia";

On page 26, line 7, after the word "dumps", to strike out "\$9,657,740" and insert "\$9,757,302";

On page 29, line 6, after the word "wagons", to strike out "\$2,227,500" and insert "\$2,344,000";

On page 31, line 10, after the word "Anacostia", to insert "addition to Cleveland Park branch library"; in line 21, after the word "expended", to strike out "\$15,685,000" and insert "\$15,712,000"; in line 23, after the word "and", to strike out "\$630,320" and insert "\$631,400";

On page 32, line 5, after the word "Grounds", to insert a colon and "Provided, That the unexpended balance of the appropriation of \$343,500 for the Cleveland Park branch library, contained in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act of 1952, shall be available toward construction of the addition provided for herein."

On page 32, after line 9, to insert: "The appropriations for 'Capital outlay, protective institutions,' contained in the District of Columbia Appropriation Acts, 1951 and 1952, shall be available for constructing such additional water purification and transmission facilities at Fort George G. Meade, Md., as may be necessary to provide for a supply of water to the District Training School and the Children's Center under agreements to be entered into by the Commissioners and the Secretary of the Army, and the said appropriations shall be available for advance payment to the United States for work to be performed, subject to subsequent adjustment."

On page 35, line 2, after the word "kinds", to insert "to remain available until expended";

On page 48, after line 5, to insert:

"SEC. 17. The Commissioners are authorized to establish a working fund without fiscal-year limitation for the purpose of printing, duplicating, and photographing; and the unexpended balances in the miscellaneous trust fund accounts 'Operating Account, Printing' and 'Operating Account, Blueprinting' shall be deposited to said working fund; and the fund shall be reimbursed for all services performed thereunder."

On page 48, after line 13, to insert:

"SEC. 18. The Commissioners are authorized to establish a permanent working fund, which shall be available without fiscal-year limitation, for necessary expenses of maintenance and repair of vehicles of the Government of the District of Columbia; and said fund shall be reimbursed, or credited in advance if required by the Director, Department of Highways, for the costs of all work performed thereunder."

On page 48, line 21, to change the section number from "17" to "19".

Mr. PAYNE. Madam President, I offer the amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Maine will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 22, line 8, it is proposed to strike out "\$1,336,284" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,415,315."

Mr. PAYNE. Madam President, the distinguished Senator from Illinois, who has so ably handled the bill, has alluded to the provision having to do with the Department of Licenses and Inspections.

The purpose of this amendment is to give the Department of Licenses and Inspections the full amount asked by the Commissioners in their restoration requests.

The committee has allowed a restoration of \$161,284. This amendment would restore an additional \$79,031.

This total increase of \$240,315 above the amount allowed by the House is not as large as it seems. Some \$128,230 of the amount represents a transfer from another department—the Health Department. This amount has been deducted from the Health Department item in the bill. This is necessary because certain building inspection functions of the Health Department will be transferred June 30, 1954, to Licenses and Inspections. The full transfer should be made because it comes to us as a minimum proposal in the first place.

If the full transfer is made, the committee figure would leave a restoration of only \$33,054 for the other activities of the Department. Yet the requested restoration for these other activities was \$112,085. That money is requested for 23 building inspectors and related items for the enforcement of the housing code, in other words, the attack on slums.

Unless the increase I have proposed is allowed, the District's efforts to cope with the slum situation are going to be seriously hamstrung. I have conferred within the past few hours with Engineer Commissioner Prentiss, and he informs me that they simply will not be able to undertake this vitally important work with the allowance made by the committee. The inspectors for whom this

money is needed must process some 5,000 to 6,000 cases of badly needed slum housing improvements. Their actual case-load is going to number 30,000 to 40,000 inspections. In addition they will augment the staff work for the Board for Condemnation of Insanitary Buildings, so that its case capacity may be increased from 500 to about 1,000 a year.

Once the District's new assault on slums is underway, savings can be effected. But the maximum push is needed to launch the city's war on its growing blighted areas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE].

The amendment was agreed to.

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

Mr. CASE. Madam President, I do not wish to offer an amendment, but I wish to make 2 or 3 brief comments on the bill.

First of all, the committee had the benefit of the leadership of the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], who served for many years as chairman of the legislative committee for the District of Columbia in the House of Representatives, and as the ranking Republican member in other years. That fact, coupled with his many years' experience in the Committee on Appropriations, made it easy for him, one might say, to handle this bill expeditiously and efficiently. He has had a vital interest in the affairs of the District of Columbia for so many years that he had a quick appreciation of all the various items in the bill.

I wish to supplement what he has said with respect to certain individual items in the bill, by calling attention to the fact that, had it not been for the public works bill which the Congress recently enacted, it would have been impossible for this bill to be presented to the Congress with the provisions contained in it for public works and for capital investment. Without the additional revenues which are in prospect as a result of the public works bill which was passed by the Congress very recently it would have been impossible to carry on any substantial public-works program in the District of Columbia during the coming year. The large increases in the bill over the appropriations for the current fiscal year are in the fields of public welfare and public buildings.

The public schools of the District will receive \$1,107,654 more than the amount for the current year. That would have been impossible without some increase in revenue.

The Department of Sanitary Engineering will receive \$1,091,911 more than the funds available this year. That, too, would have been impossible without an increase in the revenues of the District.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I should feel recreant to my duty if I did not say now—I did not have the opportunity earlier in the year—that the people of the District of Columbia owe an everlasting debt of

gratitude to the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] and the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia for the patience with which they labored on Public Law 364. It set a pattern of revenue and capital outlay for probably the next 10 years to come which will add materially to the convenience and beautification of the Federal city. It was a job that was consummated only by painstaking labor and unselfish devotion to the Nation's Capital. I salute the Senator from South Dakota for the great and consistent job he did in that field.

Mr. CASE. Madam President, such words, of course, are appreciated; but I must say that the real credit for the successful consideration of the bill goes to the committee staff and the members of the fiscal committee of the District of Columbia, who labored through the hearings, with the cooperation of all members of the committee, in reporting the bill and bringing it to final passage in the Senate.

Continuing with reference to what the new revenues make possible, attention should be directed to public building. Construction of buildings can be approximately \$8 million over the level of this year because of the revenues made available. There would have been practically none had it not been for the revenues which the new public works law makes available.

The Department of Highways will receive, under the provisions of the pending bill as it is now being considered by the Senate, \$3,891,240 more than is currently available. That is due partly to the increase in the gasoline tax, which was part of the public works bill.

In the application of this money, one other reference should be made, and that is to the paragraph in the committee report under the heading "Department of Highways." I invite attention to it, because it concludes with the hope that we may be able to report some legislation dealing with the construction of additional bridges. I understand there is as much as \$200,000 in the highway fund which might be available for expenditure on the planning of a bridge, should one be authorized.

Accordingly, the committee thought it important to place some language in the committee report to make it clear that it is the intent of Congress that such funds may be so applied if authorizing legislation is passed.

The paragraph to which I refer appears at page 6 of the committee report, and reads as follows:

CAPITAL OUTLAY

Department of Highways: It is the sense of the committee that, if in the course of the fiscal year 1955 the Congress should authorize the construction of an additional Potomac River bridge, funds for the preliminary planning should be made available by the Commissioners by transfer or otherwise from appropriations provided in this act.

With that as a part of the legislative history of the bill, I believe the citizens of the District of Columbia and of the surrounding area can be assured, should we pass legislation authorizing another bridge or bridges, that some progress can be made on the preliminary planning for such construction.

The Senator from Illinois has already referred to fringe parking. Perhaps he has mentioned what I wanted to say in that connection, namely, that moneys derived from the parking meters provide a fund for that experiment.

While the committee did not believe that we ought to go into that experiment on too broad a scale, it definitely does contemplate that fringe parking will be tried out under the provisions of this bill, and it should offer some relief to the District.

That concludes my remarks. I believe it is a constructive bill, and I hope it will be passed by the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be offered, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and third reading of the bill.

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

The bill (H. R. 9517) was read the third time and passed.

Mr. DIRKSEN. 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 appointed Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. McCARTHY, Mr. CASE, Mr. HILL, Mr. McCLELLAN, and Mr. MAGNUSON conferees on the part of the Senate.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF BILL

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on today, June 25, 1954, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 3476) to provide for the advancement of Comdr. Donald B. MacMillan, United States Naval Reserve (retired), to the grade of rear admiral on the Naval Reserve retired list.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, may I inquire what the pending business is?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending business is H. R. 303, to transfer the maintenance and operation of hospital and health facilities for Indians to the Public Health Service, and for other purposes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. If the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] will permit me to do so, I should like to make an announcement. When we conclude the consideration of Calendar No. 1541, H. R. 303, which is the pending business, it is expected that we will take up Calendar No. 1604, S. 3385, to provide for more effective extension work among Indian tribes and members thereof, and for other purposes.

That is the only bill that is expected to be considered this evening. However, before the Senate takes a recess, I shall move to consider so that it may become

the unfinished business, but not for debate or vote, Calendar No. 1635, H. R. 8300, to revise the internal revenue laws of the United States. That is the tax bill. After the tax bill has been made the unfinished business I shall move that the Senate recess until Monday next. There will be no Saturday session. There are not enough measures on the calendar to warrant a call of the calendar tomorrow as I had originally intended.

I wish to express my appreciation to the Senate for the very fine progress made today and for the excellent cooperation on both sides of the aisle.

Next week, probably on Tuesday next, I anticipate that we will take up the legislative-judicial appropriation bill which is the last of the regular appropriation bills.

I do not believe consideration of the legislative appropriation bill will take a very long time.

On Monday or Tuesday it is expected that the conference report on the Interior Department appropriation bill will be ready. The conferees have agreed, and undoubtedly the conference report will be taken up in the House on Monday, and perhaps it will be available for action by the Senate on Monday or Tuesday. We shall take it up when it is ready.

From information which has come to me, it is likely that the conference report on the State, Justice, and Commerce appropriation bill will be ready for action by the Senate on Tuesday or Wednesday of next week. I believe the conferees are about ready to agree to the conference report.

Mr. ELLENDER. The conference committee meeting has been recessed until Tuesday.

Mr. KNOWLAND. At any rate, we expect to take up that conference report by the middle of next week.

I anticipate that we will proceed to consider the tax bill next week and finally dispose of it before the Senate recesses over the 4th of July weekend.

We plan to meet on Monday next at 12 o'clock noon, but thereafter I would ask consideration by the minority and the majority to having the sessions begin at 11 o'clock in the morning. In that way I hope we will not have to hold sessions too late in the evening, perhaps until 7 o'clock, as was announced last week.

If we do that, and proceed to the consideration of the tax bill, and not displace it for other measures, I think there will be adequate opportunity for debate on and amendment of the tax bill, so that it will be possible finally to conclude its consideration before the 4th of July recess.

I recognize I cannot bind any Senator to what I have suggested. After all, the Senate determines its own procedure. However I have outlined what appears to me to be a reasonable program, in the interest of adjourning on July 31.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I concur wholeheartedly in the program announced by the distinguished majority leader. I believe if it is necessary to

have committee meetings we can give consent to the committees to hold such meetings. I believe it is much better to begin our sessions at 11 o'clock in the morning, if necessary, than to hold late night sessions.

I express the hope that the plan which the Senator from California has announced can be followed. I assure him of our cooperation.

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

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. The majority leader announced that he intends to take up S. 3385 following the consideration of the pending bill. S. 3385 is a bill on which the testimony given at the hearings has not been printed. It is available in galley form. I raise a question as to whether the majority leader desires to bring up that bill today inasmuch as the printed hearings are not available.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I suggest that we cross that bridge when we come to it, after we dispose of the pending business.

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

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I wish to state that it is the wish of the Judiciary Committee to get rid of every bill on the calendar which has been reported by the Committee on the Judiciary. Some of the bills have been pending for a long time. They have been on the calendar session after session. At each session they are reintroduced, and it is necessary to appoint a subcommittee and for the subcommittee to take testimony on them. It has become quite a nuisance. There are many deportation cases, which come up year after year. Such a bill will come up during one session but fail of passage, and 2 years later the same bill is introduced, with the result that the Judiciary Committee has to hold hearings on it every other year. The Judiciary Committee has made up its mind to get rid of everyone of those alien cases. They should be disposed of in one way or another. We have turned down more than we have reported.

Mr. DIRKSEN. By far.

Mr. LANGER. We are very anxious that every bill should be voted up or down. I particularly refer to a bill such as Calendar 449, a bill to prescribe policy and procedure in connection with construction contracts made by executive agencies and for other purposes. There has been a dispute in connection with it, and we have held hearings on it lasting a couple of weeks. If it is not disposed of, it will be on the calendar again in the next session.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The distinguished Senator from North Dakota has been a member of this body many years longer than has the majority leader, but I think I can say without fear of contradiction that our calendar is in better shape today than I have ever seen a calendar in the 9 years I have been a Member of the Senate.

Mr. LANGER. I wish to compliment both the majority leader and the minority leader for the fine cooperation we have had. It is because of that very fact that the Judiciary Committee is anxious to get rid of every bill on the calendar.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. We appreciate the action which the Judiciary Committee has taken on hundreds of bills which have been brought to the Senate floor. If the Judiciary Committee will continue to report bills which it believes are meritorious, I am sure we can assure the Senator that the Senate will act on them one way or the other.

Mr. LANGER. We have 2,650 bills, and every one of them will be reported or be indefinitely postponed. My distinguished colleague, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], has been working very hard with me on this matter. I think I have expressed the attitude of the committee.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I am certain that we shall follow the general policy we have followed of having rather frequently recurring calendar calls of bills to which there is no objection. We have from time to time gone back to the beginning of the calendar, where a little extra time has been needed. I am sure the Senator would not expect me to give assurance that each and every bill left on the calendar after failure to obtain unanimous consent for its consideration will have a specific vote up or down, because I do not think that has ever been done, nor would there be time to do it as to each bill. But I am sure the Senator knows he will have cooperation, and there certainly will be an opportunity on more than one occasion to have the calendar called again.

Mr. LANGER. I would say to my distinguished friend that in the 13 years in which I have been a Member of the Senate there has never been finer cooperation between the majority leader and the minority leader than there has been at this session. This is a wonderful opportunity to get rid of bills. It is a nuisance to the Judiciary Committee to have a bill introduced 6 or 8 times. It involves a big printing bill. We have had to appoint subcommittees, and there have been long hearings on some of the bills.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I am sure the Senator knows that both the majority leader and the minority leader appreciate his kind remarks.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I point out that there are probably less than 50 bills on the calendar which have been considered and passed over for some reason or other. There are now only 6 bills on the calendar which have not been considered.

I appreciate the statement the Senator from North Dakota has made. If the Senator will bring the bills before us, I am sure they will be disposed of.

Mr. LANGER. There are bills on the calendar on which we have not had a vote, and it is the desire of the committee to get rid of them. It is very easy to vote them up or vote them down. If they are brought up, we can get a vote on them.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I assure the Senator that we will keep his desires in mind whenever there is a little gap of which we can take advantage. The

Senator realizes that we have to consider proposed legislation which is of a high priority nature.

TRANSFER OF HOSPITAL AND HEALTH FACILITIES FOR INDIANS

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill (H. R. 303) to transfer the maintenance and operation of hospital and health facilities for Indians to the Public Health Service, and for other purposes.

Mr. WATKINS. Madam President, H. R. 303 is described as a bill to transfer the administration of health services for Indians and the operation of Indian hospitals to the Public Health Service.

The authors of the bill as well as the members of the Indian subcommittees of both Houses of Congress seek to accomplish a greater, more noteworthy goal than one could grasp from that title. We seek to obtain better health service for those Indian people who need it and are entitled to receive it.

During the hearing it was the sense of most witnesses that the Indian Bureau had done all in its power to furnish the service needed by our Indian people, but that a multitude of problems developed so as to prohibit a successful accomplishment of that goal. The Senate committee members did not attempt to judge the value of this proposed transfer upon the basis of their own knowledge but rather we sought out and followed the advice of the great majority of the available expert medical knowledge and experience. On page two of the report is a list of organizations who favor this transfer, most of which are organizations dealing with the national health problems.

These organizations are among the most important in the United States in the health field. I should like to read for the benefit of the Senate a list of the organizations which have studied this question for years and which have endorsed this bill:

ORGANIZATIONS ENDORSING INDIAN HEALTH TRANSFER

Included among the list of interested organizations which have, through their representatives, advised the committee of their endorsement in principle or entirety the proposal to transfer the medical and hospital program of the Bureau of Indian Affairs to the Public Health Service, and the Indian public health program, through the Public Health Service, to the respective States, are:

- Alaska Health Service, Commissioner of Health.
- American Medical Association.
- American Municipal Association.
- American Public Health Association.
- Arizona Tuberculosis & Health Association.
- Association of American Indian Affairs.
- Association of State and Territorial Health Officers (by resolution representing Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Iowa, Idaho, Kansas, Minnesota, Mississippi, Montana, Nebraska, New Mexico, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Dakota, Utah, Washington, and Wisconsin).
- Committee of State and Territorial Health Officers Association of the United States.
- Governors' Interstate Council on Indian Affairs (representing 11 States having sizable Indian populations).
- Intertribal Council of the Sioux Nations.

Minnesota Senate Indian Affairs Committee.

Montana Intertribal Policy Board.
Montana Tuberculosis Association.
National Congress of American Indians.
National Fellowship of Indian Workers.
National Tuberculosis Association (recommending transfer of tuberculosis hospitals to individual States).

North Dakota Indian Affairs Commission.
South Dakota Indian Affairs Commission.
State Board of Health of Montana.
State Department of Health of Arizona.
State Department of Health of California.
State Department of Health of Minnesota.
State Department of Health of North Carolina.
State Department of Health of North Dakota.
State Department of Health of Washington.

The program contemplates transferring not only the hospitals which are now operated by the Indian Bureau, but also all the employees who are now working in the Indian Health Service, and, in addition, all facilities which are available adjuncts to the hospitals or used in connection with the Indian Health Service. Furthermore, all appropriations which have been made to the Indian Service for purposes covered by this bill are to be transferred under the terms of the bill.

Mr. CASE. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. I desire to propound a question to the chairman of the subcommittee, in order to have the answer recorded as a part of the legislative history of the bill, particularly with respect to the subject of the transfer of facilities.

At Rapid City, S. Dak., there is located what is known as the Sioux Sanitarium, a health facility operated by the Bureau of Indian Affairs for the treatment and care of tubercular Indians who are members, largely, of the several Sioux reservations in that area. The facility is located on grounds which at one time were purchased by the United States and were devoted for many years to the maintenance of an Indian school. Several hundred acres were involved.

A number of years ago the operation of the facility as a school was suspended. For a few years no activity was carried on. Subsequently the buildings were converted into a health facility, and the tubercular sanitarium was established.

In connection with the history of the institution, the Bureau of Indian Affairs felt that there was a great deal of land which was not necessary to the operation of the hospital. The result was that a law was enacted some years ago providing for the disposal of the land which was excess to the needs of the operation of the hospital. Most of that land has been transferred or disposed of in one form or another under the terms of the legislation. There are pending at present, however, certain proposals to complete the liquidation of lands which are excess to the needs of the hospital as such.

In view of the statement by the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee with regard to the transfer of the facilities, the appropriations, and so forth, and in light of the possibilities of the bill itself, as I read the language,

I wish to ask the Senator whether the bill would in any way interfere with the disposal of the lands which are excess to the needs of the hospital under the specific act which was passed a few years ago. If at all possible, I do not wish to have Congress pass legislation now which would interfere with the transfer of those lands under the bill which became law a few years ago.

Mr. WATKINS. It is my opinion that lands which really are excess as a matter of fact, as well as those having been declared excess by law, should be transferred as the original act intended, and that such lands would not be included in the authority provided in the bill to transfer the hospital facilities to the Public Health Service.

Mr. CASE. I appreciate the statement by the Senator from Utah, but I thought it necessary to have it made a part of the legislative history, because legal negotiations with respect to the transfers are being conducted through the superintendent of the sanitarium, who is the nearest administrative officer for the Bureau of Indian Affairs, but it is purely a sort of outside chore for him to handle; it has nothing to do with the operation of the hospital. He is acting in the matter merely because he is the nearest agent. I would not want the transfers now in process or now being negotiated to be interrupted by the bill, which, as I understand, is intended to relate to the administration of hospitals as such, and not to any excess lands.

Mr. WATKINS. That is true. I might suggest to the Senator from South Dakota that I intend to offer an amendment which will change the effective date of the bill, should it be enacted, to the fiscal year beginning in 1955, so a full year would elapse.

Mr. CASE. In any event, I assume the chairman will stand on his original statement that it is not intended that the bill, whatever its effective date may be, is to interrupt the operation of the law which was enacted with respect to excess lands.

Mr. WATKINS. I stand on the original statement.

Mr. CASE. May I make one statement in conclusion? Then I shall be finished.

I think perhaps one of the finest benefits of the bill will be the procuring of the necessary personnel for the administration of hospitals. One of the serious problems faced by the Health Service of the Bureau of Indian Affairs has been to obtain competent personnel. I think the bill offers a possibility of improvement in that field, and this, perhaps, is one of its greatest merits.

Mr. WATKINS. I do not know of any doctors of any note among the Indian people who are opposed to the measure. I am glad the Senator from South Dakota has called attention to this factor.

It has been very difficult to get doctors to take assignments in the Indian Service. In the first place, the civil-service classifications do not permit the payment of salaries which are adequate in this modern age. As I recall, some of the testimony offered at the hearings indicated that the highest salary now being received was between \$6,000 and

\$7,000 a year. No opportunity is afforded doctors to brush up or to keep up to date in their profession by means of refresher courses, because they are situated away from the large centers. If they were transferred to the Public Health Service, they would have the regular opportunities which are now afforded Public Health Service doctors.

Moreover, the doctors would be rotated. The Public Health Service doctors are rotated every 2 years. But the doctors who serve the Indian Bureau go out to the reservations and stay there. The living conditions are not the best. All one has to do is to travel on some of the reservations to realize that to be a fact. I was amazed to learn that it has not been possible to keep doctors in isolated places in Arizona, New Mexico, and other States having large Indian populations, although the situation may be somewhat different in some of the other States. On the whole, the medical profession is very much in favor of the transfer, and has been for many years.

The author of the bill (H. R. 303), Representative Judd, of Minnesota, is himself a doctor.

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

Mr. WATKINS. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. I wish to commend the Senator from Utah for his able statement concerning the pending bill. I was particularly interested in his comment that he proposes to offer an amendment which will change the effective date of the act to the fiscal year beginning in 1955, rather than the coming fiscal year.

The distinguished senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] and I introduced the original bill on this subject, S. 132, on January 7, 1953. The Senate is now considering the companion bill which was introduced in the House by Representative WALTER JUDD.

The bill is favored by Dr. A. J. Chesley, executive officer and secretary of the Minnesota State Department of Health. Dr. Chesley has served in that capacity for a great many years. He is one of the outstanding health officers of the Nation. While I served as Governor of Minnesota, Dr. Chesley and I had many conferences on this question. He expressed the view that the Indian hospitals were not up to par, nor were they of a standard equal to that which the citizens of our State were privileged to enjoy.

It was for that reason that I endeavored to have Federal legislation enacted which might bring the health service of the Indians up to a standard that would become any American citizen—and the Indians certainly are American citizens.

So, Madam President, I am delighted that the Senate has an opportunity to consider this bill today. I think the enactment of the bill will accomplish several objectives, but more especially three.

First, it will improve the health service for the Indian people. Second, it will coordinate the public health program. Third, it will further the long-range objective of the integration of the Indian people into the common life of the United States.

I am most pleased that the distinguished senior Senator from Utah has been granted the privilege to have the measure considered this evening, and that he has so ably described the intent and purpose of the bill, and has stated the organizations which support it.

I hope that the bill will be passed before the Senate recesses this evening.

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

Mr. WATKINS. I yield.

Mr. BARRETT. Do I correctly understand that the effective date of the act will be July 1, 1955?

Mr. WATKINS. The effective date will be the time it is signed by the President; but the date for the transfer of the services, the personnel, and the facilities will be 1955, if the amendment which I propose to offer is agreed to.

Mr. BARRETT. The effective date would be July 1, 1955, following the end of the next fiscal year; is that correct?

Mr. WATKINS. That is correct.

Mr. BARRETT. I desire to commend the Senator from Utah for the excellent work he has done on the bill. I am very hopeful that means will be provided whereby the Public Health Service can be expanded, and doctors can be found, to fill the needs of the various Indian hospitals.

I wish to ask the Senator if the legislation and appropriations are adequate to provide sufficient funds to enable the Public Health Service to procure competent doctors who will accept positions on the various Indian reservations.

Mr. WATKINS. There is money for the Indian health service, of course, in this year's appropriation. However, that will be expended during the current year.

Mr. BARRETT. That is true. What I had in mind was that, as I remember, about 6 or 8 years ago the Congress considered the question of raising the salaries of doctors in the veterans hospitals throughout the country, with the idea in mind of getting more highly qualified doctors to accept the positions. I am asking the distinguished Senator from Utah if, in his judgment, the Public Health Service will have adequate funds, and if the means will be available for the service to get doctors to accept positions in the hospitals in order to carry on the work which must be done.

Mr. WATKINS. Of course, I cannot predict what the Congress will do, but I certainly shall do everything in my power to obtain ample appropriations to take care of that problem. Even now the Indian health service has been forced to call upon the Public Health Service for doctors. Under the civil service classification schedules the Indian health service has not been able to obtain an adequate number of doctors; it has had to go to the Public Health Service for help. Under the draft law at the present time, doctors who are drafted may serve in the Public Health Service. Two years of service there is equivalent to service in the Armed Forces.

Mr. BARRETT. Perhaps that answers my question. I have been under the impression that the salaries which could be paid by the Indian Bureau were

inadequate, but that under the regulations and laws existing, the Public Health Service was in a position to pay higher salaries to doctors than the Indian health service was.

Mr. WATKINS. That is true. In the Public Health Service the doctors can also rotate. In the Indian health service there are not enough doctors to rotate, and they cannot rotate. Not only that, but the Public Health Service has a program for its doctors which enables them to keep up to date with modern developments in medicine. The doctors can keep in touch with new methods in medicine which have been perfected. Furthermore, the retirement features under the Public Health Service are much better than they are under the civil service or under the Indian Bureau. Altogether, there exists an entirely different picture as regards doctors serving in the Indian health service and those in the Public Health Service. Doctors from the Indian Bureau are very happy to transfer to the Public Health Service.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I should like to ask the Senator a question. During the course of the discussion on the pending bill in committee, I heard the argument advanced several times that all we had to do was to increase the pay of the Indian Service doctor and the problem would solve itself. Is it not true that far more than the question of salary enters into the problem of getting and keeping doctors in the Indian health service?

Mr. WATKINS. That is true, and I think the Senator from Arizona is in a position to give firsthand information on what is required of the doctors, and why it is difficult to get doctors in the Navaho Indian Reservation and other reservations in the State of Arizona. As I recall, Arizona has a very large Indian population.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Is it not true that lack of in-service training is probably the greatest deterrent to obtaining an adequate number of doctors for the Indian health service? I refer to the fact that when a young doctor goes into an Indian hospital, he will not be able to keep up with modern practice. He will rarely get an opportunity to visit a modern clinic. In 4 or 5 years his ability to practice will be virtually obsolete.

Mr. WATKINS. That is true. I have before me a statement prepared by a medical doctor, which I should like to read:

It has long been recognized that a doctor must continue to be a student from the moment of his graduation to that of his retirement. If he does not keep abreast of day to day developments in a field subject to constant change, he soon falls far behind and degenerates as a doctor. Young doctors know this and are unwilling to become intellectual vegetables.

Dr. Ozro T. Woods, in his general report of the A. M. A. Survey Team's study of Indian health on the Navajo Reservation in 1947 wrote: "Good doctors will not stay in the Navajo medical service unless provisions are made for them to keep their training up to date nor would they tender good service if they stayed."

We have yet to find young doctors in the Indian field service who do not complain bitterly because of the lack of an opportunity to keep their training up to date. In the better civilian hospitals, and in the hospitals of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Veterans' Administration, and Public Health Service, active and comprehensive professional training programs provide the academic nutrition essential to top-flight performance. The Public Health Service because of its greater resources, more diversified facilities and functions, and its active intern and residency training programs is able to provide its officers the type of continued training physicians require. The Bureau of Indian Affairs is not in a position to do so.

There can be no challenge to the correctness of that statement.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one more question on the problem of obtaining an appropriate number of doctors for the Indian Service?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Is it not the opinion of the distinguished Senator from Utah that the lack of proper supervision and direction by medical personnel in a medical program has a great deal to do with the inadequacy of medical service in the Indian health service?

Mr. WATKINS. Certainly that is true.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I wanted to make that observation, because when doctors are placed in isolated hospitals, they soon lose not only the opportunity to train, but they are not under any supervision. They are actually not under any program. They are operating on their own, and they soon lose the desire to stay, because there is no possibility of advancement.

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

Mr. WATKINS. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I have not heard all of the discussion. Perhaps the Senator has already covered the point. What is the attitude of the Indians themselves to this proposed change?

Mr. WATKINS. In many of the reservations the Indians favor it. There are probably a few Indians who oppose the change. The Oklahoma Indians who testified oppose it. There are possibly some Indians in Arizona or New Mexico who oppose it. However, most of the Indians favor the program.

As an example, I have before me a note from the Navahos. The Navahos represent the largest single tribe of Indians in the United States today, and probably one of the tribes which has not advanced as rapidly as some of the others and is probably at the bottom of the ladder of education at the present time.

I should like to read the note from the chairman of the Navaho Council:

Navaho Tribal Council respectfully urges the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to approve H. R. 303 providing for the transfer of health and hospital facilities for Indians to the United States Public Health Service. This request is approved by the Navaho Tribal Council by vote of 36 to 23 this 19th day of June 1954.

SAM AHKEAH,
Chairman, Navaho Tribal Council.

Mr. HOLLAND. Does the Senator have available statistics showing which tribes have approved and which tribes have disapproved the proposed change?

Mr. WATKINS. I am not sure we have such statistics. I mentioned the health associations of the United States which have approved the change. However, it must be remembered that we are in the position of being the guardians of the Indians. If we do not furnish them with good doctors the Indians have a right to complain about it. Ordinarily, we have to use our judgment as the guardians, because it often happens that the Indians will say the doctors are incompetent. The Indians are the wards of the Government. They have gone along with the service which has been provided, because they probably could not do anything else. Notice was sent to the Indians of the United States in ample time to give them an opportunity to appear before the committees. The House committee held rather extensive hearings. The bill came over from the House after being passed on the Unanimous Consent Calendar.

Madam President, I wish to call attention to the notice of hearing that was issued for the meeting of the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. I ask unanimous consent that the notice be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

The Subcommittee on Indian Affairs of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, will hold public hearings on H. R. 303 providing for transfer of the maintenance and operation of hospital and health facilities for Indians from the Department of the Interior to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, at the committee room of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, room No. 224, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C., at 10 o'clock a. m., on the 28th day of May 1954.

You are invited to appear at this hearing and testify before said subcommittee respecting this proposed legislation.

If you are unable to attend these hearings in person, you are invited to submit written statements pertaining to this proposed legislation, for the consideration of the committee with the view of having the same placed in the record.

No allowance will be made for witness fees or traveling expenses.

Dated this 14th day of May 1954.

Respectfully,

KIRKLEY S. COULTER,
Chief Clerk, Senate Committee on
Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. WATKINS. Madam President, it would be almost impossible to take a referendum among the Indians in regard to the kind of doctors and the kind of medical service they would like to have for their care, for by the time the referendum was conducted, many of the Indians would be dead.

Mr. MONRONEY. Madam President, will the Senator from Utah yield to me?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. I wish to say that the bill was objected to countless times on the floor of the House of Representatives, and the bill had no chance of pas-

sage there during the call of the Consent Calendar.

However, the bill was called up one day when the House had just returned from vacation. Although notices had been left with the majority and the minority to make objections to the bill on behalf of the Oklahoma Members, something slipped, and the bill was passed inadvertently. The bill would never be before the Senate today if it had not been called up at an unusual time, and without notice to the Oklahoma Members. The entire Oklahoma delegation is opposed to liquidation of the Indian hospitals.

Mr. WATKINS. Madam President, I take exception to the statement about liquidation of Indian hospitals. The purpose of the bill is not to liquidate the Indian hospitals. The purpose of the bill is to attempt to give the Indians better hospitalization than they have had heretofore.

I do not know about the situation that developed in the House of Representatives; but the Senator from Oklahoma is mistaken when he says that otherwise the bill would not be before us, for a similar bill had been introduced by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER]; and if the House bill were not before us at this time, the Senate bill would undoubtedly be before us.

Let me say that many of the Indians were misinformed about the effect of the bill. One of them said he was objecting because the hospitals would thus be taken away from them. We never have intended to take the hospitals from the Indians. We want them to have better hospital service. It is simply in the interest of the Indians to have this sort of bill passed.

Mr. MONRONEY. Madam President, will the Senator from Utah yield further to me?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. Will the Senator from Utah offer to the bill an amendment providing that no Indian hospitals shall be closed?

Mr. WATKINS. I would not offer such an amendment, because we want the Indians to have better hospitalization; and in some cases the doctors and others concerned may determine that it would be better not to have an existing hospital, but to have a better hospital at another location.

Mr. MONRONEY. Yes; and the testimony we received was that the better hospitals that such persons had in mind were the 200-bed teaching hospitals. So the hospitals in isolated areas would be closed, although the Indians live in those areas. Instead, the Indians would be sent to hospitals in the metropolitan centers.

The whole scheme of the bill is to concentrate the Indians in the metropolitan hospitals or else to place the burden on the county and State hospitals. The testimony clearly shows that the Public Health Service has no respect for the Indian hospitals, and wishes to have the Indians sent to the 200-bed teaching hospitals.

Mr. WATKINS. Madam President, I heard all the testimony which was sub-

mitted before the Senate committee, and I heard no such testimony from any doctor or from anyone else who is supporting the bill. There was no testimony that what the Senator from Oklahoma has just said would be the program.

Mr. MURRAY. Madam President, will the Senator from Utah yield to me?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY. I wish to say that the Indians of Montana considered the matter very carefully and voted on it. They were unanimous in approving this measure. I am satisfied that this bill will be of great value to them, because it is obvious that some small hospitals are not properly equipped with the high-class doctors they should have; and when the Public Health Service takes over operation of the hospitals, the Indians can be assured they will have the best quality of medical care. The Indians are expecting that, and I am satisfied they will receive it under the provisions of this measure.

Mr. WATKINS. Madam President, I am glad to hear the Senator from Montana say that, and I thank him very much.

For instance, in my own State there was a very fine Indian hospital, but it was impossible to staff it, in view of the salaries that were available. About 12 miles to the west of it, there was a very fine hospital, maintained by the people of the city of Roosevelt, Utah. Of course, the Indians live checkerboarded among the white settlements in the area. To the east is another city, with a fine hospital, built under cooperation with the Federal Government, through the Hill-Burton program, as I recall. Between those two fine hospitals, an Indian hospital was being maintained. It was impossible to keep it in operation; the cost of operation was very great, and few Indians were willing to go there, for the Indians in that area preferred the other hospitals. So that Indian hospital was closed; and at this time the Indians in that area are receiving much better hospital and medical care than has ever before been known in the history of that reservation.

The Indian Bureau has repeatedly closed such hospitals, because it cannot obtain the proper personnel to maintain them in those areas. In that event, the Indian Bureau has had to do the next best thing.

Mr. MONRONEY. Madam President, will the Senator from Utah yield further to me?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. The Indian Bureau has had that authority, and has it today, in the case of a situation in which very few beds of an Indian hospital are used. In that event, the Indian Bureau has had, and still has, authority to contract with other hospitals, to have them take care of the Indians. The Indians do not object to that.

However, in this case the proposal is to transfer, lock, stock, and barrel, all activities relating to the hospitalization and medical care of Indians, to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, although the Secretary of that Department says they cannot do the job, that it is an impossibility.

Under the circumstances, I think the Indians have good reason to fear that, if this bill is enacted into law, they will not receive the hospitalization and medical care they have received in the past, poor as it has been.

Reference has been made to all the doctors who will be available from the Public Health Service. The distinguished chairman of the subcommittee knows that the testimony before his own subcommittee was that doctors for this purpose would not be available if it were not for the doctors' draft, by means of which doctors are "captured," supposedly to serve the military, but actually many of them are assigned to Public Health Service hospitals. The Senator from Utah knows, on the basis of the testimony before his own subcommittee, that if it were not for that doctors' draft, it would not be possible to staff even the present 15 Public Health Service hospitals.

But now we are to draft many more doctors, in order to supply 60 more hospitals; and in that connection this bill throws on the Public Health Service the burden of caring for the Indians at those Public Health Service hospitals.

Mr. WATKINS. Has the Senator from Oklahoma forgotten that all the personnel of the Indian Bureau who now are maintaining the service he is talking about, and which he is in favor of, I believe, will be transferred to the Public Health Service, and will be used to care for the Indians; and, in addition, the Public Health Service will have the facilities for obtaining still other personnel to care for the Indians.

Mr. MONRONEY. But the Senator from Utah says it is impossible to obtain sufficient doctors, and I agree. Under these circumstances, the Public Health Service will not solve the doctor-shortage problem, unless the drafting of doctors is continued, under the system by means of which they are told, "We need you for the Army," but later many of them are told, "But we are going to use you in an Indian hospital."

Madam President, how long will the American Medical Association put up with this form of socialized medicine, when doctors are being drafted, ostensibly for service in the Army, but often are assigned to a vast chain of hospitals run by the Federal Government? This is the greatest step toward socialization by the Federal Government in the hospital field I have ever known of; and the pending bill would set it up on a large-scale basis in the Public Health Service.

Mr. THYE. Madam President, will the Senator from Utah yield to me?

Mr. WATKINS. I shall yield in just a moment.

Madam President, let me point out that it is impossible to find greater socialization of medicine than occurs in the Indian service, for the doctors are employed by the United States Government, and are paid with tax funds, and the Indians for the most part receive free hospitalization though many are able to pay for such services. That hospitalization goes one step farther than the medical socialization program in England, if the Senator from Oklahoma wishes to discuss socialization.

Mr. MONRONEY. Is the purpose of the bill to remove free hospitalization from the Indian?

Mr. WATKINS. I did not say that.

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator from Utah just said that this program is one of socialized medicine because the Indians are provided with free medical care. Yet the white men drove the Indians off the land that belonged to them, and the white men brought many diseases to this country and, as a result, are largely responsible for the present state of health of the Indians, which has deteriorated because of the diseases and habits of the white men. Certainly there is nothing worse in the history of the treatment of any race of people than our treatment of the red men; and the Senator from Utah knows it. Yet now the Senator from Utah favors removing even the last vestiges of medical care we have offered to the Indians.

Mr. WATKINS. Madam President, I am unable to appreciate the Senator's logic, inasmuch as we are moving in the direction of giving the Indians better health service.

Mr. THYE. Madam President, will the Senator from Utah yield to me?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield.

Mr. THYE. I am one of the authors of the companion bill which was introduced in the Senate. If it had been the intention to do what the Senator from Oklahoma has said, I would not have been a party to the bill. I never would have introduced such a bill in the first instance.

The only reason in the world I introduced the bill in the first instance was that I came directly in contact with the type of medical service and hospital care we were giving the Indians in the Northwest, when it was my responsibility, as governor, to observe the character of medical service and hospital care the Indians were receiving.

I invite the attention of the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma to the fact that it is not the intention to take away any of the hospital care or medical care. The reason for the drafting of this legislation in the first instance was that a committee had been created by the governors and health officers of several States. The secretary and executive officer of the Minnesota Department of Health was one of the motivating individuals in the medical field. He brought up the idea of drafting this type of legislation.

The pending legislation proposes that the Indian shall have a health service and hospital service comparable to that which the white man receives. If I thought any such thing as described by the Senator from Oklahoma would take place I would be the first to object. If this bill is passed and put into effect in 1955 I can assure the Senator from Oklahoma that, God willing—and I expect to be here for a few years longer—I shall be most instrumental in making certain that the Indian shall not have his hospital taken away from him unless it is replaced by something which will serve him better than a small hospital in the corner of some reservation.

Again I assure the Senator from Oklahoma that, as the author of the com-

panion bill, which was introduced in the Senate before the House bill was introduced, I had no such intention in mind as that to which he refers. I had only one intention. I have testified before the committee in connection with this bill. My only intention was to improve the medical and hospital care, and the general health of the Indian. My only intention was to improve the lot of the Indian and increase the care given to him by the Indian Bureau over the many decades. We have a responsibility in dealing with the Indians.

Mr. WATKINS. Madam President, the American Medical Association would not support anything suggesting an increase in socialized medicine. We have a statement from Dr. George F. Lull, secretary and general manager of the American Medical Association. In a recent letter he stated to the subcommittee:

It is the belief of the association that the transfer of such facilities to the United States Public Health Service would result in much needed improvements in the health facilities and hospitals available to the Indian population of the United States. Administration of these installations by the Public Health Service would facilitate the recruitment of necessary physicians and allied health personnel and would insure a higher degree of medical care for the beneficiaries of the program.

I expected that the cry of "socialized medicine" would be raised in connection with this program. However, the program has been in effect for many years. We are taking the situation as it is. There is no way I know of to improve the program under the Indian Bureau at the present time, particularly in view of the declared sentiment of both Houses of Congress that we are to carry out the original intention of the United States in connection with the Indian program, that is, gradually to retire from the business of guardianship over the Indians. If we are to retire from such guardianship as rapidly as they become educated to the point where they can manage their own affairs—and we are moving in that direction—we shall have a dwindling Indian Service.

All the white people are interested in the Public Health Service. There will be pressure from many directions for appropriations. The program will be in the limelight. The Public Health Service will have to treat the Indians right or the situation will be immediately noticed and called to the attention of everyone.

The poor Indian Bureau, by itself, has a desperate time trying to give the Indians any kind of health service. Senators would be amazed at the statistics we have. I believe the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] will place them in the RECORD later. They show what is happening to the Indian children of the United States, as compared with white children.

Mr. STENNIS. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator from Utah in yielding to me. In Mississippi we have a special problem in connection with the

Indians. We have about 3,000 very fine Choctaw Indians in portions of 3 or 4 counties. They have a hospital of their own. It has contributed wonderfully to their health and improvement and mental condition for the past 25 or 30 years.

Mr. WATKINS. Do the Indians themselves own the hospital?

Mr. STENNIS. No; they do not own it. It is under the Bureau of Indian Affairs. It has done a wonderful work.

Serious consideration is being given to a proposal to abolish that hospital. The only hospital facilities that would be left would be those available in local hospitals. These Indians have been writing to me. They are not particularly well organized. Few of them have any particular interest in voting. A few of them are in my home county. I know enough about them to know that if their hospital is abolished it will be almost equivalent to taking away from them altogether medical treatment and hospital facilities.

Let us have an understanding. These Indians are located in an isolated area. There are no other Indians within hundreds of miles of them. We should preserve that little hospital. Those Indians do not like to go to other hospitals. They want to be among their own people. Very few of the women speak anything but their native tongue. Their blood is perhaps the purest bloodstream in America, without exception.

I urge the Senate not to pass this bill. I think it is a part of the process of liquidating that little hospital in Mississippi.

Mr. WATKINS. Let me invite attention to the bill itself, which I think is a good and sufficient answer. I read from page 2, line 12:

No hospital or health facility that has been constructed or maintained for a specific tribe of Indians, or for a specific group of tribes, shall be transferred by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to a non-Indian entity or organization under this act unless such action has been approved by the governing body of the tribe, or by the governing bodies of a majority of the tribes, for which such hospital or health facility has been constructed or maintained:

If the Indians want a change, I think the Senator will agree with me that they ought to be permitted to make the decision. Under the circumstances related by the Senator with respect to the Choctaws in his State, the decision is up to them.

Mr. STENNIS. I am advised that the language read by the Senator from Utah would not cover the case which I mentioned. I have not had an opportunity thoroughly to study every clause of the bill, but I have been advised by those on and off the floor who are versed in these matters that the bill would apply to the hospital I have in mind. I know that it has been actively considered as being one of those to be discontinued. Perhaps some of the local people would not mind seeing it discontinued. I refer to the non-Indians.

Mr. WATKINS. How about the Indians?

Mr. STENNIS. It may be desired to use the hospital for something else. I am speaking solely for the Indians.

Mr. WATKINS. Does not the Senator believe that the provision I have just read to him would take care of the situation?

Mr. STENNIS. I do not believe it would.

Mr. WATKINS. What is wrong with it?

Mr. STENNIS. I am afraid it does not cover the situation.

Mr. WATKINS. Let me read it again. I read beginning in line 12 on page 2:

No hospital or health facility that has been constructed or maintained for a specific tribe of Indians, or for a specific group of tribes, shall be transferred by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to a non-Indian entity or organization under this act unless such action has been approved by the governing body of the tribe, or by the governing bodies of a majority of the tribes, for which such hospital or health facility has been constructed or maintained.

It is left up to the Indians to make the decision. I am sure the Senator would not disagree with a provision allowing the Indians themselves to make the decision.

Mr. STENNIS. My complaint is that the hospital would be closed, and my plea is that it should not be closed under the bill or under the present law.

Mr. WATKINS. Does the Senator mean by the Indian Bureau?

Mr. STENNIS. That is correct.

Mr. WATKINS. The Indian Bureau probably has that authority now.

Mr. STENNIS. I believe perhaps it does have the authority.

Mr. WATKINS. But it has not closed the hospital.

Mr. STENNIS. The decision of that question has been deferred until the fate of this bill is determined. I do not want the hospital abolished or closed under the present law or under this prospective law. For an isolated case like this, why not write in a provision which will actually and fully cover the situation?

Mr. WATKINS. I do not know how we can do it any better than by having the question submitted to the Indians themselves before any transfer is made to the Health Service.

Mr. CASE. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield.

Mr. CASE. There seems to be a little confusion. Section 2 relates not to transfers to the Public Health Service, but transfers by the Public Health Service to States, Territories, or political subdivisions thereof. I should think that the spirit of the bill would require the hospital to be operated, because the bill states in line 9:

It shall be a condition of such transfer that all facilities transferred shall be available to meet the health needs of the Indians and that such health needs shall be given priority over those of the non-Indian population.

Obviously they would not be available if the hospital were closed.

I detect in the colloquy a little confusion as to whether we are speaking of a transfer to the Public Health Service, or a subsequent transfer by the Public Health Service to some other agency.

Mr. WATKINS. I believe I may have contributed to that misunderstanding by saying that it will not be transferred to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. I wish to correct that.

Section 2 states:

Whenever the health needs of the Indians can be better met thereby, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is authorized in his discretion to enter into contracts with any State, Territory, or political subdivision thereof, or any private nonprofit corporation, agency, or institution providing for the transfer by the United States Public Health Service of Indian hospitals or health facilities, including initial operating equipment and supplies.

I believe what I have been reading contemplates the application of the principle that the question would have to be submitted to the Indians.

Mr. CASE. I believe the answer to the question which the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] has raised is to be found in section 1. That relates to the operation by the Public Health Service. Let me read a part of it:

All functions, responsibilities, and duties of the Department of the Interior, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Secretary of the Interior, and the Commissioner of Indian Affairs relating to the maintenance and operation of hospital and health facilities for Indians, and the conservation of the health of Indians, are hereby transferred to, and shall be administered by, the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, under the supervision and direction of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

I should like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee whether he would interpret the words "and shall be administered by" to require the Public Health Service either to continue the operation of the hospital so transferred, or, under section 2, to provide for the continued operation by the agency to whom it might be transferred in a subsequent transfer.

Mr. WATKINS. I believe that is the correct interpretation. I will say that before it could make the transfer to any other agency other than the Public Health Service, the matter would have to be submitted to the Indians.

Mr. CASE. That is correct.

Mr. WATKINS. For their vote.

Mr. CASE. Yes.

Mr. STENNIS. What is that?

Mr. CASE. If there were a second transfer by the Public Health Service to a State agency, the transfer would require the consent of the specific tribe of Indians for whom the facilities had been constructed.

Mr. WATKINS. That is correct.

I have two amendments which I should like to send to the desk to be considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the first amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 4, line 3, it is proposed to strike out the date "July 1, 1954," and to insert in lieu thereof the date "July 1, 1955."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Utah.

Mr. WATKINS. I have discussed the amendment and the necessity for it. I

do not believe there will be any objection to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I send to the desk another amendment and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, line 3, after the word "responsibilities", it is proposed to insert the word "authorities."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. WATKINS. The insertion of that word would give to the Public Health Service full authority which the Indian Bureau and the Secretary of the Interior and the Indian Commissioner now have. It is deemed that the insertion of that word is necessary.

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

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point certain questions which have been raised in connection with this bill, and the answers to those questions.

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

PAY INCREASE WILL SOLVE DOCTOR SHORTAGE PROBLEM

This whole question of doctor shortage could obviously be solved by raising the salaries paid to doctors so as to bring them into line with salaries offered by the other services. It is not necessary to transfer the health activities to the PHS to obtain that.

Increase in salary is important, but it is by no means the only cause of doctor shortage. Poor morale among Indian service doctors is due also to several other factors, some of which transcend monetary rewards:

1. LACK OF IN-SERVICE TRAINING

It has long been recognized that a doctor must continue to be a student from the moment of his graduation to that of his retirement. If he does not keep abreast of day-to-day developments in a field subject to constant change, he soon falls far behind and degenerates as a doctor. Young doctors know this and are unwilling to become intellectual vegetables.

Dr. Ozro T. Woods, in his general report of the AMA survey team's study of Indian health on the Navaho Reservation in 1947 wrote: "Good doctors will not stay in the Navaho medical service unless provisions are made for them to keep their training up to date nor would they tender good service if they stayed."

We have yet to find young doctors in the Indian field service who do not complain bitterly because of the lack of an opportunity to keep their training up to date. In the better civilian hospitals, and in the hospitals of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Veterans' Administration, and Public Health Service, active and comprehensive professional training programs provide the academic nutrition essential to top-flight performance. The Public Health Service because of its greater resources, more diversified facilities and functions, and its active intern and residency training programs, is able to provide its officers the type of continued training physicians require. The Bureau of Indian Affairs is not in a position to do so.

2. LACK OF SUPERVISION AND DIRECTION BY MEDICAL PROGRAM PERSONNEL

Dr. Lewis J. Moorman, in his report on the health of the Navaho-Hopi Indians resulting from the second A. M. A. team's survey in 1948 (published in the J. A. M. A. 139:6, Feb. 5, 1949, p. 370) wrote:

"It is the unanimous opinion of the medical team that the desired evolution of what amounts to almost a medical miracle cannot be realized under the present administrative methods. As we see the situation in the light of past accomplishments and present handicaps, only complete professional autonomy can accomplish satisfactory results. The chief medical officer should be free to make plans, build budgets, and make and act on decisions having to do with the welfare of his charges. He should have full charge of the medical appropriations, the employment of professional personnel, and the tenure of service. * * * Decisions having to do with birth, life, and death must be in the hands of the physician; only he can justly carry the responsibility."

Management of medical problems by lay personnel have contributed in no small measure to the utter discouragement of doctors in the Indian Bureau medical service as a career.

3. ISOLATION, POOR HOUSING, LOW COMMUNITY MORALE

The emotional impact of isolation has seriously handicapped our medical effort. Many Bureau doctors are compelled to live in locations which are so remote from non-Indian communities that community life just does not exist. Nothing has been done to mitigate this loneliness which affects not only the doctor but his family, and often his family more than himself. Public Health Service officers on 2-year tour of duty can tolerate this isolation, when there is the assurance of relief at the end of the tour. Doctors and their families who do not have this relief in sight simply quit the service.

Housing is a problem which plagues all Indian program workers in the field. The number of houses and quarters for doctors, nurses, teachers, and relief workers are woefully inadequate, and those which do exist are for the most part in poor repair. The assignment of quarters at all levels and the competition for quarters have produced discontent, hurt feelings, suspiciousness, and have been major factors in the rapid turnover of personnel. Livable quarters, especially in remote isolated regions, are absolutely essential to the maintenance of a health operation, no matter in what department it may be located. The Public Health Service has generally provided good living quarters for its personnel.

Morale of the community is vital to its survival. The esprit de corps for which the Public Health Service is noted cannot help but elevate the morale of the doctors, nurses, and other employees over its present low.

TRANSFER WILL VIOLATE THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE FUNCTION

"The Public Health Service is largely a preventive medical service. Aside from a few cases where they now operate merchant marine hospitals, it is strictly in the field of preventive medicine. To turn this agency into the direct operating head of the 4,000 hospital beds built and maintained for Indians would violate this concept."

This line of thought is unrealistic because:

(a) In the first place the Indian health problem is predominantly one of public health and preventive medicine. Public health, sanitation, rehabilitation, health education, and direct medical care are so inextricably interwoven, each with the others, that any attempt to separate them would be chaotic. Only the Public Health Service is

equipped with the technical competencies to handle this complex health challenge.

(b) In the second place history should be recalled. Everything the Public Health Service has been—and its history is a glorious one of accomplishment and heroic self-sacrifice—everything the Public Health Service has accomplished can be traced to the corps of commissioned officers which have staffed the United States marine hospitals.

NO ADVANTAGES IN TRANSFER

The Bureau of Indian Affairs already has a large number of Public Health Service medical officers in its hospitals. What advantages are there in transfer?

To the Indian health services:

(a) Operation of highly technical work by highly specialized experts instead of by laymen who do not and cannot understand the intricacies, indications, and needs of sick people, hospital management, public health, health education, sanitation, and epidemiology.

(b) Operation of health services by people whose major concern is people, rather than by those whose major concern is things.

(c) Freer and quicker access to the special skills available in the Public Health Service:

(1) Chronic disease services: The Indian people suffer from the same chronic diseases which afflict our non-Indian population. The Public Health Service has a division staffed with experts in each of them. We believe that for our Indian patients who also suffer the ravages of heart disease, arthritis, diabetes, kidney disease, tuberculosis, cancer, and many others, our doctors should have the benefit of quick and easy access to these experts for consultation, advice, and study.

(2) Closer ties and collaborative work with the communicable disease center; most of the diseases which harass and kill the Indian people are both preventable and curable.

(3) Case-finding services: We are currently seeking the help of case-finding experts in the Public Health Service to assist us in a massive survey of the Navaho Indians for tuberculosis, the greatest killer of the Indian people.

(4) Research: The Indian people and the health personnel who serve them should have freer access to the laboratories and the vast stores of technical skill and knowledge derived from the research of the National Institutes of Health.

To the Public Health Service:

An opportunity to serve in the best traditions of the Public Health Service and in an area of service whose need for help the Public Health can give is so great as to shock all who learn of it. An opportunity to practice public health as well as research. An opportunity to safeguard the health and lives of the entire country from these very large foci of contagious disease.

To the doctors concerned:

(a) True career service. In view of the intent of Congress to withdraw from special Federal services to Indians, the Bureau of Indian Affairs cannot offer a career to any doctor. The Public Health Service can.

(b) The advantages of high-class teaching hospitals through which to rotate.

To the Indian people:

Better and more highly skilled medical care.

A much more stable source of supply of doctors and nurses.

Improved public health and sanitation.

To the country at large:

An urgently needed protection.

NO PLACE IN PHS STRUCTURE

There is no place in the present structure of the Public Health Service into which the Indian health services would fit.

It can be said of each of the functional units now operating within the Public Health

Service that it did not fit the structural pattern of the Service prior to its creation. The Division of International Health was such a one. Following its formative years in the office of the Surgeon General, this famous organization was transferred to the Bureau of States Services, where it is today.

The Division of International Health has a span of functions as broad as that of the Indian health services. The latter should be placed as a complete operational unit in the Office of the Surgeon General, where the unit should be molded to its highest peak of efficiency, and then, after 2 or 3 years of operations, transferred to the Bureau of States Services.

FRAGMENTATION OF FUNDAMENTAL RESPONSIBILITIES

The fragmenting of functional responsibilities for Indian affairs at the Federal level would introduce confusion of policy toward Indian affairs, duplication in effort, and militate against proper coordination of services for Indians.

1. There should be no confusion at all at the Federal level if the present Indian health organization is preserved intact within the Public Health Service and permitted to operate as a single unit for at least a year before organizational changes are introduced. Such preservation of unity is absolutely necessary, in view of the very close working relationships which presently exist between its various sections—hospitals, field health, sanitation, health education, and rehabilitation. Indian health entails much more than the operation of hospitals. Confusion and unnecessary waste in both lives and money will inevitably result if the several health functions of the present Indian health services are scattered among the several bureaus and divisions of the Public Health Service.

It is recommended that the Indian health services be transferred intact as a unit to the Office of the Surgeon General for temporary operation, study, and eventual transfer to the Bureau of States Services.

2. Working relationships between the present Branch of Health and the other branches of the Bureau of Indian Affairs are excellent. There should be no confusion in the proposed transfer if the Indian health services including present personnel are transferred as an operational unit, preferably one of divisional status.

PHS IGNORANT OF INTRICACIES OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

A great complexity of rights, treaty obligations, privileges of Indians, trust funds, etc., is known only to the Bureau of Indian Affairs. This tremendous background of variegated legislation, treaties, and special negotiations with a great many tribes, their tribal councils, and representatives is unknown to the PHS; the PHS would not be in possession of this background and know-how; its administration would be an extremely difficult undertaking.

1. Administrative acquisition of the Indian health services would not in any way make less available to the PHS the legal and cultural knowledge and facilities presently available to PHS officers serving with the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

At headquarters level the PHS would derive its know-how from the same sources and through the same channels which now provide it for new administrative personnel in the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the other Bureaus of the Department of the Interior.

At field-operational level the same sources of information and know-how would be available to PHS-operated health facilities as are available to BIA health facilities.

2. Old personnel in the health services would carry on in the same places and with the same liaison and cooperation with BIA

personnel that has existed in the past. The only differences which would result in the changeover would be superior medical and public-health services to the Indian people, and greater efficiency in the health program.

3. The nature of this law would imply, without question, the highest order of co-operation and collaborative effort by both Departments in the best interests of all citizens of this country.

INDIAN EMPLOYMENT

Transfer to PHS would throw out of employment large numbers of Indians who depend upon employment in the Indian hospitals for their livelihood.

1. It should be emphasized at once that it would be impossible to operate our Indian hospitals without the Indian employees. Our hospitals are located in such isolated regions that only Indian employees are available for many indispensable functions such as cooks, cook's helpers, orderlies, practical nurses, ward aides, drivers, interpreters, and many others.

2. The ability to hire such employees outside of civil service is presently enjoyed by the Bureau of Indian Affairs by virtue of Public Law 383, 73d Congress, 2d session, which authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to employ Indians without regard to civil-service laws.

3. All personnel would be transferred to PHS by H. R. 303. Additional authority by Congress would be necessary, however, before any Indians could be hired in the future without regard to civil-service laws.

NEW ADMINISTRATIVE DIFFICULTIES

House report from Secretary Oveta Culp Hobby, of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—page 12—"Furthermore, the administrative separation of health services from other related Indian services—particularly those in the field of education and public welfare—might create new administrative difficulties and actually retard the overall improvement of living conditions on Indian Reservations."

1. Of course, administrative difficulties will be encountered. They will be encountered irrespective of the department in which the Indian health services are placed. The important consideration, however, is not administrative but technical:

(a) A Navaho average life expectancy of well under 20 years, which reflects a Navaho infant mortality of 50 percent in the Tuba City area, and for the whole Navaho Tribe of 80,000 people, the following comparisons for the year 1952, which are understatement:

Ratio of Window Rock area death rates to United States total death rates per 100,000 population

	Death rates, Window Rock	Death rates, total United States	Ratio, Window Rock to United States
Tuberculosis.....	149.8	16.1	9.30
Dysentery.....	7.9	.6	13.17
Whooping cough.....	1.3	.3	3.25
Meningococcal infections.....	2.6	.9	2.89
Acute poliomyelitis.....	3.9	2.1	1.86
Measles.....	11.8	.4	29.50
Pneumonia.....	99.9	26.6	3.76
Gastroenteritis.....	134.0	5.4	24.81
Maternal causes.....	6.6	1.6	4.13
Infections of newborn.....	15.8	2.7	5.85
Other conditions of infancy.....	61.8	20.7	2.99
Accidents.....	103.8	63.2	1.64
Unattended deaths.....	138.0	12.7	10.87

(b) An estimated probable number of tuberculosis cases on the Navaho Reservation of 3,500.

(c) An estimated probable number of tuberculosis cases among the 35,000 Alaskan natives of 3,500, or 10 percent.

(d) The facts that:
 (1) Practically all the diseases which kill our Indian citizens are both preventable and curable.

(2) Prevention of disease is normally the function of the Public Health Service which has all the competencies necessary with which to combat these cesspools of disease.

(3) Unless drastic improvement in the Indian health situation is accomplished—and only the Public Health Service is equipped technically to accomplish it—these reservoirs of disease will overflow into many States and contaminate the non-Indian population. That this has already begun in the public schools is more than an apprehension.

The need for effective action implied in the above realities transcends administrative difficulties at any level of government.

2. It is difficult to accept as valid the fear that an all-out direct attack on the above health situation could possibly retard the "overall improvement of living conditions on Indian reservations."

NO NEED FOR CHANGE

Present Indian medical care is good. The Indians are not only happy with it, but are fearful of change; they believe that in both quality and quantity it will deteriorate rapidly, if transferred to Public Health Service.

1. Dr. Haven Emerson, honorary president of the Association on American Indian Affairs and a member of the New York City Board of Health stated in a letter, dated April 20, 1953, to Congressman WILLIAM H. HARRISON, then chairman of the House Subcommittee on Indian Affairs, with regard to H. R. 303:

"The result of this neglect has been a depressed condition of health among the Indians, as expressed in higher morbidity and mortality rates from a wide range of preventable diseases than can be found among even the most unfavored economic and social disadvantaged groups of whites or nonwhites in the worst city slums or the impoverished rural communities in any of our States or insular possessions."

Mute evidence in support of this statement is found in the following table which compares Indian and general United States population death rates in several preventable and curable disease categories:

Ratio of Window Rock area death rates to United States total death rates per 100,000 population

	Death rates, Window Rock	Death rates, total United States	Ratio, Window Rock to United States
Tuberculosis.....	149.8	16.1	9.30
Dysentery.....	7.9	.6	13.17
Whooping cough.....	1.3	.3	3.25
Meningococcal infections.....	2.6	.9	2.89
Acute poliomyelitis.....	3.9	2.1	1.86
Measles.....	11.8	.4	29.50
Pneumonia.....	99.9	26.6	3.76
Gastroenteritis.....	134.0	5.4	24.81
Maternal causes.....	6.6	1.6	4.13
Infections of newborn.....	15.8	2.7	5.85
Other conditions of infancy.....	61.8	20.7	2.99
Accidents.....	103.8	63.2	1.64
Unattended deaths.....	138.0	12.7	10.87

2. Dr. Chapman H. Binford, consultant in pathology, Bureau of Medical Services, Public Health Service, in a report of his survey of the Indian hospitals in Arizona and New Mexico made on May 11 to May 21, 1954, writes:

"Since the Federal Government has been required by Congress to provide medical care for certain Indians, these people obviously should be entitled to the diagnostic services and the medical and surgical practices which the graduates of our modern medical schools have been taught to regard as commonplace.

From the observation of the laboratories in the 14 Indian Service hospitals which I surveyed in the Southwest May 11-21, 1954, with few exceptions the level of diagnostic laboratory medicine was very low and no credit to the Federal Government or to the medical profession. In 6 of the 14 hospitals visited there were no technicians. In several the proficiency of the incumbent technician was questionable; and in some, for varying reasons, well-trained, qualified technicians were not being used effectively.

As an inevitable result of the lack of laboratory assistance or inadequate or inferior laboratory assistance, the physicians must often practice a grade of hospital medicine which they recognize as substandard."

3. Dr. Haven Emerson writes further:

"The competence of the Commissioned Corps of the United States Public Health Service and their scientific contributions to national health in a wide variety of situations mark these physicians and their associates, the public health nurses, sanitariums and medical administrators of hospitals, as well qualified to correct present abuses and neglect of the health of the Indians and bring them benefits equal to those enjoyed by other citizens."

TRANSFER WILL SPEED HOSPITAL CLOSURES

Transfer of the Indian health facilities to the Public Health Service will only serve to speed up closures of hospitals that are desperately needed by the Indians.

The present policy of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, which is based upon the intent of the Congress, is to provide the eligible indigent Indian with necessary health services. Wherever these services are available locally, are equal to or better than present Bureau operated facilities, and are available to the Indian without racial discrimination, the Bureau facilities are closed and the local services obtained by contract. The closure of Indian hospitals is thus governed by policies which reflect the intent of Congress, regardless of which department or bureau contains the Indian health services. In no event will closure of an Indian hospital deprive the eligible indigent Indian of medical care. In most instances the quality of care will be improved by it.

TRANSFER IS A GIVEAWAY PROGRAM

"It is a giveaway program, yielding without compensation millions of dollars in Federally owned properties and land, plus valuable medical equipment without any provision for any reimbursement whatsoever."

This statement is completely untrue: H. R. 303 does not change or alter the present procedures of property transfer, but merely insures that procedure presently in use will also be available to the Public Health Service. These are the facts:

In no instance since the Bureau's announcement in 1950 to discontinue direct operations of health facilities under the requirements established for this procedure, has there been a failure to utilize the facilities after closure.

In the case of transfer of the property to a community the facilities have continued to furnish health services to the total community—non-Indian and Indian alike.

In case there is no further use for the property after closure, such as health center, school facilities, administrative function, tribal headquarters, or a combination of these, definite procedure is outlined for the disposal of the property. It is declared surplus to the needs of the Bureau and is transferred to the General Services Administration which in turn disposes of the property after ascertaining that no further need by the Federal Government exists. The equipment is transferred to hospitals which are being operated by the Bureau; in many instances,

this brings much needed equipment to these hospitals which had not previously been available to them because of lack of funds.

Mr. WATKINS. Madam President, I have a statement of death rates of white people as compared to death rates among Indians from tuberculosis of all forms, and also relating to the operation of the program. I ask unanimous consent that the statement be printed in the RECORD as part of my remarks.

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

DEATH RATES

1. Ratio of death rates among all Indians for tuberculosis, all forms: six times that of whites.

Ratio for age group 0 to 1 year—36 Indians to 1 white (tuberculosis, all forms).

Ratio for age group 0 to 1 year—50 Indians to 1 white (respiratory tuberculosis).

In 1948 tuberculosis death rate among Indians in United States listed as 143 per 100,000 population; for white, 24; and for Negroes, 76. (Bureau of Indian Affairs, 1949.)

2. Death rates: 1950, tuberculosis:

State	Indians	White
Arizona.....	188.6	43.7
Montana.....	183.6	13.3
New Mexico.....	147.7	26.2
South Dakota.....	231.0	11.0
Minnesota.....	79.0	9.0
Oklahoma.....	121.7	18.6

¹1952.

Source: Fred Foard, M. D., Medical Director, USPHS, Chief Branch of Health, Bureau of Indian Affairs.

3. "The Papago population curve resembles that of medieval Europe. The life expectancy of a Papago infant is 17 years, whereas that of a non-Indian infant in the United States is 60 years. Only a birthrate double that of the country as a whole enables the Papagos to survive at all" (Foard).

4. Since 1946 a plateau has developed in the death rate among Indians while the rate in the general population has steadily decreased. Approximately 25 percent of all deaths on Indian reservations are due to tuberculosis. In 1949, of 25,495 Indians examined, 20 per 1,000 were tuberculous as compared with 1 to 3 per 1,000 in the general population. (H. Dellen and Arthur W. Dahlstrom, *An Ethnic Reservoir of Tuberculosis*, Journal of American Public Health Association, May 1951, p. 529.)

5. "Health conditions are awful. In one family alone, with 26 member persons there were 17 deaths between 1941 and 1944, 13 of which were attributed to tuberculosis." (Ruth F. Kirk, chairman, State board, New Mexico Department of Welfare, Public Welfare, April 1946, p. 83.)

FACILITIES AND STAFF

1. By 1922, the hospitals and sanatoriums operated by the Bureau of Indian Affairs numbered 73; more than 25 years later the service operated approximately the same number of hospitals and sanatoriums for an increased Indian population. (1922 figures taken from a report of a committee of the National Tuberculosis Association, 1923, 101 pp., *Tuberculosis Among the North American Indians*.)

2. Based on a conservative estimate, 2,400 tuberculosis beds are needed for Indians in the United States. Actually, the Indian Service has but 1,229 beds for the tuberculous. Moreover, only 60 percent of the beds were available in 1948 because of lack

of funds. In 1949, 25 tuberculous patients were discharged from Sioux Sanatorium, Sioux City, S. Dak., for lack of operating funds, 17 of whom had positive sputum at the time of discharge. In every instance, the six sanatoriums operated by the Indian Service in the United States have long waiting lists. A field nursing program has been the only public health service provided by the Indian Service. In 1949, only 69 positions could be filled out of 104 allowed by the budget. (The Federal Government and the American Indian's Health, Fred J. Foard, Journal of American Medical Association, Feb. 4, 1950.)

3. A preventive health program simply does not exist under the Bureau. The administration of public health programs for the Indians should be the responsibility of State and local health authorities, a major portion of the cost being provided from Federal funds. (Fred T. Foard, "Health of the American Indians," Journal of American Public Health Association, 1949.)

4. None of the 62 hospitals now operated by the Bureau of Indian Affairs is recognized by the American Medical Association as an acceptable institution for the training of interns or for other use as teaching hospitals. This is not at all comparable to the acceptable status of hospitals operated under the jurisdiction of the USPHS.

5. Of 16,000 Navahos examined in connection with a survey conducted by the AMA to study health conditions among the Navahos and Hopis and in particular to ascertain the presence of tuberculosis among these tribes, 1,859 or 12 percent were found to have active tuberculosis; this finding indicates that the tribe as a whole needs approximately 4,000 beds. AMA committee recommended immediate and thorough case finding, more hospital beds, an intensive educational program and a program of BCG vaccination more comprehensive than any carried on before.

While tuberculosis programs have achieved a substantial though varying degree of success throughout most of the United States, the Indians remain as one of the most dangerous sources of infection. When they move off the reservation, as many are being forced to do—and a progressive policy may encourage more of them to do so, they will inevitably carry infection to the white population.

6. From records of the Selective Service Board, it was estimated that about 5,000 cases of tuberculosis existed on Navaho Reservation.

7. "I have just returned from a trip to the Navaho Reservation and conditions are deplorable. At Fort Defiance, they have a general hospital of 150 beds with a staff of 8 or 10 physicians but due to shortage of nursing personnel, operation has been reduced to 50 beds or less. In the meantime, hundreds of tuberculous and other patients are being sent to hospitals all over the western part of the United States at costs from \$15 to \$30 per day plus transportation costs.

"In southern Arizona, Indian Service is spending \$200,000 on Indian health center located at considerable distance from tribes. While Indian Service area medical director is pouring over these grandiose schemes, doctors and reservation officials are pleading with State health department officials to give urgently needed service." (C. J. Salisbury, M. D., health officer, June 26, 1953.)

ADMINISTRATIVE DIFFICULTIES

1. "I doubt if a continuous acceptable medical-care program will ever be possible under the complex administrative problems to be met with in the Bureau of Indian Affairs. There are entirely too many lay supervisory people in whom authority is placed over medical personnel to permit this serv-

ice to become attractive to professional personnel as a career service." (Foard.)

2. So far as the tuberculosis-control program among the Indians is concerned, little has been attempted in the past and less has been accomplished. The ever-present difficulty has to do with the fact that Indian affairs have traditionally been handled by the Federal Government while the voluntary tuberculosis movement functions through State and local organizations.

The consensus in most of the literature is that the solution to the Indians' poor economic, social, and health status lies in local administration by agencies already functioning with the community, though Indian services should still be financed by Federal funds.

In 1943, the Bureau of Indian Affairs expended \$69 per Indian for all services, at that time the Commissioner of Indian Affairs stated that this figure compared with an overall per capita expenditure of \$183 from Federal, State, and local sources.

The large area of jurisdiction and the controls imposed on the present Bureau of Indian Affairs make efficient functioning impossible.

The failure to make any appreciable progress toward the control of the disease among the Indians over a period of 23 years is extremely discouraging. In fall of 1951, however, Federal and State health services for Indians were consolidated in 27 counties of eastern Oklahoma, one of the first States where public health services for the Indian have been combined with those provided for the entire community. (E. C. Connolly, "Résumé of Data Concerning the American Indian and His Health," NTA, December 27, 1951.)

3. "The medical service should have complete control of its own personnel and budget in order to provide intelligent planning, uniformity of policy, and authority commensurate with responsibility. Three times in the past 4 years, medical teams representing the AMA have investigated the problems of Indian health in specific areas, all three groups of investigators have made this recommendation.

"Medical and nursing personnel of sufficient quantity and quality to do the job can never be induced to accept employment under existing conditions of social and professional isolation." (Raymond C. MacKay, M. D., "Indian Health Needs and Services," *The American Indian*, Summer 1951.)

4. Example of how lack of funds and personnel preclude continuity in attack on tuberculosis thus keeping morbidity and mortality rates among Indians consistently high:

"The year prior to World War II, with an inadequate health program, 3,000 cases of tuberculosis were discovered and on two reservations every known case was hospitalized. The following year, 50 percent of the medical officers left the Indian Service and the public health program collapsed, and only 500 cases of tuberculosis were discovered.

"In another instance, the funds appropriated for health purposes among Indians were so sharply limited that admissions to hospitals and sanatoriums had to be restricted. This is best exemplified at Ah-gwah-ching, a 118-bed addition to the Minnesota State Sanatorium, built with Federal funds. This year with a large backlog of cases of tuberculosis discovered by the State department of health mass X-ray surveys, it was only possible to keep an average of 63 beds occupied. This meant that 55 beds were unused or more individuals with significant tuberculosis were left in the community to spread the disease." (Horace Dellen, M. D., and Arthur W. Dahlstrom, M. D., "Tuberculosis Control Among American Indians," *Journal Lancet*, April 1950.)

Average age of Arizona Indians at time of death

County	Tribe	1949			1950		
		Deaths	Total years lived	Average age at death	Deaths	Total years lived	Average age at death
Apache	Navajo-Apache	119	2,389	20.1	1212	14,113	19.4
Cochise	Navajo-Supai, Walapai-Hopi	104	1,519	14.6	184	2,860	10.2
Cocumino	Apache	40	1,282	32.1	163	11,651	26.2
Gila	do	10	407	40.7	15	630	42.0
Graham	do	3	25	8.3			
Greenlee	Pima	33	1,040	31.5	140	11,275	31.9
Mariopai	Walapai	12	206	17.2	12	1,370	30.8
Mohave	Navaho-Hopi, Apache	123	2,707	22.0	183	13,589	24.1
Navaho	Papago	71	1,522	21.4	180	12,717	34.0
Pima	Papago-Pima	45	1,754	39.0	244	11,458	23.1
Pinal							
Santa Cruz							
Yavapai	Yavapai-Apache	8	323	40.4	25	2,256	51.2
Yuma	Chemehuevi, Mohave	8	126	15.8	122	1,701	21.9
Unknown		2	66	33.0	1	1	1.0
Total		578	13,366	23.1	1,771	17,621	22.9

¹ Higher in 1950 than in 1949.

² Lower.

Mr. WATKINS. Madam President, I yield the floor.

Mr. ANDERSON. Madam President, this is a situation which many of us do not enjoy. We recognize that a very sincere effort has been made to present a good bill to the Senate and to pass it.

When we have as much division as we have among the Indians themselves on a bill of this kind, and when we have as much division among the administrative authorities of the Government as we have on this bill, we ought to be a little careful, and we ought to take more time in its consideration.

I call the attention of the Senate to the report accompanying H. R. 303, at page 16, where the executive office of the President reports upon the bill, and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget points out that the Bureau does not believe that H. R. 303 should be enacted. It states why. It says:

These programs of health, education, welfare, and resources utilization are closely interrelated, and it was stated that much of their effectiveness might be lost, particularly at the reservation level, if administrative responsibility were divided between two agencies.

I think that is a very sensible observation. When we were considering the Navaho-Hopi rehabilitation bill, of which I was one of the authors, one of the things we tried to point out was that we were not dealing in an isolated fashion with roads; we were not concerned wholly with the health of Indians, but we were considering their education, the rehabilitation of their lands, and were looking at the whole picture of the Navaho Reservation. The very purpose of that bill, the most progressive legislation of which I can think, is destroyed if we take the Indian Health Service and transfer it to the Public Health Service without very careful consultation with the Indians themselves and without a very careful study as to what it does.

I wish also to suggest that perhaps the department to which the service is to be transferred might have something to say about it. On the 28th day of May 1954, in a letter to the chairman of the Senate committee, the Department of Health,

Education, and Welfare stated that it had made an unfavorable report on Senate bill 132, which was introduced by the able Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] and the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs [Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska]. That is true. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare did make an unfavorable report. But let us remember that on May 5, 1953, the Department of the Interior itself also made an unfavorable report on the bill. I read only a few words from the letter of Orme Lewis, Assistant Secretary of the Interior, dated May 5, 1953, in which he said:

Reference is made to your request for report on H. R. 303 to transfer the maintenance and operation of hospital and health facilities for Indians to the Public Health Service. The following report applies also to a similar bill, H. R. 1057:

I recommend that these bills be not enacted.

Madam President, in what direction are we going when, despite the recommendation of the Department of the Interior, the recommendation of the Bureau of the Budget, and the recommendation of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, we say that, regardless of how official Washington feels, regardless of how those who are most definitely involved feel, we are going ahead with this bill?

I recognize that on May 12, 1954, the Interior Department made a different recommendation and said, "We recommend that the bill be enacted." If Senators will read the letter, they will find how tortuously that had to be finally evolved, so that the Secretary, who said on May 5 that the bill should not be enacted, stated a few days later that the bill should be enacted.

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

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. I think it should be considered that the Secretary of the Interior made a further study of the situation—

Mr. ANDERSON. I should dislike to think that the letter of May 5, was im-

mature, and that the subject was not properly considered by the Department. I think the very same things prompted the letter of May 28 from the Bureau of the Budget and from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Let us see what the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare said:

A report on a similar bill, S. 132, was submitted by this Department to your committee on April 22, 1953. Our report stated that a unified administration of all related services to Indians is preferable, on the whole, to a division of responsibility between the two Departments; that there is serious doubt whether significant improvement in health services or conditions could be achieved simply by the device of transferring administrative responsibility and that such a transfer would not overcome the fundamental difficulties which have retarded the improvement of Indian health conditions.

This department desires to reiterate its position as expressed in its report on S. 132 and in addition the following comments are offered for the consideration of the committee.

It points out as follows:

The Federal Government's relationship with Indians is based upon and controlled by a tremendous background of variegated legislation, treaties, and special negotiations with a great many tribes, their tribal councils and representatives. This complexity of rights, treaty obligations, privileges of Indians, trust funds, etc., has been dealt with by the Department of the Interior since 1849. The administration of a health program for Indians by an agency not in possession of this background and know-how would be an extremely difficult undertaking. From the point of view of the Indian, he would be required to become acquainted and deal with another Federal department which has very little experience in his problems and little basic knowledge of his cultural characteristics and his tribal relationships with the Federal Government.

What is wrong with that reasoning? It strikes me as a pretty sensible approach. Most people who have been dealing with Indians for any length of time would come to the conclusion that it is a sensible approach. I think those who introduced this bill and those who are supporting it are moving in what will eventually be a correct direction. The time will come when we shall dispose of many of the activities of the Indian Bureau. I believe that a better selling job, if I may use that term, might have been done by the Indians. Why do I say that? Prior to the time this bill was to be considered, I received a letter from the head of the tribal councils, under date of May 25, 1954, from which I read:

I have just received notice that there will be a hearing by the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs of the Senate on H. R. 303, May 28, at 10 a. m. The All-Pueblo Council, consisting of tribal councils of all New Mexico Pueblos has voted unanimously to oppose this bill on the ground that it is their belief that health and hospital service to Indians will be best served by the Bureau of Indian Affairs. We have given much thought to it and have discussed it fully, and we believe it is better not to make the change. The Indian Bureau knows the needs of the Indians, who have found discrimination against them in non-Indian hospitals and have had to pay

hospital fees that were staggering. We believe that once the transfer is made, Indian health services will diminish even more than at present. We know what we have now, and there is no telling what will be done to us if health services are transferred to the United States Public Health Service. We prefer, therefore, that H. R. 303 be defeated and ask that you present our views opposing it.

Madam President, strangely, the Indians in that particular area are divided on this question very substantially. In fact, nearly all Indians who live in the pueblos are opposed to the proposed legislation. The Tribe of Navaho Indians is in favor of it. The Navahos voted, first, 69 to 1 in their tribal council to support the bill. They reconsidered the matter at a later date and voted 36 to 23 to support it. I am not so sure they are as strong for it as they were. But I should like to say that I met with the Pueblos and tried to satisfy their views about it. I arranged the meeting about 10 days ago and asked the Indians to tell me why they were opposed to the bill, not through some special spokesman, or their lawyer, but in their own words. I did not take the notes down completely, but the very first Indian who spoke said, "The Indians feel they cannot go to the Surgeon General as well as to the Indian Commissioner."

That is a perfectly natural position for the Indians to take. For a long time they have felt they could talk to the Indian Commissioner. They have a very fine Indian Commissioner with whom to talk. He is in favor of the bill, and I know if the bill is passed he will administer it to the best of his ability so that the Indians will not be harmed. But I notice that the Indians are worried about it. Perhaps with the passage of time they may somewhat change their point of view.

They pointed out that they can get better acquainted with one doctor, who happens to be an Indian Service doctor, than they can with a doctor of a different service. One of the Indians, not a Jemez Pueblo, spoke up and said to me, "The Indians are timid. They are afraid to go to a new doctor when they trust the old one."

I visited with the various individuals who were there—and every one of the Pueblos was represented at the meeting. They asked many other questions, because we were dealing not only with this bill, but also with the bill which is scheduled to follow, to provide for the transfer of the extension service. Much of the discussion dealt with the transfer of the extension service, probably more so than with the transfer of the Health Service. But constantly the Indians said they would like to have additional time in which to consider the matter.

I do not believe it could be said that the Indians were completely rejecting the idea, but I know that Pueblo after Pueblo took the position that they were not yet ready to be included in the bill.

As I have said, the Navaho Indians favor the bill. At page 43 of the hearings I placed in the record a statement which was made by Anna Wauneka, a councilwoman, in an address before the council to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs. They did not endorse the proposal at that time in actuality, but cer-

tainly what was said was approved by the tribal council, and I think it involved really an endorsement of the bill by the Navaho Tribal Council. Subsequently, when the bill was brought to them, they supported it.

But I call attention to the fact that from the State of Oklahoma, where there are from one-third to one-half of all the Indians in the United States, every member of the Oklahoma delegation, in both the Senate and the House, appeared in opposition to the bill; and the Oklahoma Indians who appeared were strongly opposed to it. It seems to me that the Oklahoma Indians probably are sensing the very thing which the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] was speaking about. They have some hospitals. They know what their rights are in those hospitals. They do not know what their rights will be when the hospitals are transferred to the Public Health Service and they cannot go to Indian hospitals. One can hardly blame the Indians for wanting to go slow.

At the session held by the Senate committee, one of the Representatives from the State of Oklahoma said that there was some question about the preferential rights which Indians had. He said he would feel better if an amendment were included to read as follows:

Provided, That with respect to such hospitals, persons of Indian blood shall have the same employment preferences now given to Indians by law in the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

That does not fit into the scheme of operating Public Health Service hospitals. Congress cannot suddenly say to the Public Health Service in connection with the operation of its great public health facilities, such as the one at Bethesda, that it must give preference rights to Indians, because that is a very elaborate establishment, and intended to be such. Therefore, the problem arises as to what is to be done about the preference rights of the Indians in their own hospitals.

I am trying to say that I do not condemn the bill. I do not say it is viciously drawn so as to take benefits away from the Indians. I simply say there is, across the country, a strong idea on the part of the Indians that they are not ready for legislation of this kind; that perhaps they might get ready for it; but certainly they are not ready now.

I call attention to the fact that when the Oklahoma delegation appeared, they were not taking a position only from a political point of view, because the Honorable PAGE BELCHER, a Representative from the State of Oklahoma, who is as staunch a Republican as can be imagined, stood up and said that he was opposed completely to the proposed legislation and he believed that if career jobs were created in the Health Service of the Indian Bureau as attractive as the positions in other departments of the Government, it would be just as easy to recruit medical personnel for the Health Service in the Indian Bureau as it would be in any other department.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Senator has been referring to the Oklahoma Indians. I am certain he is correct. It is not so much that they are against the pending legislation, but they would like to know a little more about it. They would like to be advised whether it would be in the interest of the Indians and in the interest of the American people, or whether the proposal is something which is simply being shoved down their throats.

My colleague has also referred to the fact that Oklahoma has many Indians. Next to Oklahoma, New Mexico has most of the Indians. In New Mexico the sentiment is divided. There are as many Pueblo Indians as there are Navahos, or practically so. The Navahos say they might be for the bill; at least they gave tacit endorsement.

Mr. ANDERSON. The Navahos endorsed the bill.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Taking the Indians as a whole, as between the Pueblos and the Navahos, would not my colleague say that, so far as being informed about the proposed legislation is concerned, the Pueblos probably know what its results will be, and that even they do not say they are necessarily against it, but simply say that a study should be made, and the Indians advised—not only the tribal council of a particular group of Pueblos or of a particular tribe, but the individual Indian himself?

Tribal councils are like city councils. When a city council passes a resolution, notwithstanding that the members of the council are representatives of the people as a whole, they do not, in many instances, represent the ideas of the individual person. Is not that the situation with the Indians now?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes; it is. In part the reason is that the Indians who are members of the Pueblo council live closer to some of the metropolitan communities than do the Navahos. When they have accidents while working in town, they are taken to the city hospitals. They feel sometimes that they are being discriminated against in those hospitals. They know that when they go to an Indian hospital, they are not discriminated against. They want to be very certain of what their rights are when they go to a hospital.

I believe it would be possible to administer the bill if it should become a law, in such a way that the Indians would not be discriminated against. I only point out that they are worried about the situation at present. They want time to study the measure, and they have asked for time in which to study it.

In view of the fact that the Bureau of the Budget has reported against the bill, and that the Public Health Service, which will have to administer it, is strongly opposed to the bill, I think we are moving in a very strange direction when we say that, regardless of how the Bureau of the Budget feels, and regardless of how the Public Health Service feels, we are going to push it over; we are going to shove it down the throats of the great mass of Indians.

While the Navahos have endorsed the bill, as I have pointed out, they are almost equally divided in their tribal coun-

cil upon it. The first time, they were unanimously in favor of it, because they saw only the good possibilities of it.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. My colleague knows that the Navaho Reservations in New Mexico and Arizona contain 16 million acres. Outside of the 16 million acres, there are thousands of allotments of from 160 to as much as 420 acres. What percentage of the people in that area, who never have an opportunity to go to Window Rock, Ariz., or to Gallup, N. Mex., know what the proposed legislation means?

Mr. ANDERSON. I think they have a very poor opportunity to learn about it. Of course, I think it might be possible to acquaint them with it more fully, and to bring more of them to support it. But I do not believe they have as yet had an opportunity to study the measure.

I recognize the fact that the American Medical Association favors the bill. I recognize that many State health department officials also favor it. There is a very sound reason why they favor it. A pretty bad situation has existed, so far as disease and mortality on the reservations are concerned. The reservations are years behind the other areas of the United States in their health methods. Congress ought to be dealing with the problem as rapidly as possible. The difficulty is that the Indians do not believe that the bill will improve their situation at all.

Mr. MONRONEY. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. Is it not true that if medical conditions on the reservations are bad, the fault rests with Congress, because Congress has not appropriated sufficient money? If the money had been appropriated throughout the years, the health conditions would have been better. But when it comes to the welfare of the Indians of the United States, it seems that Congress has economized and reduced the appropriations for Indians to such a point that the Government cannot hope to attract doctors of the competence which is needed in the Indian Service.

Mr. ANDERSON. I think Congress has had a responsibility which has not been discharged, and that the health service which has been extended to the Indians has not been as good as it should have been; but I recognize that when attempts have been made to enact beneficial legislation, the attempts have failed.

I thought that a great deal of the testimony was extremely interesting. I listened to a statement that years ago it had been suggested that this change be made. That material is carried in the hearings from page 97 to page 107. It refers to a report by Dr. Lewis J. Moorman, who came from the great State of Oklahoma to make a survey. I recall when he made the survey. I do not recall the conclusions he reached, but they did not seem to me to be quite so strong for the transfer of the facilities. If anyone will take the time to read the report, which is reprinted in the Senate hearings on H. R. 303, he will see all

sorts of suggestions for the improvement of the present health service. In recommendation No. 16 of his list, after all the other things he proposed, he said:

Finally, if the above recommendations do not meet with approval and result in prompt execution, we recommend that the Navaho-Hopi medical service be placed in the hands of the United States Public Health Service.

Yes, if considered alone, if the 15 first recommendations to build a decent health service are ignored, if no attention is paid to conditions on the Navaho Reservation, then in that case the transfer might be made.

What I am trying to say is that if the Indians are divided on the question, if the Bureau of the Budget is opposed to the transfer, as it was and still is, if the Public Health Service is opposed to the transfer, as it has been opposing and still is opposing it—and it is the agency to which it is sought to transfer the service—and if the department has written a letter as recently as May 28 saying the transfer should not be made, then I think we shall certainly be going a long way if we make the transfer.

Mr. KILGORE. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. KILGORE. It is not a question of getting adequate medical service in hospitals, is it?

Mr. ANDERSON. I may say to the Senator from West Virginia that the problem is not simple. Many of the hospitals are in very isolated places. Young medical men who go to them are not very often inclined to stay. There is a great temptation for them to move away.

Mr. KILGORE. The Senator from New Mexico has used the word "young" very advisedly. Is it not true that only young medical men will take positions of that kind?

Mr. ANDERSON. No, it is not entirely true. There have been some very wonderful doctors in the southwest Indian country. The able Senator from Arizona will remember Dr. Salisbury, who was a fine physician, and not young. In the main, in the approximately 78 hospitals, the doctors who have been supplied have been those who have been drafted into the Army, as the Senator from Oklahoma pointed out, who have been available for assignment, and who have been assigned to the Public Health Service, working in that part of the world.

Mr. KILGORE. I realize that there are certain highly devoted individuals in the medical profession, as there are in all other professions, who work with consecrated zeal. However, is it not also a fact that there is a limitation imposed by the medical profession, based perhaps, on the fear of competition, which limitation has been superimposed, shall we say, on the educational facilities and by prescribing certain educational qualifications for those who want to be doctors? That has led to such a situation that it is not possible to recruit the high type of doctors it is desired to obtain for hospitals, and who are really necessary. Is that not correct?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes; it is extremely difficult to recruit doctors for this particular service.

Mr. KILGORE. Then there is also to be considered the question of the anti-trust proceeding against the American Medical Association, which has been instituted, and which is still pending. Does not the distinguished Senator think that possibly restrictions of the type I have mentioned have limited the recruitment and the importation of physicians? The elimination of such restrictions might be a solution toward getting adequate health service in the many hospitals in which doctors are needed.

I know that in my own State there was a hospital which was built by a foundation established by a man who had been cured of infantile paralysis, or whose son had been cured, by a physician. He donated a farm and all the other necessary facilities to that physician. Eventually the hospital got into the hands of the municipal council. Finally the hospital ended up in the hands of private owners, and it is not doing a bit of good to infantile paralysis patients in that area. The doctor I mentioned, who had worked on that health problem during his entire life as a physician, had to go out and find another location for himself.

I wonder if such a condition would not result if control of the hospitals were relinquished by the Government and they eventually came under the control of the wrong kind of individuals who might use the facilities for private benefit.

I believe some of the same conditions with regard to the shortage of doctors will continue until the complete monopoly of medical service which is now exercised by the American Medical Association is broken. I wish to say to the Senator, and I hope the RECORD will quote me correctly, that I realize I shall be crucified for taking the position I have assumed. However, the condition faces us right now.

I may state that I received a letter about 2 or 3 years ago from persons in my State which said that the signers were opposed to compulsory hospitalization as proposed by the Government. Dr. Fishbein had delivered a lecture in that community the day before in which he had stated that if that kind of health insurance were made compulsory by law, everybody would be going into hospitals. That is a part of the propaganda which is put forth. I realize that what I say is going to be used against me. However, in my opinion, that is one of the primary factors in the problem now being discussed. What is now proposed is one way to start a move in the other direction.

Mr. ANDERSON. I had relationship with the Public Health Association and the Department of Health in the State of New Mexico in the years 1920 and 1921, which was a good many years ago. I realize the problem which has existed in recruiting doctors for the service under discussion. I think the Public Health Service has a magnificent record, and has done well.

I appreciate that the distinguished majority leader is trying to bring the session to a close so the Senate will not

have to sit on tomorrow, Saturday. I could spend a good deal of time discussing the question, but I do not expect to do so. I shall read only one final paragraph, and then I think I shall be through.

Mr. KILGORE. Let me ask one question. So long as we keep the situation under Government control, it works pretty well, does it not?

Mr. ANDERSON. I think the Government has done well in the Public Health Service and, considering the amount of money which has been available, it has done well in the Indian Service.

Mr. KILGORE. But if the control slips over into private or county hands, there will be a different picture.

Mr. ANDERSON. I want to be fair to the sponsors of the bill. It is not proposed to have it slip over to private control.

Mr. WATKINS. If the Senator will yield, I should like to say that the bill provides that if the hospital has been used or maintained for a designated group of Indians, the hospital facilities may not be transferred by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare without the consent of the Indians.

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. WATKINS. That provision protects the Indians.

Mr. ANDERSON. I wish to read from a recent letter from the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, in which she stated:

Because this proposed transfer would separate health services for Indians from the other federally supported programs for Indians which are so closely related both in substance and in administration, it is our opinion that such action may tend to diminish the coordination among these activities and tend to increase the difficulties of pursuing the policy of integrating the Indian into the general pattern of community and State services and benefits, as a part of the general population. Furthermore, the necessity of establishing a new administrative structure in dealing with Indians separate and distinct from the Bureau of Indian Affairs in the Department of the Interior may result in needless duplication and confusion in the conduct of Indian affairs and militate against a unified and sound Indian policy.

I think the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has well stated that until this program is so established that we can be sure that there will not be the needless duplication and confusion which is referred to in the letter, we ought to be very slow about passing the bill, and the proposed legislation may be one of the measures which could well stand further study.

Mr. WATKINS. Madam President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield for a question?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. Does the Senator from New Mexico realize that there will be a full year before the transfer will be made, and during that period of time the study can be made?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes; and I think that adding a year is a material improvement.

Mr. WATKINS. Obviously the transfer cannot be made by the end of the present fiscal year, because we have al-

most reached that date, and the law cannot be made effective by that time.

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. WATKINS. I think the Senator from New Mexico is aware of the fact that the Indian Bureau will still be there, and all the information and background they have had will be available to the Public Health Service.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is true; but I think the Senator from Utah would be more sure of himself and of the effect of the bill if he could have persuaded the Bureau of the Budget and those who will have to administer the bill that it is a good thing. When those who will have to administer a bill begin by saying, "We think it will lead to confusion," then I do not believe it is the type of measure we should pass.

Mr. WATKINS. It seems to me that the attitude of the Bureau of the Budget was similar to the original complaint, namely, an unwillingness to make a change. That attitude has been taken whenever, in the past, an effort has been made to get the Indians on their feet, and possibly to abolish the Indian Bureau. Invariably the departments or agencies concerned would reply, "Wait a while."

If we had accepted that advice, if we had followed the philosophy which has been advocated by the Indian Bureau, and even advocated by Mrs. Hobby, in her letter, the Indians would now be relying upon medicine men.

Mr. ANDERSON. I concede that probably the progress that will be made will still be made slowly. I concede that it might be wise for me to go to the Indians at Pueblo Isleta, the pueblo near my home, and say to them, "You must use trucks, as the rest of us do; and you must use machinery, and stop using hand tools." But sometimes I wonder whether the Indians are not wise in adhering to their way of life.

Mr. KILGORE. Madam President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield for a question?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. It is much easier not to do something than to undo something that has been done in error. If we take action now, and later find it is not proper action to take, we shall have to engage in an undoing process.

So it would be much better to wait until we get the whole situation cleared up, and then take action, rather than to take action now, and then have to undo it 12 months from now.

Mr. ANDERSON. However, I think it might be possible for the opinion of many of the Indians to be changed. The National Conference of American Indians, which has been opposed to this proposal, is to have a meeting in August. From that meeting could well come support for this measure, and that would make it much more effective. I think time will be most useful in this regard.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Madam President, the Senator from New Mexico asked a question that is very pertinent to this problem and to the other problems involving the Indians. He asked, "When is the proper time?"

I feel that now is the time. That is why I am supporting this measure.

This measure is not new. I first heard it thoroughly discussed when I was a member of the Advisory Committee on Indian Affairs to the Department of the Interior back about 1948, and the survey team that had been appointed by the present administration came forward with this recommendation. So the Indians have known about this plan for years and years; it is not new to them. I have heard it discussed in their councils, and I have discussed it with them.

If we allow the health of the Indians to continue in the deplorable state it is in at this time, if we continue to say the Indian Bureau has the answer to this situation after 100 years of deplorably bad service to the Indians, we shall never enable the Indians to enjoy the services and privileges the white people enjoy.

I realize that the hour is late; nevertheless I should like to read excerpts from a report on the health conditions existing among the tribes of my State. I shall read from a report entitled "Indians of the Southwest," which is the First Annual Report of the Bureau of Ethnic Research, Department of Anthropology, of the University of Arizona, in 1953. The subtitle is "A Survey of Indian Tribes and Indian Administration in Arizona."

Madam President, Arizona has some weight in the Indian world. In Arizona and in the small portion of the Navaho Reservation that lies in New Mexico there are 101,750 of the 400,000 Indians who live in the United States and its possessions.

The Navaho Tribe is the largest native-tongue tribe in the United States. There are approximately 71,000 of those Indians, and only about 10 percent of them speak English.

Madam President, I wish to review the health conditions existing among the various tribes.

On the San Carlos Apache Reservation, in Arizona, there is a population of 3,971.

In the report, under the item of "Health," we find the following:

The San Carlos Indian Hospital has a capacity of 45 beds and 6 bassinets, but only 20 beds are available for use under present appropriations. This is considered inadequate by both Indians and Indian Service officials. A staff of 16, including a medical officer and 5 nurses, operates the hospital. The field staff is composed of a medical officer and one public-health nurse.

The White Mountain Apache Tribe, of the Fort Apache Agency, has a total population of 3,738. In the report, under the item of "Health," we find the following:

The Indian Service hospital at White-river has a capacity of 48 beds and 6 bassinets, but only 25 beds are available for use under present appropriations. A staff of 21, including a medical officer, dental officer, and 6 nurses, operates the hospital. The field staff is composed of a medical officer and two public-health nurses.

Today there is no reluctance on the part of most Indians to go to white doctors, now that the ice has been broken by the construction of the many fine church hospitals which have been built

on the reservations, including the Presbyterian Hospital at Ganado, which was founded by the eminent Dr. Salsbury.

Madam President, I should like to proceed by reading from the report about health conditions among the other tribes.

Incidentally, much has been said about the Navaho people and their plight, during the discussion of the Indians and the conditions existing among them. In fact, one living in the East would be led to believe that the tribe of Indians in the West that is in the worst shape is the Navahos. However, I wish to read to my colleagues a few statistics about the Papago Tribe.

In the case of the Papago Tribe, on the Papago Agency—the headquarters of the agency and the tribal offices being at Sells, Ariz.—the total population on the 3 reservations is 7,674. In the report, under the item of "Health," we find the following:

The following information is from facts compiled in 1949; of approximately 260 infants born each year, one-fourth die within 12 months; at the age of 6 there are only 160 left; at the age of 18, only 125. The life-expectancy of a Papago infant is 17 years, whereas that of a non-Indian infant in the United States is over 60 years. The comparison of the weighted Papago curve with that of the United States as a whole tells an almost incredible Papago health story. Only a birth rate double that of the country as a whole enables the Papagos to survive and increase.

The Indian health service had a hospital at Sells, but it burned down a number of years ago, and never has been reconstructed, although in this year's appropriation there are funds for the construction of a small clinic there.

This tribe is not a small one. Its population is approximately 7,000. They live on a vast reservation.

The situation today is that if a Papago Indian becomes sick, breaks his back or his skull, is burned, or for other reasons requires medical care, in many cases a drive of nearly 200 miles is required in order to reach the nearest hospital. I hope the small clinic to be built at Sells this year will be of benefit to those people.

The Colorado River Mohave-Chemehuevi Indian Tribes, that live near Parker, Ariz., and have a population of 1,175 have a hospital with "a capacity of 28 beds, but only 15 are authorized for use under present appropriations. A staff of 20, including a medical officer and 5 nurses, operates the hospital."

The Mohave Tribe is a very small tribe. It is practically extinct today. It has a population of only 374.

Under the heading "Health" we find the following:

The Indian service maintains no hospital or medical facilities on the Fort Mohave Reservation. Those requiring hospitalization that can be moved are sent to the Indian hospital at Parker, Ariz. Minor medical needs are cared for by the local physicians on a fee basis. Emergency cases are cared for at the Needles Hospital until they can be moved to Parker. In fiscal year 1952, the cost of emergency hospitalization and physicians' fees came to \$3,000 for an estimated 518 patient visits and 310 patients treated.

Next we come to the Cocopa Tribe, which is also a very small tribe. The

population is 55. Under "Health" we find the following:

There is no Indian Service hospital or medical facilities available on the reservation. Cases requiring hospitalization are sent to the Indian hospital at Fort Yuma, Calif., which is under Sacramento Area Office jurisdiction. This hospital, which is across the river from Yuma, Ariz., also takes care of nonhospitalized patients through the outpatient clinic.

We next come to the Hualapai Tribe, which has a population of 641. They are the Indians who live near the Grand Canyon. Under "Health" we find the following:

There is no Indian Service hospital or medical facilities available on the Hualapai Reservation. All cases requiring hospitalization are taken to the Kingman Hospital, with the Government providing ambulance service. There is a budget allowance for a resident physician, but this position has not been filled.

The next tribes are the Camp Verde Yavapai-Apache Tribes, a small group with a population of only 438.

Under the heading "Health," we find the following:

The Indian Service provides no medical facilities for use by the Indians of this reservation. Patients are cared for under contract at the local hospital in Cottonwood, 22 miles distant.

The Havasupai Indians live in the Grand Canyon some 3,500 feet down in the earth, in a small crack which is tributary to the Grand Canyon. The population is 235. Under the heading "Health" we find the following:

The only health facility available in Supai is first-aid treatment administered by the resident agent. The nearest professional medical attention is at Grand Canyon, 14 miles by horse trail and 35 miles by a road which is usually passable by pick-up truck. Cases which need diagnosis or hospitalization up to a maximum of 5 days are referred by the resident agent to the hospital at Grand Canyon, the Indian Service paying the expenses. Cases requiring more than 5 days' hospitalization are sent to Indian hospitals either at Parker, Phoenix, or Albuquerque.

We now come to the Yavapai Tribe, with a population of 54. It has no health service at all. Under "Health," we find the following:

Since the Indian Service does not have a medical contract with the doctors or hospital in Prescott, medical facilities are arranged and paid for on an individual basis.

We now come to some of the larger tribes in the central part of the State. Under the Pima agency, there is the Salt River Pima-Maricopa community, with a population of 1,403. We find the following under "Health":

There are no medical facilities available on the Salt River Reservation with the exception of a field nurse who lives on the reservation but also serves Fort McDowell and part of the Gila River Reservation. Patients are cared for at the Pima Hospital at Sacaton, a distance of 40 miles.

The next is the Fort McDowell Mohave-Apache community, with a population of 212. Under "Health," we find the following:

There are no medical facilities on the Fort McDowell Reservation. Patients are cared for at the Pima Indian Hospital at Sacaton,

a distance of 52 miles. A field nurse from the Salt River Reservation and a dental officer from the Gila River Reservation hold clinics on the reservation and serve approximately 200 patients each year.

The next is the Ak Chin (Maricopa) community, with a population of 139. Under the heading of "Health" we find the following:

There are no medical facilities available on the Maricopa Reservation. Patients are cared for at the Pima Hospital, the agency hospital at Sacaton, Ariz., which is 25 miles away. An outpatient clinic is also maintained at the hospital, and clinics are held at regular intervals on the reservation by the field nurse for the Gila River Reservation.

The next is the Uinta and Ouray agency, under which we find the Kaibab Paiute Tribe, with a population of 96. Under the heading of "Health" we find the following:

There are no Indian-operated hospitals or medical facilities on the Kaibab Reservation. Emergency medical cases are cared for under contract at the Kane County General Hospital at Kanab, Utah, 25 miles northeast of the reservation. Some of these are later removed to the Phoenix Medical Center.

Next come the Navaho and Hopi Reservations, with a population of 75,000. Under the heading of "Health" we find the following:

Hospital facilities operated by the Indian Service to serve the 75,000 Indians on the Navaho and Hopi Reservations are located at Fort Defiance, Keams Canyon, Tuba City, and Winslow in Arizona and at Shiprock and Crownpoint in New Mexico. Total bed capacity is 381. In addition to these facilities approximately 200 Navaho and Hopi patients have been sent to other Indian hospitals and to private hospitals under contract with the Government.

The Hopi hospital facilities at Keams Canyon are described in the Hopi section. Navaho hospitals are as follows:

Navaho Medical Center, Fort Defiance, Ariz.: Two hundred and six bed budgeted capacity, including 100 for tubercular patients. Total staff of 185 including one hospital administrator, 11 medical officers, 3 dental officers, 1 medical student aide, 55 nurses, 23 trained practical nurses, 5 medical technician assistants, 1 medical technician, and 1 each anesthetist, X-ray technician, and occupational therapist.

Western Navaho Hospital, Tuba City, Ariz.: Thirty-five bed budgeted capacity. Total staff of 40 including 2 medical officers, 1 medical student aide, 9 nurses, 4 trained practical nurses, and 1 medical technician assistant.

Northern Navaho Hospital, Shiprock, N. Mex.: Thirty-five bed budgeted capacity. Total staff of 30 including 2 medical officers, 8 nurses, 3 trained practical nurses, and 1 medical technician assistant.

Eastern Navaho Hospital, Crownpoint, N. Mex.: Thirty-five bed budgeted capacity. Total staff of 25, including 2 medical officers, 9 nurses, 6 trained practical nurses, and 1 medical technician assistant.

Winslow Indian Hospital, Winslow, Ariz.: Thirty-five bed capacity. Total staff of 33, including 2 medical officers, 9 nurses, 3 trained practical nurses, and 1 medical technician.

The following figures apply to all 6 hospitals for the year ending April 30, 1952: Number of admissions, 8,925; number of discharges, 8,641; total hospital days exclusive of newborn, 126,032; total hospital days for newborn (hospital births), 6,543; average daily patient load, exclusive of newborn,

344.3; number of authorized beds, 381; percentage of occupancy, 90.4.

In addition to these hospital facilities, a field staff of 40 persons is engaged in preventive health services on the Navaho Reservations. This number includes 3 medical officers, 5 dental officers, 1 sanitary engineer, and 17 public health nurses. Field clinics are located at Chinle on the reservation at Gallup, N. Mex. Arrangements have been made with Sage Memorial Hospital at Ganado, Ariz., to provide field clinics at Kayenta, in cooperation with Navaho service physician, Dr. Edwin Wilde, of Chinle. These clinics will be held monthly.

The annual report of out-patients treated for the year ending April 20, 1952, including the Hopi Reservation, is as follows:

	Area total	Hospital total	Field total
Out-patients treated.....	64,439	47,246	17,193
Number of treatments.....	79,091	60,297	18,794

During the same period 14,162 dental patients had been examined and 12,357 given treatments. By the end of the fiscal year each schoolchild in the reservation schools was examined and necessary treatment rendered.

The employment of Navahos in the health branch has remained relatively constant at approximately 60 percent of the total employees. Six of the medical technicians, 12 of the staff nurses, and 156 of the ancillary personnel are Navahos.

Other health facilities in addition to those operated by the Indian service include three mission hospitals for Indians operating on or adjacent to the reservation. The Sage Memorial Hospital at Ganado, Ariz., has a capacity of 100 beds; the San Juan Mission Hospital at Farmington, N. Mex., has a capacity of 21 beds; and Rehoboth Mission Hospital at Gallup, N. Mex., has a capacity of 30 beds.

Statistical data on the Navaho Indians has not been reliable in the past and is still not good. According to Dr. L. A. Byers, chief of the medical branch, this lack must be corrected before the Navaho doctors can know what their problems are and how to correct them. Dr. Byers is also of the opinion that there has been a great improvement in the Navaho and Hopi attitudes toward white medicine and white doctors, and that this new interest in modern medicine has brought in more patients than can be served with existing facilities.

The greatest problem is in obtaining and keeping physicians and nurses in the Navaho and Hopi hospitals. Physicians of proper training and qualification are often unavailable because of the difference between their earnings in private practice and Government salaries. For nurses, where pay differences are not so great, the difficulty is in the isolation of reservation communities and, often, in the inadequacy of housing. The Indian Service is now planning to establish semi-permanent trailer courts to solve the housing problem, especially for nurses who have family dependents.

In the State of Arizona, in which, counting the small section of the Navaho Tribe that is in New Mexico, more than 101,000 Indians live, only 544 beds, 19 bassinets, and 399 people are available to operate those facilities.

In answer to the question of the junior Senator from New Mexico as to when is the proper time, let me say that the time is any time when we are not providing adequate health service to any of the people of the country, whether they be whites or Indians.

Down through the history of the Indian Service the Indian Health Service has not improved. The Indian Health Service does not provide adequate health service to the Indians. I have maintained a trading post on the Navaho Reservation for a number of years. It is 90 miles to the nearest hospital. I have driven many Indian boys and girls to the hospital who have been hurt either by falling off a horse or having a horse roll over on them. The 90-mile trip to the hospital is over almost impassable roads. We have had to provide our own medical care by asking pharmaceutical houses to donate equipment and then instruct the white people who live there in the use of such equipment.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.
Mr. CHAVEZ. I have followed the distinguished Senator from Arizona very carefully. I feel that he has made a correct statement as to the condition of the health of the Indians of Arizona. Let me add that the same situation exists in New Mexico.

But how are we to relieve the situation by making a transfer of facilities from one agency to another? Are not the guilty ones, the ones who are supposed to provide the necessary facilities, the Congress of the United States? Why are there only 42 beds in a given hospital? Because the Congress does not provide for 100. Why are there only 6 bassinets instead of 16? Because Congress does not provide funds for more. Why is it necessary to travel 90 miles in order to get to a hospital? Because Congress does not provide adequate facilities. The real question, as I see it, is not whether the Public Health Service or the Indian Bureau itself shall handle the health problem of the Indians. The responsibility is that of Congress, whether the work be done through the Public Health Service or the Indian service.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am glad the Senator asked that question, because it should be perfectly obvious to anyone who is acquainted with the Indians, as is the distinguished senior Senator from New Mexico, that the answer has not been in the Indian service. For many years the Indian service has requested money of the Congress, but has been denied. There is nothing to indicate that the Congress is about to change the pattern at the present time.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Does the Senator—
Mr. GOLDWATER. Let me finish.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I do not yield. I wish to answer the Senator's question, and then I shall yield.

The Public Health Service of the United States has demonstrated that it can handle medical care in isolated situations. There is an esprit de corps in the Public Health Service which is not found in the Indian Health Service. Money is not the answer. We cannot get doctors to go out and live on the Navaho Reservation, the Papago Reservation, or on the Hualapai or Havasupai Reservations. They are far from civilization. The situation is different from

that in Oklahoma, where the Indians have progressed, and a majority of them speak English. They have access to towns. We cannot ask a man who is not dedicated to the service to go out into such places and expect him to remain.

Mr. WATKINS. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I pointed out earlier that money is not the only problem. The problem rests in morale. We do not find young doctors who are willing to devote their lives to the Indian Health Service in the same way in which doctors dedicate themselves to the Public Health Service.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Madam President, may I interrupt the Senator on that particular item?

Mr. GOLDWATER. Certainly.
Mr. CHAVEZ. I happen to have been the chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations which for years handled funds for public health. My experience—and I venture to say it is the experience of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], who now handles the particular bill which passed the Senate this afternoon—is to the effect that, so far as funds are concerned, the Public Health Service has just as hard a time as the Indian Bureau.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The Public Health Service can come to the Congress with a fine record of achievement.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct.
Mr. GOLDWATER. The Public Health Service can get attention in the Congress. The Indian Health Service has not received adequate money. It has not received the money it has needed. Many times I have felt that it has not asked for enough. It has not justified additional funds. I sat through hearings on that appropriation before I ever became a Member of this body. I have been interested in the subject almost all my life.

Mr. THYE. Madam President, will the Senator yield at this point in his statement?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am glad to yield.

Mr. THYE. The Senator from Arizona has made a most intelligent argument as to why the pending bill should be enacted. I cannot add anything to it. But I wish to invite the attention of Senators to the fact that in every State of the Union there is a State health organization which has developed a State health program on a par with that of other States throughout the Union.

In developing health measures various States have gone to the extent of establishing a central State organization and a county organization reaching across the entire State. If this proposed legislation is enacted, the Indian health problem will come under the jurisdiction of the State health organization, and the State health officer and his entire office and organization in the State will be dealing with the problem, as contrasted with the situation in which there is an isolated hospital unit several hundred miles from the State health officer. A doctor in such a hospital is isolated from the rest of the State with respect to every function he has to administer. If we are to have a health

system for the Indian comparable to that for the white man, we must bring the Indians under the care of State health organization.

That is the reason I introduced a bill similar to the House bill now pending. It was specifically on that basis that Dr. A. J. Chesley recommended the proposed legislation. Dr. Chesley is the secretary and executive officer of the Minnesota Department of Health, and was chairman of the association's special committee on Indian health services. That committee included the health officers of the States of Arizona, California, Colorado, Idaho, Mississippi, New Mexico, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Oregon, and South Dakota. Those officers were affiliated with the National Association dealing with Indian questions, in trying to improve the health of the Indians.

From the studies and findings of these many State health officers, who were affiliated with the national association, have come the recommendations embodied in the original bill I introduced, and in the companion bill which was later introduced by Dr. Judd, a medical doctor, serving as a Representative in the House. It was that bill which the House of Representatives passed, and the Senate committee adopted the House bill. I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Madam President, I thank the Senator for his observations. He has pointed out additional reasons why the bill should be favorably acted upon. I now yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I agree entirely with the views of the Senator from Minnesota and also with the views of the Senator from Arizona. However, having had experience in obtaining funds for the Public Health Service and for the Indian Service, I have my doubts whether the fact that we change the jurisdiction from one department to another will help, unless Congress becomes a little more liberal. Let me tell the Senator that in connection with the bill which was passed this afternoon the Public Health Service and many medical officers and State health agencies recommended that Congress provide a very limited amount for hospital construction. Not one penny was appropriated.

Mr. THYE. Madam President, now we are getting into a situation completely confusing, and I again call the attention of my distinguished friend from New Mexico to the hospital moneys provided in that bill.

The only question involved was whether we would appropriate some money for the construction of research facilities in various universities and colleges throughout the United States.

There has been money appropriated in years past for such research centers as at Bethesda. It was not money for the Bethesda hospital construction. It was money for purposes that Dr. Wangenstein, of the University of Minnesota, recommended. I have the highest regard for Dr. Wangenstein that I could possibly hold for any man. I believe in the policy and principle of the Federal Government appropriating funds for the

purpose of expanding research in universities and colleges.

I hope during the course of this year the Appropriations Committee will make available sufficient funds for that purpose, so that when we reconvene next year we can intelligently approach the question of whether we should appropriate further funds for research facilities in universities and colleges. I would advocate it. The National Health Association has made a very broad recommendation for a \$20 million appropriation for the construction of research facilities on a nationwide basis in universities and colleges. That is what the National Health Association recommended.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is the item I referred to.

Mr. THYE. The House rejected the appropriation. We did not have sufficient information to satisfy ourselves that we wanted to expand so-called health research activities into that field until we knew better how much money we should make available, and the type of legislation that would make it possible for the Federal Government to match State appropriated funds. It is not correct to say that we denied funds for hospital construction, because money was provided for hospital construction.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Madam President, I have occupied the floor far longer than I should have occupied it. I should like to close by asking two questions of the Senator from New Mexico, because he is most intimately acquainted with the problems concerning Indian health. The Senator from New Mexico has stated that he agrees that the condition of Indian health today is bad. Am I correct?

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Will the Senator also agree that the Indian health situation has been bad for a number of years?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes. I believe the responsibility lies in Congress, not in the Indian Bureau.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I merely wanted an answer of "yes," and I am glad I have that answer from the Senator. Would the distinguished Senator from New Mexico continue with the same doctor when in 75 years the doctor had not been able to cure him? Would he not look across the halls of government to a successful doctor, the Public Health Service, and say, "That is where I am going to go"?

Mr. CHAVEZ. If this bill is passed, I assure the Senator from Arizona that I will join him and any other Member of the Senate in trying to get more money for the new service than the Indian Bureau has had up to this time.

Mr. MONRONEY. Madam President, I am interested, as I know my distinguished friends on the other side of the aisle are interested, in the improvement of the medical services available to the Indians.

Of all classes of people in this great land of ours for whom in health matters we have a direct responsibility, I believe it is the original inhabitants of America. They are the people whose way of life and whose usual good health have been lowered to their present standards large-

ly because they have been unable to change their old cultural habits and adopt the civilization of the white man.

Frankly, I fear that the passage of this bill, not through intent, but through inevitable circumstances of Government, will mean far less medical service to the Indians than they now have. I believe it will mean taking the Indian to the hospital in the metropolitan area, instead of taking the hospital to the Indian.

Earlier today we appropriated a vast amount of money for the Hill-Burton program, to take to the smaller-settled communities hospital facilities; yet in the bill that follows we are trying to remove the hospital from the areas in which the Indians live and take the Indian to the great metropolitan areas.

It is necessary only to read the testimony of the star witness, when he tells the advantage of the Public Health Service in operating the hospitals. He boasts that only 3 of the hospitals operated by the Public Health Service were below the 100-bed capacity, and that 15 hospitals varied from 150 to 1,000 beds, in the largest hospitals.

Several of the Public Health Service hospitals were, the doctor testified—and I refer to Dr. Fred T. Foard, a former member of the Public Health Service—were affiliated with medical schools as teaching hospitals. A large majority of the Public Health hospitals accredited by the American Medical Association train interns in the various medical specialties. The witness testified that they like Public Health Service in the big hospitals where interns can be trained, but, he pointed out, the minimum number of beds is 200. Yet I believe the testimony shows, if I remember it correctly, that all but 8 of the 60 Indian hospitals which we are proposing to transfer to the Public Health Service, have less than 200 beds. Most of them have from 25 to 50 beds.

Mr. WATKINS. Madam President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. The Dr. Foard to whom the Senator has been referring was head of the Indian Health Service for many years; was he not?

Mr. MONRONEY. I believe he was. That is the point I am making. The purpose, I fear, is to liquidate the present Indian hospitalization and transfer the Indian to a metropolitan center for treatment. That will be a little bit severe for the Indian. It has taken years to get the Indians to come to their present hospitals and to trust in medical science instead of in the medicine men. That is true in my own State and in other States. Do we expect the Indian to remove himself from his accustomed place and go to a large hospital? He simply will not do so. So he will receive far less medical service. He will lose the great advantage of the small hospitals, because, under the Indian service, the Indians themselves have preference in employment, in nurse training, and in the housekeeping facilities of the hospitals.

The Indian feels at home there because there are other Indians there. Even

though the degree of proficiency in medicine is not up to present standards, the Indians are better cared for, from the Indian standpoint, because they trust those hospitals.

Make no mistake about it, Madam President, the plan is on to close these hospitals. I have been to the Indian Office no less than six times this year to protest against the closing of nearly half the Indian hospitals in Oklahoma. So I fear we may lose this background of experience and of knowledge, understanding, and sympathy of the Indian Bureau, and we will make this transfer to the cold walls of the Surgeon General's Office. The giant hospitals with a thousand beds or 500 beds in some far-off metropolitan area are going to appeal, and we shall lose the little hospitals which have served so well.

Mr. WATKINS. Madam President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield further?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. The Senator mentioned the fact that under the Hill-Burton Act we are helping to build hospitals in smaller areas. The Senator has heard the statement of the Senator from Arizona regarding the lack of hospitals in rural areas of the Navaho Reservation. It is all rural, as a matter of fact.

Mr. MONRONEY. I am sure we are not going to build any Hill-Burton hospitals in the middle of the Navaho Reservation or in any of the Pueblos of New Mexico. We are going to build them in the small progressive county-seat towns where there is need of hospitalization.

Mr. WATKINS. Why not have the Indians move to those points if there is to be any moving, not to the large metropolitan areas? In Utah the Indians are going to the non-Indian hospitals that are located in the towns bordering the reservation.

Mr. MONRONEY. I think Utah is very fortunate, then. In my State the white man is pushing the Indian farther and farther back into the hill country, where there is no hope for Hill-Burton hospitals, or for any other hospitals, unless we continue the operation of the present Indian hospitals.

Counting the lines in the bill, there are nine lines relating to the transfer of hospitals to the Public Health Service. There are two full pages regarding the supervision over Indian hospitals. I do not believe the chairman planned it that way, but I think it is a blueprint for the giving away of fully half the Indian hospitals to some local charitable, or political subdivision, without any remuneration coming to the Federal Government.

We might look back and find that most of the hospitals that were started were started with Indian tribal money.

The Indian leaders asked the Government to allow them to spend tribal funds for the establishment of hospitals. Much of the land on which they stand was acquired through tribal allocations and tribal allotments through Indian funds. But this bill would take away from the Indians that which they started and for which they spent their own money, and turn it over to some local or political subdivision. I fear that it will lead to

the disintegration of nearby treatment for Indians.

One thing which has not been mentioned here is the fact that the great benefit from Indian hospitals in my State—and we have some pretty good ones—is in the out-patient treatment. The only way the Indian gets any medical treatment is to come to the hospital. He does not go there to be a patient, but while the hospitals have perhaps 25 or 50 beds, they are serving more than 100 Indians a day.

Indians have told me that in the examining room in the out-patient department of these hospitals every morning there are some 50 Indians waiting for the medical skill that will be available to them. No one can tell me that we can substitute a 500- or a 1,000-bed hospital in a metropolitan area and begin to carry on the degree of medical service that is received by these out-patient Indians.

The only real argument in favor of the bill is the fact that doctors can be more readily obtained if the Indian hospitals are turned over to the Public Health Service.

Mr. THYE. Madam President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, who wishes, as I do, to improve the health of the Indians to the very best degree, but as to the means we differ.

Mr. THYE. I wish to state to my good friend from Oklahoma that I have the highest regard for him, and I know of his concern that legislation be not enacted which would deprive the Indians of the State of Oklahoma of the medical care and hospital care which they now enjoy. That is his fear.

My hope is that in the proposed legislation which is before us we will integrate the hospital and medical care of the Indian with our fine State health departments. When we do that we shall place the Indians under the same health standards that we now apply to white people. If anything will assure for the Indian of the future good hospital facilities and good medical care it will be when the health officers in the Senator's State will fight for the welfare and health measures for Indians just as they do for the white man. That is the whole purpose of the bill, to care for the Indians in the respective States.

That is the reason why, in 1953, I introduced proposed legislation similar to that now pending. That is the reason why I have supported it. That is why Dr. A. J. Chesley, of Minnesota, has been active in the entire movement. He is a medical man who knows the shortcomings of the health measures on the Indian reservations of northern Minnesota. We have a large population of Indians in Minnesota. For that reason I have a very keen interest in the Indians. I do not believe one bed will be taken away from the Indians in Oklahoma. I think additional beds will be put in Oklahoma to care for the Indians.

Mr. MONRONEY. That is contrary to the statement I have made about the difficulties we have been having, and the blueprint which has been drawn for the liquidation of the Oklahoma Indian hos-

pitals. I think if the Senator would look at the list, he would find that some hospitals will be closed in Minnesota.

The Oklahoma Indian does not want to be a charity or an indigent patient under the care of State-operated hospitals. The simple reason for this is that he owned all of Oklahoma until 1889. He was moved there by the Government and was given an estate which was to be his own for as long as fire burned and water ran. It was only a few short years until the sacred treaty was broken by the Government, and the Indians' land, which had been unlimited, was reduced to 160 acres per Indian, largely upland, rocky country. Luckily, some few Indians have found oil underneath some of the rocks, and that has paid off.

But the Indian does not want to be an indigent patient. He feels that he is entitled to hospitalization at the hands of the Government which took all his land away from him and gave it to the white men.

The only justification I can see for the bill is that the Public Health Service can get doctors, and the Indian Service cannot. What it boils down to is simply that.

I asked Dr. Foard, who was the principal witness in behalf of the bill, the following question:

Much of the argument behind this bill is that the Public Health Service will be able to staff these hospitals. Is it not a fact that the Public Health Service will rely primarily on the doctors' draft for the doctors that would be recruited to operate, under the Public Health Service, these 60 additional hospitals?

Dr. Foard replied as follows:

To a considerable extent they would, and rightly they should, as long as they were available.

I do not know what kind of trouble will be encountered when the good old American Medical Association learns that the Government is drafting doctors, not to serve the military, but to operate some 60 hospitals for civilians.

Someone might say that these people are Reds. Certainly they are. They are the original red men, but they are extremely good Americans, too.

When the Government begins to draft doctors, and take them away from their medical practice, to treat nonmilitary personnel, there will be trouble in passing a doctors' draft law.

So I do not believe, that all the argument which has been made, that the hospitals can be staffed to give better medical service, will hold water, unless there is the powerful compulsion of the draft to turn the doctors over to the Public Health Service, or to take them from the military and to transfer them to the Public Health Service.

The Indian Health Bureau has been under the direction of the Public Health Service for about 14 years and has been supervised by a public-health officer. Still, the performance of the Indian hospitals has not been improved, because money is required to do that.

If it is believed, as I believe the distinguished supporters of the bill honestly believe, that we in Congress can simply be blind, and that because the hospitals will carry the label of the Pub-

lic Health Service, we can smuggle out a few more dollars for the benefit of Indian health, then let us tell the country so. But I think it would be much more honest for us to do a job for Indian health and not have to conceal funds in an appropriation for the Public Health Service, which are needed for the Indian Health Service.

Mr. WATKINS. Madam President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. For many years there have been some great philanthropists in the Senate. Money has been spent all over the world. Why has not Congress in the past, under the leadership and direction of the Democratic Party, provided funds for the Indian Health Service? In recent times, Republicans have had control of only the 80th Congress. The rest of the time the Democrats were in control. Why did not the Indians get sufficient money?

Mr. MONRONEY. I say to the distinguished chairman that neither the 80th Congress nor the 83d Congress nor any preceding Congress has provided sufficient funds. We are practical men in politics. We know there are not Indians in very many States. That is the reason why money is not provided. I submit that if there were large numbers of Indians in all the 48 States, Congress probably would provide sufficient money to take care of the health of the Indians.

Mr. WATKINS. Does the Senator mean that if there were more Indians, more funds would be provided?

Mr. MONRONEY. If the Indians were more evenly distributed among the 48 States, there would be more funds provided in appropriation bills for the benefit of the medical service for Indians.

Mr. WATKINS. Then we are considering a measure which might help them, because in addition to the Indians, all the white people will be interested in the program, too.

Mr. MONRONEY. In other words, we will simply take the Indians and wrap them up in a great big package labeled "Public Health."

I would hate to think that Congress is unwilling to provide funds specifically for the improvement of Indian health, but that if the Indians are placed under the general label of the Public Health Service, we shall be giving them all the public health services and facilities necessary.

Mr. THYE. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. THYE. I do not believe we should delay action on the bill much longer. I doubt whether the Indians are going to read all this colloquy anyway. It is most important, after all, that the facts be established.

Mr. MONRONEY. We might have the debate translated into Cherokee.

Mr. THYE. If we ever intend to act on the basis of treating the Indian as if he were one of us, God knows—and I say this reverently—the Indian was here before either the Senator or myself or our ancestors, and he should be treated as an American citizen. If we are to treat Indians as American citizens, we shall have to integrate them into our

hospitals, schools, and society in general, exactly as we do other American citizens, instead of classifying them by themselves, and denying them their rights as citizens on the streets, in the cafes, and in other places in the various cities.

I say we had better begin with the medical and health service, and to provide the Indians with the same State health service and health care as is now given to the white people of the States.

If the health situation of the Indian is as deplorable as it is said to be—and it is known to be deplorable—it is not speaking well for what has been done in the past, and we had better take a new step, by enacting the proposed legislation, to try to establish a new method of providing care for Indians.

In my State, I know our Indians to be among the finest men and women in Minnesota. Their hearts for their children are just as big as my heart is for my children. I want the Indians on the Red Lake Reservation, or anywhere else in the State, to begin to live like the other citizens of Minnesota, and I know they will do so once they are given the opportunity.

Mr. MONRONEY. If I understand the point being made by my distinguished colleague, the real purpose of the bill is to transfer most of the health services from Federal jurisdiction and Federal responsibility to the States. I have just listened very carefully to the Senator's statement. He says he does not wish to discriminate against the Indian. But we shall be discriminating against him by depriving him of his hospitals. We shall be turning him over to the State as a charity patient or an indigent patient for medical care.

I do not want that to happen to our Indians. I do not believe the Indians of American deserve to be treated as indigents and to be shoved across to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to the same extent as the penniless people who are given some degree of public health service by the States.

Mr. THYE. The Senator from Oklahoma now is simply drawing on his own imagination to find the words he has just spoken. He has not drawn on what the Senator from Minnesota has said or what the Senator from Minnesota was endeavoring to imply. I merely said that we shall never be able to provide the Indian with the same opportunities as the white people of the Nation have until such time as he has been treated in his respective State and community as the white man is treated. That can never be done so long as the Indian is isolated, as he has been in the past; and the Indian as a citizen will never be able to assume the same status in this land the white man has.

If the bill is enacted, the Indian will come under the Federal Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; and because those 3 divisions are included in 1 agency, he will then come under the influence of the State health officers in the respective States.

The departments of education and health in the respective States act in cooperation with the Federal Government, so the Indian will not be isolated,

as the Senator from Oklahoma has said he would be. He will be integrated in the same health programs as are now being administered by the Federal Government in the various States and communities throughout the Nation. The Indian will not be isolated; he will be integrated in a health system extending from the Federal Government to the State, county, and city governments.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so I may offer an amendment?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield, with the understanding that I do not lose the floor.

Mr. STENNIS. I offer an amendment, send it to the desk, and ask that the clerk read it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PAYNE in the chair). The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Mississippi.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 1, in line 11, after the word "welfare", it is proposed to strike out the period and add the following:

Provided, That hospitals now in operation for a specific tribe or tribes of Indians shall not be closed without the consent of the governing body of the tribe or its organized council.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, my amendment is an attempt to cover the situation discussed a short while ago, when I asked the Senator from Oklahoma to yield.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I am willing to accept the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Mississippi on page 1, line 11.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from Oklahoma for yielding, and the Senator from Utah for accepting the amendment.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, in closing, I say we are being asked to change a pattern which has been in existence for 150 years in our governing of Indian affairs. We are asked to do it in the face of adverse reports, one from the agency which must carry out the provisions of the bill, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The bill was condemned for many reasons by Mrs. Oveta Culp Hobby.

Second, we shall be passing the bill over the strong protest of the Bureau of the Budget.

Third, we shall be passing it over the protest of a large number of Indian tribes, 62 in Oklahoma, a few in New Mexico, and a few scattered Indians in Washington.

Fourth, we shall be passing the bill over the real feeling of the Department of the Interior, which, up until the day of the hearings before the United States Senate committee, had taken just as strong a position against the passage of the bill as have the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Bureau of the Budget.

This is a bad bill. It needs more study. I hope the Senate will vote the bill down.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there are no further amendments to be offered, the question is on the engrossment of

the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

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

The bill was read the third time.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I am about to ask unanimous consent that, without further debate, the Senate proceed to vote on the pending bill at 4 o'clock on Tuesday next, but first I ask unanimous consent that the requirement for a quorum call preceding such a request be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may I ask the reason for the request?

Mr. KNOWLAND. The reason is that if we continue in session this evening and if a quorum should not be available—although I think one may be available—then there would be no alternative but to hold a Saturday session.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, in my experience not only has the Senate held Saturday sessions, but on one occasion the Sergeant at Arms was sent out, and Senator McKellar, of Tennessee, and I, among other Senators, were called here. So I ask the reason for the present proposal.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Well, whatever the Senator from South Carolina wishes to do will be perfectly agreeable.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I only reserved the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from California? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that, without further debate, the Senate proceed to vote at 4 o'clock on Tuesday next on this bill.

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

The unanimous-consent agreement, as subsequently reduced to writing, is as follows:

Ordered, That on Tuesday, June 29, 1954, at 4 o'clock p. m., the Senate proceed to vote on the final passage of the bill (H. R. 303) to transfer the maintenance and operation of hospitals and health facilities for Indians to the Public Health Service, and for other purposes. (June 25, 1954.)

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I wish to ask whether it will be agreeable at this time to order the yeas and nays.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes, Mr. President; I am glad to make that request. I now ask that the yeas and nays be ordered on the question of final passage of the bill.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

EXTENSION WORK AMONG INDIAN TRIBES

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I now move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1604, Senate bill 3385, to provide for more effective extension work among Indian tribes, and members thereof, and for other purposes.

In explanation, I may say that I have been informed that the author of the bill is prepared to accept an amendment which I think will eliminate the controversy over the bill, and therefore will remove the necessity for a quorum call.

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

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 3385) to provide for more effective extension work among Indian tribes and members thereof, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with amendments, on page 2, line 15, after the word "terminated", to strike out "the Secretary of Agriculture shall as rapidly as possible diminish or discontinue"; in line 17, after the word "Indians", to insert "because of their status as Indians"; in line 19, after the word "section", to strike out "and such work shall in no event be continued beyond" and insert "shall cease on or before", and on page 3, line 18, after the word "State.", to insert "The Secretary of Interior is authorized to make lump sum leave payments to any employee separated from the Federal service as a result of this section from any unexpended balances of appropriations for the Bureau of Indian Affairs for the fiscal year 1954."

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I ask that the committee amendments be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the committee amendments will be considered en bloc.

The question now is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I call up my amendment identified as "6-22-54-A," and ask that it be stated. The amendment is offered by me, on behalf of myself, the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], and the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 4, it is proposed to strike out the quotation marks at the end of line 4, and between lines 4 and 5 to insert the following:

(f) This section shall not apply with respect to the Indians of Arizona and New Mexico.

On page 4, in line 6, after the word "work," it is proposed to insert "(except insofar as such appropriations are necessary for carrying out Indian agricultural extension work in the States of Arizona and New Mexico)."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amend-

ment offered by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] for himself and other Senators.

Mr. LAYDEN. Mr. President, in justification of the amendment, at this time I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Consultation Sought—Indians Ask Go-Slow on Farm Proposal," which was printed in the Arizona Republic of May 28, 1954; also a telegram from J. J. Stevens, chairman of the Tribal Council of the San Carlos Indians; also a letter from one of the regents of the University of Arizona, who expressed grave doubts about this matter; and also an excerpt from the United States Code, section 452, which indicates that contracts for education, medical attention, relief, and social welfare of Indians can now be made.

I think these will make a sufficient record, so that it will not be necessary to discuss the matter much longer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

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

[From the Arizona Republic of May 28, 1954]

INDIANS ASK GO-SLOW ON FARM PROPOSAL

Arizona Indians yesterday urged Congress to go slow on legislation transferring their agricultural extension service from the Bureau of Indian Affairs to the Department of Agriculture and the State.

Meeting at Phoenix Indian School, the Inter-Tribal Council of the State of Arizona passed a resolution which asks:

1. That Indians be given more time to study the proposed transfer.
2. That they be consulted before the bills are passed.

Already on record with a stronger resolution against the transfer was the San Carlos Apache Tribal Council. Jess J. Stevens, chairman of the Apache Council, said his tribe definitely opposes the transfer for the following reasons:

1. State extension agents rely on public demonstrations rather than the individual instruction which Indian farmers need.
2. USDA men are neither trained nor interested in Indian affairs.
3. Some State extension agents are distrustful of Indians.
4. There would be a language barrier between State extension agents and Indians.
5. Indians lack the volunteer leaders on which some phases of State extension work depend.
6. Farm credit and technical assistance for Indian farmers should remain together in the Bureau of Indian Affairs.
7. Time is needed to determine whether the State is in a position to take over from the Bureau.
8. The Republican Party "promised the Indian people that the Government would act in their behalf only with their consent. * * *

SAN CARLOS, ARIZ., May 25, 1954.

HON. CARL HAYDEN,
United States Senate:

The tribe still goes on record as opposing legislative bill S. 3385, H. R. 8982. San Carlos Apache tribal council, San Carlos, Ariz., goes on record before Subcommittee on Indian Affairs of Senate and Subcommittee on Interior and Insular Affairs. The tribal council strongly opposes such move. Take a stand in behalf of San Carlos tribal council, San Carlos, Ariz.

JESS J. STEVENS,
Chairman, Tribal Council.

UNIVERSITY AND STATE COLLEGES
OF ARIZONA BOARD OF REGENTS,
June 2, 1954.

HON. CARL HAYDEN,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CARL: My attention has been called to S. 3385 and H. R. 8982. These companion bills would transfer the administration of agricultural extension work among Indians from the Department of the Interior to the Department of Agriculture. The Board of Regents has not considered this as a board and I am writing you entirely from a personal standpoint.

While I am in accord with the theory of transferring as many functions of the Indian Department as possible to the States in which the Indians are located, nonetheless it seems to me that there are several pitfalls that we must try to avoid. From my own experience in our State legislature, it always seemed to me that when it came to Indians, the Federal Government was more than anxious to place an undue burden on the State of Arizona. I am thinking of the welfare situation, as one example of what the Federal Government endeavored to do to Arizona.

If the above-mentioned bill is passed, it seems to me that it should be clearly understood that adequate funds should be forthcoming from the Government in order that this will not be an additional burden on the university's legislative budget. Also, it would seem obvious that the question of jurisdiction and authority should be very clear-cut, or the university would find itself in a chaotic condition.

As you well realize, Arizona will be much more greatly affected than any other State in the Union and I do hope that if this bill is passed in its present form that you will give it a great deal of consideration from Arizona's standpoint.

Thanking you, and with kindest regards,
Very truly yours,

JOHN G. BABBITT.

CONTRACTS FOR EDUCATION, MEDICAL ATTENTION, RELIEF, AND SOCIAL WELFARE OF INDIANS (25 U. S. C. 452)

The Secretary of the Interior is authorized, in his discretion, to enter into a contract or contracts with any State or Territory, or political subdivision thereof, or with any State university, college, or school, or with any appropriate State or private corporation, agency, or institution, for the education, medical attention, agricultural assistance, and social welfare, including relief of distress, of Indians in such State or Territory, through the agencies of the State or Territory or of the corporations and organizations hereinbefore named, and to expend under such contract or contracts moneys appropriated by Congress for the education, medical attention, agricultural assistance, and social welfare, including relief of distress, of Indians in such State or Territory. (Apr. 16, 1934, ch. 147, sec. 1, 48 Stat. 596; June 4, 1936, ch. 490, 49 Stat. 1458.)

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield to me?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. Is the Senator from Arizona certain that the conference committee will retain his amendment? I favor the amendment.

Mr. HAYDEN. We do not have to go to conference on the amendment, for the bill will go to the House of Representatives, and the House may approve the amendment.

Mr. MAYBANK. I understand. Is the Senator from Arizona satisfied that the House of Representatives will approve the amendment?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes; I think the Members from Arizona and New Mexico will favor it.

Mr. MAYBANK. Is the Senator from Arizona sure of that?

Mr. HAYDEN. I can assure the Senator from South Carolina that there will be great difficulty about the bill's becoming law without the amendment included in it.

Mr. MAYBANK. If the Senator from Arizona assures me of that, I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] for himself and other Senators.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, under ordinary circumstances I am opposed to excluding any particular State from a measure which should apply to the entire Nation. However, since the Senators from New Mexico and Arizona insist that their people do not want this provision, although I think it will deprive the Indians of the two States of great benefits that otherwise would go to them, by means of this measure, I accept the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] for himself and other Senators.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted at this point in the RECORD a brief explanation of the bill.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WATKINS ON TRANSFER OF INDIAN EXTENSION SERVICE TO DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE (S. 3385)

This bill has for its purpose the transfer of the Indian extension service now administered under the Department of the Interior to the Department of Agriculture. The bill was reported by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with the amendments felt necessary to more effectively accomplish its purposes and I ask that the committee amendments be adopted en bloc.

This bill, if enacted, will be one further step in carrying out the declared policy of Congress as set forth in House Concurrent Resolution 108 which was passed last session. It will not terminate the Federal services provided for Indians, but rather will transfer the responsibility for administering and performing that service to a Department of Government set up to furnish better extension service and a more complete extension service to the Indian peoples. This legislation is the culmination of many years of study and negotiation between Congress, the Department of the Interior and the Department of Agriculture.

Recently the proposal of transferring these services was taken to the respective State directors of the extension service in those States having Indian reservations and I'm happy to report that as a result of those meetings in which I was honored to participate the proposal received almost unanimous acceptance. The proposal has the endorsement and approval of the Department of Agriculture, Department of the Interior, and the Bureau of the Budget and as the report points out there is a general understanding between the Departments of Interior and Agriculture that no insurmountable problems will be faced by transferring the Indian

extension service over to the Department of Agriculture.

As a matter of fact, several States have for the past few years been cooperating formally on a contract basis with the Bureau of Indian Affairs to provide extension agents to work with specific Indian groups and these trial examples or experiences have been satisfactory.

At the present time the Indian Bureau Extension Service consists of approximately 160 employees to provide the necessary extension service to all of our agricultural Indians. By this transfer the full facilities of the Department of Agriculture Extension Division plus the services available from land-grant colleges and universities throughout the Nation will be at the disposal of these Indian groups. This alone would stand to better the service performed for Indians in the field of extension work.

Also most desirable among the benefits conferred by this bill would be the experience of working the Indian boys and girls into the 4-H Clubs of America with the non-Indian children. That integration will confer immeasurable benefit in educating and preparing the Indian youths for ultimate liberation from all Federal supervision.

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 and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 3385) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of May 8, 1914 (38 Stat. 372), as amended by the act of June 26, 1953 (67 Stat. 83), is hereby further amended by adding thereto the following:

"SEC. 9. (a) In order to carry on cooperative agricultural extension work among Indian tribes and members thereof who now receive agricultural extension services through the Bureau of Indian Affairs of the Department of the Interior, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to enter into cooperative agreements with the State agricultural colleges receiving the benefits of this act, which shall provide for a cooperative agricultural extension program adapted to the special needs of the Indians. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to transfer to such colleges from funds appropriated pursuant to this section such sums as he determines are needed to carry out the provisions of the agreements. Such transfers of funds shall be in addition to and not in substitution for any other funds provided pursuant to section 3 of this act.

"(b) In the event that the Secretary of the Interior or other authorized official shall publish in the Federal Register notice that the Federal trust relationship to the property and the affairs of an Indian tribe, band, group, or community, and the members thereof has been terminated, cooperative extension work among such Indians, because of their status as Indians pursuant to this section, shall cease on or before the close of the fiscal year following the fiscal year in which such notice is published in the Federal Register. After discontinuance of cooperative work under this section, such Indians shall participate with other citizens of the State in the cooperative agriculture extension program conducted by the college pursuant to other provisions of this act.

"(c) There shall be transferred from the Secretary of the Interior to the Secretary of Agriculture so much of the property, personnel, and unexpended balances of funds held, used, employed, available, or to be made available for Indian agricultural extension work as the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior may agree will be needed by the Department of Agriculture

in connection with the program authorized by this section. The Secretary of the Interior shall certify to the Secretary of Agriculture the names of such other personnel as are available for employment by the State colleges in connection with the program authorized by this section. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to transfer to any State concerned such records and property as he determines may be needed by such State in connection with the cooperative work undertaken by such State. The Secretary of Interior is authorized to make lump sum leave payments to any employee separated from the Federal service as a result of this section from any unexpended balances of appropriations for the Bureau of Indian Affairs for the fiscal year 1954.

"(d) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as the Congress determines from time to time may be required for carrying out of the purposes of this section, including necessary administrative expenses.

"(e) The term 'State' as used in this section includes the Territory of Alaska.

"(f) This section shall not apply with respect to the Indians of Arizona and New Mexico."

SEC. 2. All authorizations for appropriations to the Secretary of the Interior for Indian agricultural extension work (except insofar as such appropriations are necessary for carrying out the Indian agricultural extension work in the States of Arizona and New Mexico) are repealed effective after the transfer of property, personnel, and funds authorized by section 1 of this act.

REVISION OF INTERNAL REVENUE LAWS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I now move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar 1635, House bill 8300, to revise the internal revenue laws of the United States. This is the tax bill. Let me state that it is not proposed that the bill be debated or explained this evening; it is merely desired to have the bill made the unfinished business.

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

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 8300) to revise the internal revenue laws of the United States, which had been reported from the Committee on Finance with amendments.

RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, unless Senators wish to make insertions in the RECORD, I am about to move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon, on Monday next.

Mr. President, if at this time there are no requests for the insertion of matters in the RECORD, I now move that the Senate stand in recess until Monday next, at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 8 o'clock and 18 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, June 28, 1954, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 25 (legislative day of June 22), 1954:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Waldemar J. Gallman, of New York, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, now Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Union of South Africa, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Iraq.

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

Robert Thompson Secrest, of Ohio, to be a Federal Trade Commissioner for the term of 7 years from September 26, 1954, vice Albert A. Carretta, term expiring.

SENATE

MONDAY, JUNE 28, 1954

(Legislative day of Tuesday, June 22, 1954)

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

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

Our Father God, who hast brought us in safety to the beginning of another week, with grateful hearts we pause in Thy presence to invoke Thy blessing and guidance in all the tangled problems which press for solution, in the homeland and in our relationships to the whole world of which our Nation is so vital a part. Save us from the paralysis of fears which are unworthy of our heritage, for we are surrounded by a cloud of witnesses out of heroic yesterdays. May we dread nothing but the loss of Thee and the compromising of principles the vindication of which is dearer to us than life itself. Whatever the risk or cost, save us in these crucial days from any specious doctrine of safety first. In all the deliberations in this sanctuary of a nation's weal, be near us to direct, within us to refresh, around us to protect, above us to bless, and beneath us to uphold in Thine everlasting arms. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. KNOWLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, June 25, 1954, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its clerks, announced that the Speaker had

signed the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 119. An act to provide for the construction of the Markham Ferry project on the Grand River in Oklahoma by the Grand River Dam Authority, an instrumentality of the State of Oklahoma;

S. 2217. An act to amend section 67 of the National Defense Act, as amended, to provide for an active-duty status for all United States property and fiscal officers;

H. R. 2231. An act to authorize the negotiation and ratification of separate settlement contracts with the Sioux Indians of the Lower Brulé and the Crow Creek Reservations in South Dakota for Indian lands and rights acquired by the United States for the Fort Randall Dam and Reservoir, Missouri River Development, to authorize a transfer of funds from the Secretary of Defense to the Secretary of the Interior and to authorize an appropriation for the removal from the taking area of the Fort Randall Dam and Reservation, Missouri River development, and the reestablishment of the Indians of the Yankton Indian Reservation in South Dakota;

H. R. 3038. An act for the relief of Mrs. Olympia Cug; and

H. R. 8873. An act making appropriations for the Department of Defense and related independent agency for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes.

SENATOR FROM WYOMING

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, there is to come before the Senate this morning the privileged matter of presenting the credentials of a United States Senator.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, I present the certificate of appointment of Hon. EDWARD D. CRIPPA, Senator-designate from Wyoming, and ask that it be read.

The certificate of appointment was read, and ordered to be placed on file, as follows:

STATE OF WYOMING,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
Cheyenne.

TO the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that pursuant to the power vested in me by the Constitution of the United States and the laws of the State of Wyoming, I, C. J. "Doc" Rogers, the Governor of said State, do hereby appoint EDWARD D. CRIPPA a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States until the vacancy therein, caused by the death of Lester C. Hunt, is filled by election, as provided by law.

Witness: His Excellency, our Governor, C. J. "Doc" Rogers, and our seal hereto affixed at Cheyenne, this 24th day of June, in the year of our Lord 1954.

By the Governor:

C. J. "DOC" ROGERS,
Acting Governor.

[SEAL]

C. J. "DOC" ROGERS,
Secretary of State.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If the Senator-designate will present himself at the desk the oath of office will be administered to him.

Mr. CRIPPA, escorted by Mr. BARRETT, advanced to the Vice President's desk, and the oath of office prescribed by law was administered to him by the Vice President.