

to the House of Representatives full and complete information about the effect on the weather of certain atomic bomb explosions; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. Res. 281. Resolution directing the Secretary of the Navy to furnish to the House of Representatives full and complete information about the effect on the weather of certain atomic bomb explosions; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. Res. 282. Resolution directing the Secretary of the Air Force to furnish to the House of Representatives full and complete information about the effect on the weather of certain atomic bomb explosions; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. Res. 283. Resolution directing the Secretary of Commerce to furnish to the House of Representatives full and complete information about the effect on the weather of certain atomic bomb explosions; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. RABAUT: Resolution of the Senate of the State of Michigan requesting the Federal Government to give consideration to the Hearst plan for better roads; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Connecticut, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States concerning the McCarran Act and seeking its revision; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOLAND:

H. R. 5709. A bill for the relief of Astor Cole; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURDICK:

H. Res. 284. Resolution providing for sending to the United States Court of Claims the bill (H. R. 5683) for the relief of Willard L. Gleeson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

322. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Robert Hunt and others, Daytona Beach, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2446 and H. R. 2447, social-security legislation known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

323. Also, petition of Mrs. Arthur Pond and others, St. Petersburg, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2446 and H. R. 2447, social-security legislation known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

324. Also, petition of Independent Order Sons of Italy, Grand Lodge of Ohio, Youngstown, Ohio, relative to the McCarran-Walter Immigration and Naturalization Act, and requesting that it be abolished; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

325. Also, petition of Chinese Embassy, Washington, D. C., relative to transmitting a statement of the Legislative Yuan of the Republic of China relating to the Korean truce talks and requesting that the United Nations not grant the Chinese Communist aggressors the right to participate in the negotiations on the settlement of the Korean problem; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE

MONDAY, JUNE 15, 1953

(*Legislative day of Monday, June 8, 1953*)

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

Rev. Levinus K. Painter, minister of Collins Friends Meeting, Collins, N. Y., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, we acknowledge Thee as Lord and Creator. Enable us to see Thy unfolding purposes in our daily experiences.

Grant discernment that arises out of integrity of character.

The measured judgment born of mental maturity.

The prophetic insights arising out of spiritual awareness.

May the responsibility of office be borne with humility.

Renew within a sense of mission before God and our fellow men in fulfilling political responsibilities.

Counsel us in this privileged Nation as we seek to remove barriers between cultures, religions, and political philosophies. We would reaffirm the oneness of mankind before Thee.

"Take from our souls the strain and stress.

And let our ordered lives confess The beauty of Thy peace."

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. KNOWLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, June 11, 1953, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF JOINT RESOLUTION

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 13, 1953, the President had approved and signed the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 76) designating the week beginning June 14, 1953, as "Theodore Roosevelt Week."

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 639. An act to provide for the abandonment of a certain part of the Federal project for the Broadkill River in Delaware; and

S. 1679. An act to repeal certain acts relating to cooperative agricultural extension work and to amend the Smith-Lever Act of May 8, 1914, to provide for cooperative agricultural extension work between the agricultural colleges in the several States, Territories, and possessions receiving the benefits of an act of Congress approved July 2, 1862, and of acts supplementary thereto, and the United States Department of Agriculture.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4730) to

provide for the conveyance by the United States to the city of Cincinnati, Ohio, of certain lands formerly owned by that city.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 5174) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the Vice President.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES SUBMITTED DURING RECESS

Under authority of the order of the Senate of June 11, 1953,

Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported on June 13, 1953, an original bill (S. 2128) to further amend the Mutual Security Act of 1951, as amended, and for other purposes, and submitted a report (No. 403) thereon, which was placed on the calendar.

Under authority of the order of the Senate of June 11, 1953,

Mr. AIKEN, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to which was referred the bill (S. 2112) to provide for the transfer of price-support wheat to Pakistan, reported it on June 13, 1953, with amendments, and submitted a report (No. 404) thereon.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, Mr. KERR and Mr. SYMINGTON were excused from attending the session of the Senate today; Mr. HILL was excused from attending the sessions of the Senate from today until Wednesday, June 17; and Mr. HUNT was excused from attending the sessions of the Senate this week.

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. FULBRIGHT was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate, beginning Wednesday, June 17, 1953, through Monday, July 20, 1953.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. KNOWLAND, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Reclamation of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs was authorized to sit during the session of the Senate today.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, it is my intention, as acting majority leader, to suggest the absence of a quorum. I ask unanimous consent that immediately following the quorum call there may be the customary morning hour, for the purpose of allowing Senators to introduce bills and joint resolutions, to make insertions in the RECORD, and transact other routine business, under the usual limitation of 2 minutes.

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

CALL OF THE ROLL

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Goldwater	McCarran
Anderson	Gore	McCarthy
Barrett	Green	McClellan
Beall	Griswold	Millikin
Bennett	Hayden	Monroney
Bricker	Hendrickson	Mundt
Bridges	Hennings	Neely
Bush	Hickenlooper	Pastore
Butler, Md.	Hoey	Payne
Butler, Nebr.	Holland	Potter
Byrd	Humphrey	Purtell
Capehart	Jackson	Robertson
Carlson	Jenner	Russell
Chavez	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Clements	Johnson, Tex.	Smathers
Cooper	Johnston, S. C.	Smith, Maine
Cordon	Kefauver	Smith, N. J.
Daniel	Kennedy	Smith, N. C.
Douglas	Kilgore	Sparkman
Duff	Knowland	Stennis
Dworschak	Kuchel	Thye
Eastland	Langer	Watkins
Ellender	Lehman	Welker
Ferguson	Long	Wiley
Frear	Malone	Williams
Fulbright	Mansfield	Young
George	Martin	
Gillette	Maybank	

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official committee business.

The Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] is absent by leave of the Senate, having been appointed a delegate to attend the International Labor Organization Conference at Geneva, Switzerland.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] is necessarily absent.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is absent by leave of the Senate on official committee business.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent by leave of the Senate, having been appointed a delegate to attend the International Labor Organization Conference at Geneva, Switzerland.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1953—REFERENCE OF BILL TO ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, with further reference to a discussion I had with the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], I ask unanimous consent that the bill (S. 2128) to further amend the Mutual Security Act of 1951, and for other purposes, reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations on Saturday, June 13, be referred to the Committee on Armed Services in order that an examination may be made

of the arms features of the bill; that the first and second reading of the bill be deemed to have been had, so that my request may be in order.

I wish to assure the Senate that the Committee on Armed Services will give the bill prompt consideration, and that no undue delay will be occasioned by this action, which is in accord with the understanding with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY].

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I wish to say that I think this is not only in keeping with the prior understandings but also with the precedents of a year ago in connection with the mutual security legislation.

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

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

PROPOSED TRANSFER OF EX-GERMAN SUBMARINE TO CITY OF CHICAGO, ILL.

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, reporting, pursuant to law, that the city of Chicago, Ill., had requested the Navy Department to transfer the ex-German submarine *U-505*, to be established and maintained as a memorial, in that city; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF COOPERATION WITH MEXICO IN CONTROL AND ERADICATION OF FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on cooperation of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease, for the month of April, 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

TRANSFER OF CERTAIN LAND TO STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to convey to the State of North Carolina a tract of approximately 134 acres, together with buildings and improvements thereon, which the Bureau of Plant Industry, Soils, and Agricultural Engineering has been using as a cotton field station (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON CANCELLATION OF CERTAIN CHARGES AGAINST INDIVIDUAL INDIANS AND TRIBES OF INDIANS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of his order cancelling certain charges existing as debts due the United States by individual Indians and tribes of Indians (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON CREATION OF OBLIGATION IN EXCESS OF APPROPRIATIONS

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce reporting pursuant to law of the creation of an obligation in excess of appropriations, in the National Bureau of Standards; to the Committee on Appropriations.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS—WITHDRAWAL OF NAMES

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department

of Justice, withdrawing the names of sundry aliens from reports relating to aliens whose deportation had been suspended, heretofore transmitted to the Senate (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXPENSES OF CERTAIN UNITED STATES COMMISSIONERS

A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, Washington, D. C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide that United States commissioners who are required to devote full time to the duties of the office may be allowed their necessary office expenses (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"Senate Joint Resolution 45

"Joint resolution relative to memorializing the Secretary of Defense of the United States and other officials and agencies authorized to act in the matter in relation to the enlistment in and strength of the California National Guard and California Air National Guard and the national manpower pool

"Whereas the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower and Personnel has submitted a recommendation to the Secretary of Defense that the several States be denied the right to enlist in the National Guard young men before attaining the age of 18 years and 6 months and thereby secure for them a classification of 1D and deferment from selective service; and

"Whereas said recommendation is based upon the assumption, not supported in fact, that veterans returning to civilian status and who possess a Reserve obligation to serve in a civilian component of the Armed Forces, will provide an adequate manpower pool for the National Guard; and

"Whereas the governor has declared by proclamation that the California National Guard and California Air National Guard cannot be maintained at the necessary strength unless the said deferment from selective service is extended to the said young men and that the returning veterans will not provide an adequate manpower pool for the National Guard; and

"Whereas the approval of said recommendations will remove the last source of manpower available for recruitment in the National Guard and will thereby permanently jeopardize and injure the National Guard which has been an accepted democratic institution for over 300 years: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly). That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the Secretary of Defense of the United States to disapprove the recommendation of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower and Personnel that the several States be denied the right to enlist in the National Guard young men before attaining the age of 18 years and 6 months and thereby secure for them a classification of 1D and deferment from selective service; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Legislature of the State of California further respectfully memorializes the Secretary of Defense and all other officials and agencies possessing authority to act in the premises to continue the present indispensable authority granted to the several States to by proclamation of the governor recruit young men before at-

taining the age of 18 years and 6 months for enlistment in the National Guard and to reserve for them a classification of 1D and appropriate deferment from selective service; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of the senate is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States, to the Secretary of Defense and the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower and Personnel."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin; to the Committee on Finance:

"Joint resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation providing for the withdrawal of the Federal Government from the field of gasoline taxes

"Whereas the Federal gasoline tax is levied upon the users of American highways; and

"Whereas the highway system of this country and the highway systems of the several States are rapidly deteriorating because the funds needed to develop and maintain a modern highway network are not available; and

"Whereas the Federal Government is now distributing to the States only about two-thirds of the revenue which it is deriving from the Federal gasoline tax and is diverting the remainder to its other purposes; and

"Whereas if the Federal Government would withdraw from the field of gasoline taxes and the several States would increase the taxes imposed by them on gasoline and motor vehicle fuels in an amount equal to the Federal tax on gasoline, a much larger amount of revenue would be available to the several States for the purpose of developing and maintaining a modern system of highways therein; and

"Whereas the 11th general assembly of the States which was held in Chicago, Ill., in the month of December 1952, at which practically all of the States of the United States were represented, went on record as favoring the withdrawal of the Federal Government from the gasoline tax field; and

"Whereas the National Conference of Governors and the Midwestern Regional Conference of the Council of State Governments, of which the State of Wisconsin is a member, have declared by appropriate resolutions that the Federal Government should withdraw from the gasoline tax field: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the assembly (the senate concurring), That the legislature respectfully urge and request the Congress of the United States to enact legislation which will provide for the withdrawal of the Federal Government from the field of gasoline taxes; and, be it further

Resolved, That the chief clerk be directed to transmit a copy of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, the Secretary of the United States Senate, the Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives and each member of the Wisconsin delegation in the United States House of Representatives and the United States Senate, and to the respective houses of the legislatures of the several States of the United States. Copies submitted to the Secretary of the United States Senate and Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives shall be sent by registered mail, return receipt enclosed, and the receipt shall be filed in the office of the secretary of state."

A resolution adopted by the Oklahoma Cattlemen's Association, relating to the purchase and distribution of certain beef by

the Federal Government; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A resolution adopted by the Baltimore (Md.) Association of Commerce, favoring an amendment to the Constitution relating to the treaty-making power; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by National Sojourners, Inc., at Los Angeles, Calif., protesting against the enactment of Senate bill 1917, to authorize the issuance of 240,000 special-quota immigrant visas to certain escapees, German expellees, and nationals of Italy, Greece, and the Netherlands; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the International Union, United Automobile, Aircraft and Agricultural Implement Workers of America (CIO), at Atlantic City, N. J., relating to farm prices; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A resolution adopted by the International Union, United Automobile, Aircraft and Agricultural Implement Workers of America (CIO), at Atlantic City, N. J., relating to housing and rent control; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Four resolutions adopted by the International Union, United Automobile, Aircraft and Agricultural Implement Workers of America (CIO), at Atlantic City, N. J., relating to taxes, social security, veterans, and pension security for workers; to the Committee on Finance.

Two resolutions adopted by the International Union, United Automobile, Aircraft and Agricultural Implement Workers of America (CIO), at Atlantic City, N. J., relating to international relations, and St. Lawrence seaway and power project; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the International Union, United Automobile, Aircraft and Agricultural Implement Workers of America (CIO), at Atlantic City, N. J., relating to plunder of the public domain; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Five resolutions adopted by the International Union, United Automobile, Aircraft and Agricultural Implement Workers of America (CIO), at Atlantic City, N. J., relating to civil rights and equal job opportunity, civil liberties, political action, the heroic people of Berlin, and women in industry; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Twelve resolutions adopted by the International Union, United Automobile, Aircraft and Agricultural Implement Workers of America (CIO), at Atlantic City, N. J., relating to a study of new technological developments in the industries, full employment, workmen's compensation and industrial health and safety, free world labor fund, guaranteed annual wage, the UAW-CIO model antidiscrimination clause, labor unity, children and youth, health security through collective bargaining, the Taft-Hartley Act, education, and legislation, Federal, State, and local; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. BUSH:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Connecticut; to the Committee on Finance:

"House Joint Resolution 14

"Joint resolution urging repeal of Federal tax on motor fuel

Resolved by this assembly:

"Whereas there is definite need for prompt and extensive correction of the critical deficiencies of our streets and highways in the interest both of our economy and our national security; and

"Whereas highways of the country, including the streets and bridges, are, by tradition and by law, the property and responsibility of the States and the subdivisions thereof; and

"Whereas many of the States are in need of additional revenue for the construction and maintenance of their highways, but are experiencing extreme difficulty in their ef-

orts to obtain additional revenues for highway purposes because of the magnitude of the existing overall tax burden now imposed upon the motor-using public; and

"Whereas the Federal Government imposed its automotive excise taxes as temporary emergency measures during the depression of the early 1930's, but has continued these taxes in effect ever since at increasing rates; and

"Whereas taxation of motor fuel traditionally has been relied upon by the States to produce a major part of the revenues necessary to construct and maintain their highways, and the Federal Government, by its continued intrusion in this field, has so increased the tax burden on the highway user as virtually to preclude further increases in such taxes by the States: Therefore be it

Resolved by this assembly, That the Legislature of Connecticut urgently requests that the Federal Government retire immediately from the field of motor-fuel taxation; be it further

Resolved, That the Governor of Connecticut is urged to request the Connecticut Senators and Representatives in the National Congress at the appropriate time to appear before the appropriate committees of Congress for the purpose of urging that the Federal tax on motor fuel be eliminated; be it further

Resolved, That the clerks of the house and senate shall cause copies of this resolution to be sent to the Connecticut Senators and Representatives in Congress and to the legislatures of the other States."

RETENTION OF OFFICES OF WAGE AND HOUR DIVISION, DEPARTMENT OF LABOR, IN BOSTON AND SPRINGFIELD, MASS. — RESOLUTIONS OF GENERAL COURT OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague, the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, memorializing Congress to retain the New England regional office of the Wage and Hour Division of the United States Department of Labor in the city of Boston, and the branch office of said Division in the city of Springfield, Mass.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolutions memorializing Congress to retain the New England regional office of the Wage and Hour Division of the United States Department of Labor in the city of Boston, and the branch office of said Division in the city of Springfield

Whereas it has been proposed in the interests of economy that the appropriation for the New England office of the Wage and Hour Division of the United States Department of Labor be reduced 15 percent, and that the New England offices of said Division be reorganized; and

Whereas the proposed reorganization provides for the transfer of the work now being done by the New England regional office, located in the city of Boston, to the city of New York, and the abolition of a branch office of said Division, located in the city of Springfield; and

Whereas since 1951 the said regional office in said city of Boston has recovered, in cases where wages paid to employees were less than the minimum required under the

Fair Labor Standards Act, wages amounting to \$944,545.66 and involving 15,440 employees; and

Whereas the proposed reorganization will greatly reduce the effectiveness of enforcing the minimum wage provisions of the Federal law in the New England area, and will result in hardship to employees and to conscientious employers within the Commonwealth: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Senate of Massachusetts respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to take such action as may be necessary to keep the New England regional office of the Wage and Hour Division of the United States Department of Labor in the city of Boston, and a branch office of said Division in the city of Springfield; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, the Secretary of Labor, to the Presiding Officer of each branch of the Congress, and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth.

FLUORIDATION OF COMMUNITY WATER SUPPLY—RESOLUTION OF HOUSE OF DELEGATES OF MASSACHUSETTS DENTAL SOCIETY, BOSTON, MASS.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the house of delegates of the Massachusetts Dental Society, on the subject of fluoridation of community water supply.

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

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE HOUSE OF DELEGATES OF THE MASSACHUSETTS DENTAL SOCIETY IN ANNUAL SESSION, MAY 5, 1953, RE FLUORIDATION OF COMMUNITY WATER SUPPLIES

Whereas the fluoridation of community water supplies has been demonstrated to reduce the incidence of dental decay among children by approximately two-thirds; and

Whereas the complete safety of fluoridation has been repeatedly demonstrated in extensive scientific research; and

Whereas fluoridation has been recommended and endorsed by all major national health organizations of the United States, including the American Dental Association, the American Medical Association, the National Research Council, the Association of State and Territorial Health Officers, and many others; and

Whereas certain individuals and groups whose motives are most difficult to understand have been attempting to delay and forestall the fluoridation of community water supplies through the spread of rumors and erroneous and misleading information: Be it therefore

Resolved, That the Massachusetts Dental Society, in session here today, hereby reaffirms its endorsement and approval of fluoridation of community water supplies and urges that fluoridation be adopted in all communities in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts as rapidly as local conditions will permit; and be it further

Resolved, That the Massachusetts Dental Society hereby go on record commanding the excellent efforts of the local, State, and Federal departments of health for their enlightened efforts to make the benefits of fluoridation available to all children in all communities of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Honorable Christian A.

Herter, Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to Dr. Samuel B. Kirkwood, Commissioner of the Department of Public Health, Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to each Senator and Representative from Massachusetts serving in the Congress of the United States; to the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States; to the Honorable Oveta Culp Hobby, Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare of the United States, and Dr. Leonard A. Scheele, Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service.

At Boston, Mass., this 5th day of May A. D. 1953.

IVOR P. MUZZEY, D. M. D.,
President, Massachusetts Dental Society.

HAROLD E. TINGLEY, D. M. D.,
Secretary, Massachusetts Dental Society.

MCCARRAN-WALTER IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT—RESOLUTION OF PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL DIOCESE OF MASSACHUSETTS, BOSTON, MASS.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Protestant Episcopal diocese of Massachusetts, Boston, Mass., dealing with the McCarran-Walter Immigration and Nationality Act.

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

THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL DIOCESE OF MASSACHUSETTS,
Boston, May 18, 1953.
The Honorable JOHN F. KENNEDY,
The United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR KENNEDY: At the 168th annual convention of the Protestant Episcopal diocese of Massachusetts, held in Boston on May 6, 1953, the following resolution was passed, and I am pleased to transmit a copy to you:

Be it resolved, That this convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the diocese of Massachusetts strongly endorses President Eisenhower's proposal that the injustices contained in the McCarran-Walter Immigration and Nationality Act be remedied, thereby reaffirming the position of the National Council of Churches of Christ in the United States of America and the Massachusetts Council of Churches, which called specifically for (1) a much more flexible quota system, (2) complete removal of all discriminatory provisions, (3) a system of fair hearings and appeals respecting issuance of visas and deportation proceedings, and (4) passage of emergency legislation to enable additional displaced persons and refugees to enter the United States; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Senators and Representatives in Congress from Massachusetts.

Faithfully yours,
PHILIP H. STAFFORD,
Secretary.

SUPPORT FOR UNITED NATIONS—RESOLUTION OF PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL DIOCESE OF MASSACHUSETTS, BOSTON, MASS.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Protestant Episcopal diocese of Massa-

chussets urging support of the United Nations.

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

THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL DIOCESE OF MASSACHUSETTS,
Boston, May 12, 1953.
The Honorable JOHN F. KENNEDY,
The United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR KENNEDY: At the 168th annual convention of the Protestant Episcopal diocese of Massachusetts, held in Boston on May 6, 1953, the following resolution was passed unanimously, and I am pleased to transmit a copy to you:

Whereas some of our fellow citizens are urging the United States to withdraw from the United Nations Organization: Be it

Resolved, That this convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the diocese of Massachusetts reaffirms its firm belief in the importance of the Government of the United States continuing to give its support to the United Nations Organization and to do everything in its power to make it stronger and more effective; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Secretary of State and the Senators and congressional Representatives from Massachusetts."

Faithfully yours,

PHILIP H. STAFFORD,
Secretary.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY—RESOLUTION OF MINNESOTA RAILROAD AND WAREHOUSE COMMISSION, ST. PAUL, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the Minnesota Railroad and Warehouse Commission, in St. Paul, Minn., on June 8, 1953, relating to appropriations for the Tennessee Valley Authority.

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

Whereas the Minnesota Railroad and Warehouse Commission has been advised by the Railroad and Public Utilities Commission of the State of Tennessee, that the Federal Budget Director has recommended a reduction of some \$63 million in the \$190,822,000 appropriation requested by the TVA for its 1954 appropriation, our commission wishes to join with the Railroad and Public Utilities Commission of Tennessee in urging that this curtailment in appropriations should not be concurred in by the Congress of the United States; and

Whereas it is a matter of record that this type of electric power was not available for the public throughout the rural area in the State of Tennessee and adjoining communities prior to the time the TVA authority was established; and

Whereas private power neglected for generations to provide this needed electric power; and

Whereas projects of this type have been financially sound and self-liquidating, it is our conviction that the matter of curtailing this appropriation is not in accord with the best interests of the general public and is not being considered on its merits but that it is rather a matter of a contest between private power and public power.

Therefore we desire to go on record, in accordance with the request of the Railroad and Public Utilities Commission of the State of Tennessee, urging that the appropriation

for the TVA for the fiscal year 1954 should not be curtailed.

Adopted in St. Paul, Minn., this 8th day of June 1953.

MINNESOTA RAILROAD AND WAREHOUSE COMMISSION,
PAUL A. RASMUSSEN, *Chairman*,
CLIFFORD C. PETERSON.

Commissioner Ewald W. Lund dissenting.

REPEAL OF FEDERAL ADMISSION TAX—RESOLUTIONS OF NORTH CENTRAL ALLIED INDEPENDENT THEATER OWNERS, INC., MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that two resolutions adopted at a recent convention of the North Central Allied Independent Theater Owners, Inc., held in Minneapolis, Minn., relating to the repeal of the 20 percent Federal admission tax be printed in the RECORD.

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

Whereas all Senators and Representatives from North and South Dakota, both Senators from Minnesota, and 7 of its 9 Congressmen have pledged themselves to fight and vote for repeal of the obnoxious and discriminatory 20 percent Federal admission tax and,

Whereas all Senators and Representatives in the Congress of the United States in this territory have shown full understanding of and great sympathy with the plight of the independent theater owners: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the North Central Allied Independent Theater Owners, Inc., and their guests from the ranks of distribution, in convention assembled in the city of Minneapolis this 5th day of May 1953. That the proper officers are hereby authorized and instructed to extend to these cooperating and understanding Senators and Representatives, the sincere thanks of the motion picture industry in this territory and call upon them to continue their good work until the fight is won, and that our particular gratitude be extended to JOHN BLATNIK, Eighth Minnesota District, HAROLD HAGEN, Ninth Minnesota District, ROY WIER, Third Minnesota District, and to any other Members of Congress who may have done likewise, for their sacrifice of time and showing of interest in making personal appearances in our behalf before the House Ways and Means Committee.

Whereas Minnesota Senator, EDWARD J. THYE, is Chairman of the United States Senate Small Business Committee, and Minnesota Senator, HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, is a member of that committee; and

Whereas both of these outstanding lawmakers have long taken a personal interest in the problems of the independent motion picture theater owners: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the North Central Allied Independent Theaters Owners, Inc., in convention assembled in the city of Minneapolis this 5th day of May 1953. That the President and Executive Counsel are hereby authorized and instructed to address Senators THYE and HUMPHREY, urging them to take personal interest in the work of the committee in connection with the problems of independent motion picture exhibitors and to do all in their power, by way of recommendation of suitable legislation or otherwise, to relieve the exhibitors of the onerous, oppressive and unlawful practices featured in the testimony before the committee.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. CARLSON, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

S. 1684. A bill to facilitate civil-service appointment of persons who lost opportunity therefor because of service in the Armed Forces after June 30, 1950, and to provide certain benefits upon appointment; with amendments (Rept. No. 405).

By Mr. BUTLER of Maryland, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 1237. A bill to amend the act of January 12, 1951, as amended, to continue in effect the provisions of title II of the First War Powers Act, 1941; without amendment (Rept. No. 407);

H. R. 2313. A bill to continue the effectiveness of the act of March 27, 1942, as extended, relating to the inspection and audit of plants, books, and records of defense contractors, for the duration of the national emergency proclaimed December 16, 1950, and 6 months thereafter; without amendment (Rept. No. 408); and

H. R. 3853. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, entitled "Crimes and Criminal Procedure," with respect to continuing the effectiveness of certain statutory provisions until 6 months after the termination of the national emergency proclaimed by the President on December 16, 1950; with amendments (Rept. No. 409).

By Mr. CORDON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

S. 1901. A bill to provide for the jurisdiction of the United States over the submerged lands of the outer Continental Shelf, and to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to lease such lands for certain purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 411).

By Mr. LANGER, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 144. A bill for the relief of the Cavalier County Fair Association (Rept. No. 413);

S. 296. A bill conferring United States citizenship posthumously upon Henry Litmanowitz (Litman) (Rept. No. 414);

S. 385. A bill for the relief of Anna Solenni (Rept. No. 415);

S. 508. A bill for the relief of Alfred Theodor Ex (Rept. No. 416);

S. 559. A bill for the relief of Edward Joseph Wentworth (Rept. No. 417);

S. 561. A bill for the relief of Charles Chardon Brooks (Rept. No. 418);

S. 648. A bill for the relief of Damiano Mario Carmine Palusci (Rept. No. 419);

S. 722. A bill for the relief of Mary Bethe Hines (Rept. No. 420);

S. 1016. A bill for the relief of Josephine Schaitel (Rept. No. 421);

S. 1363. A bill for the relief of Eddie L. Bennett, Jr. (Joji Chitose) (Rept. No. 422);

S. 1366. A bill for the relief of Dr. Jose Montero (Rept. No. 423);

S. 1380. A bill for the relief of Simonella Evonne Magliulio (Rept. No. 424);

S. 1432. A bill for the relief of Peter Penovic, Milos Grahovac, and Nikola Maljkovic (Rept. No. 425);

S. 1443. A bill for the relief of Jose Deang (Rept. No. 426);

S. 1467. A bill for the relief of Patrick Devine (Rept. No. 427);

S. 1659. A bill for the relief of Antony Timothe Fairchild (Ishida Makoto) and Marie Dolores Fairchild (Shimizu Reiko) (Rept. No. 428);

S. 1701. A bill for the relief of Paul Stanley Blow (Paul Stanley Matsumura) (Rept. No. 429);

S. 1705. A bill for the relief of William Lance McKinley (Biro Takedo) (Rept. No. 430);

S. 1758. A bill for the relief of Cathalina Furukawa (Rept. No. 431);

S. 1791. A bill for the relief of Leong Walk Hong (Rept. No. 432);

H. R. 2201. A bill for the relief of Constantinos Tzortzis (Rept. No. 433); and

H. R. 5238. A bill for the relief of Franciszek Jarecki (Rept. No. 434).

By Mr. LANGER, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

S. 381. A bill for the relief of Donald Grant (Rept. No. 435);

S. 551. A bill for the relief of Mamertas Cvirk and Mrs. Petronele Cvirk (Rept. No. 436);

S. 730. A bill for the relief of Winfried Kohls (Rept. No. 437); and

S. 973. A bill for the relief of Dr. Jawad Hedayati (Rept. No. 438).

By Mr. LANGER, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

S. 247. A bill for the relief of Frans Gunnick (Rept. No. 439).

AMENDMENT OF CONSTITUTION RELATING TO TREATIES AND EXECUTIVE AGREEMENTS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE—MINORITY VIEWS—INDIVIDUAL VIEWS (REPT. NO. 412)

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary, I report favorably with amendments, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 1) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the making of treaties and executive agreements, including the minority views of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], and the individual views of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER].

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received, and printed, including the minority views and individual views, and the joint resolution will be placed on the calendar.

IMPORTATION OF FEED WHEAT FROM CANADA—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 410)

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, I desire to submit a report on the investigation of the importation of feed wheat from Canada. The investigation was based on a report which was made to the Congress by the Comptroller General last December, and which indicated that there had been violations of certain provisions of the law, possibly criminal violations. The Committee on Agriculture has conducted an investigation and has held two or three hearings. I therefore submit the report on those hearings, as conducted to this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received, and printed.

GRANTING OF STATUS OF PERMANENT RESIDENCE TO CERTAIN ALIENS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary, I report an original concurrent resolution, favoring the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens, and I submit a report (No. 440) thereon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received, and the concurrent resolution will be placed on the calendar.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 34) was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring). That the Congress favors the suspension of deportation in the case of each alien hereinafter named, in which case the Attorney General has suspended deportation for more than 6 months:

V-909397, Abreu, Domingos Viegas.

A-7223134, Achtman, Marcel or Mozes.

A-6522644, Akiros, Lucas George or Lukas Aciros or Lucas Liros.

A-5026239, Albers, Gustav Heinrich or Gustav H. Albers or Gustav Henry Albers or Gus Albrecht.

A-4323384, Alexandris, Stamatios Anthony. 0300-239223, Ali, George Hatim.

A-7450368, Ali, Osmuth or Asmal Ullah or Osmuth Ullah or Armenthat Elluh and Asmath Ali.

A-7125193, Alimanesteanu, Ileana (nee Eremin).

A-4527972, Ambrosini, Vittorio.

T-2334466, Anthony, Wellington.

A-5680159, Antonopoulos, John G.

A-1964296, Anthony, Mario Ivanov or Martin Ivanov Antonov.

A-9214730, Antonsson, Valdemar Torsten or Valdemar Antonsson or Torsten Valdemar Antonessen.

A-6827824, Arar, Alexandra (nee Alexandra Nikelsberg).

A-8106208, Araujo, Antonio Jose or Antonio Jose De Araujo.

A-2477177, Arcos, Jesus Martinez-De.

0300-381164, Attin, Carol Diane or Carole Diani Attin.

A-9670832, Badr, Sharof Yousey or Sharof Youssef Badr.

A-7375511, Balanikas, Vasilia or Vasilia Vallas (nee Fargani).

A-5813501, Baratta, Ennino or Pedro Gomez or Joseph Bacchieri.

A-6469188, Barilla, Muriel Mavis (nee Baker).

A-6781680, Belanger, Marie Alice (nee Le-cours).

A-4352084, Bereincua, Teresa Calderon De or Teresa Calderon-Cazares.

A-6203198, Bianchi, Ralph or Raffaele Bianchi.

A-7841447, Bibliewicz, David or David Bibliewicz Szmuklarewicz.

A-4203497, Binder, John or Janos Binder or John Bender or Johann Binder.

A-559324, Bonnesen, Mary Ann Catherine.

A-6378885, Bosch, Louis or Luis Bosch-Delgado.

A-6794722, Botermans, Karel Frans.

A-6780693, Bott, Shu-Ying (nee Shu-Ying Chen).

A-9734733, Bottiglieri, Luigi.

A-8189523, Bouchard, Miriam Ernestine.

A-4670147, Boullon, Raymond Perez.

A-2354351, Bourassa, Lydia Rose or Lydia Rose Lombardino.

A-3943923, Bowen, Sidney Henderson.

A-6635303, Braun, Mauritiu.

A-5827078, Breen, Michael.

A-6347451, Brown, Frances Norah.

0300-413772, Burgess, Mortimer Myrtle or

Betty Burgess.

A-7983203, Buttaro, Giuseppe.

0300-332710, Byndloss, Theopilus.

A-7073998, Canive, Mariano Ramirez or

Juan Bilbao Canive.

A-8082822, Capasso, Michele.

A-1162321, Carlo, Antonio Di.

A-5963754, Carty, John Daniel.

A-7178182, Casada, Maria Bind.

A-6877396, Castaneda-Cantu, Juan Andres.

A-6877397, Castaneda-Cantu, Marie Anita.

A-6919712, Castaneda-Navarro, Adolfo.

A-2951929, Castillo, Antonio Sinohui or

Antonio Castillo-Sinohui or Tony Castillo or

Jose Antonio Sinohui Castillo.

A-3512570, Catania, Salvatore.

A-3090411, Chaar, Hadj Ahmed.

A-8196795, Chen, Ah San (nee Ah San Yuen).

A-9655399, Cheong, Ching or Cheng Chong.

A-5013464, Chin, Sam.

A-3776007, Chin, Sam Sing.

A-9142421, Chong, Gee Ling or Cheung Cam.

A-6857588, Chow, Chung Hsiang or Chester H. Chow.

A-9777188, Christoforatos, Evangelos Angelos.

A-4747187, Christopher, Arthur Leopold.

T-555031, Christopher, Evelyn Rhymer.

A-4034720, Chu, Yee Goon.

A-9687823, Chul, Chau.

A-4056865, Chung, Won or Woon Chung or Chung Choy or Chung Wing.

A-7248055, Clik, Abraham.

A-7248056, Clik, Feiga (nee Davidovic).

A-1262700, Cilia, Carmelo or Charles Cilia.

A-5942949, Cirocki, Leon Stanley.

A-1347956, Clarke, Arthur Alexander.

A-4732616, Cochran, Sylvia Schaner.

0300-389038, Cockburn, Stanley Aloysius.

V-937783, Colachio, Matteo or Mattia Colachio.

A-8117576, Conceicao, Manuel Jose.

0300-410289, Cordero, Rita (nee Diaz or Soler).

A-6150237, Cordoso, Renee Szwarc de Magalhaez.

0300-400836, Cortes, Julia (nee Julia Murat Verano).

A-8010637, Cotrina, Jose Rosell or Jose Ignacio Rosell Cotrina.

A-8117569, Crabbe, Ifield.

A-9703060, Davies, John Pryce.

0205-23233, Dennis, Cecil.

V-69352, Desousa, Miguel Alberto Simoes.

V-1327659, Diaz, Julie Del Valle Y.

A-8106918, Diaz, Zenaida (nee Leon).

T-1510110, Dickson, Leon Ruliford or Leon Aston Dickson.

A-6257329, Dodge, Henry or Heinz Deutsch.

A-6886719, Dominguez-Dominguez, Cruz.

A-9765666, Drazolvskis, Konstantins.

A-7957545, Duer, Sandra Banescu or Maria Alexandra Banescu.

A-4614903, Dunn, Sing or Shing Dunn or Wu Fun or Hong Wah.

A-1537893, Dvozenja, Joseph or Govan or Dvozenjoc or Joseph Dvozenvoz or Joe T. Dvozenja.

A-5507399, Eggebrecht, Wilhelm or William Eggebrecht.

A-5449063, Ellassen, Edward.

A-798217, Escallon, Santiago Gamba.

A-2776852, Esken, Maria Roosi.

A-8189432, Esposito, Luigi.

T-339503, Esteso, Arturo Torrecilla.

A-7608938, Esther, Eva Darling.

A-1424587, Estwick, Joshua Reynold.

A-2312801, Evelyn, Louis Buchanan.

A-8057935, Fernandez, Gregorio Sandalio Villegas or Gregorio Sandalio Villegas y Fernandez or Gregorio Villegas Fernandez or Villegas Fernandez Gregorio Sandalio or Sandalio or Sandalio Fernandez.

A-8120962, Fernandez, Elsa Villegas or Elsa Eugenia Villegas Garcia or Elsa Eugenia Petrona Villegas y Garcia or Elsa Eugenia Villegas.

A-7445966, Fernandez, Maria Patria or Maria Patria Rodes-Daffos.

0300-354207, Fernandez-Legra, Jorge Armando.

A-3851113, Ferrieri, Joseph or Giuseppe Ferrieri or Ferriere.

A-6834048, Florio, Dante de or Dante Virgilio-Omero de Florio.

A-3433149, Focareta, Gennaro or Gennaro Fogaretta.

A-4173509, Fong, Fook or Fong Fook.

A-9124885, Foo, Hing Ning or Hing Ming Foo or Hung Yan Foo.

A-3997686, Fook, Wong Bong or Bong Wong or Wong Zee Tin.

A-4822783, Frank, Mollie or Mollie Wechner or Wieczner.

A-5484693, Freeman, John Frederick or Joseph F. Freedman or Joseph F. Freeman.

A-6381536, Friedmann, Israel A.

A-6556349, Friedmann, Greta Dina.

0300-400098, Frisone, Orazio.

A-8190849, Fruciano, Giuseppe or Joseph Fruciano.

A-6958007, Gadekar, Shreekrishna Mannah.

A-4556423, Galbreth, Mary Lou (nee Korn) or Maria Ender.

A-7809264, Garces, Virgilia or Virginia Pancorbo Navares De or Virgilia or Virginia Garces (nee Pancorbo Navares).

A-6860822, Garcia, Jesus Pena.

1409-14046, Garcia-Martinez, Juan.

A-2663360, Garcia-Torres, Gil or Gil Torres-Garcia or Gilberto Garcia.

A-9554769, Gardesien, Roel Elfrith.

A-3619357, Gaudio, Nicola Simeone.

A-8258415, Gerald, Gladys Marion Fitz.

A-8258414, Gerald, Constance Dale.

A-8258413, Gerald, Richard Alexander.

A-8258412, Gerald, David Ross.

A-7279434, Gervino, Pasquale.

A-7196380, Gervino, Alfredo.

A-1029061, Giannoutsos, Christos Gregores or Christ Gregory Giannoutsos or Gianoutsos.

A-5665235, Giovinco, Ignazio or Joe Giovinco.

A-6669416, Glogower, Szlama or Stanley.

A-7483022, Glyptis, Nicolaos or Nicholas or Nick Glyptis.

0300-222417, Goldstein, Albert.

A-6533494, Gomez-Mendoza, Jesus.

A-7365166, Gonzales, Gertrude Kalab.

A-7365167, Kalab, Eveline Berta.

A-6958444, Gordon, Marie Florence (nee Marie Florence Goggins).

A-7201211, Gottdengen, Menyhert or Melchior Gottdengen.

A-7001755, Grabel, Nicole Beatrice.

A-5903134, Green, Louis or Tommy Dale.

A-4542654, Greindl, John or Joseph or Josef.

A-6145442, Grier, Mennell Leach.

V-945958, Grossi, Felice or Felice Mose Grossi.

A-3828805, Guagliano, Calogera or Calogera G. Barone or Gloria Guagliano.

A-8196301, Gutierrez-Romero, Justiniano.

A-8196598, Gutierrez, Sabina Lopez-Gomez de.

A-4973059T, Halvorsen, Janey Annie Ethel.

A-9684832, Hansen, Karl Bernard K.

A-5071337, Hanson, Hilja Johanna (nee Hilja Seppanen).

A-5387777, Hendrikson, John Thorwald.

A-7197014, Herrera-Mendizabal, Manuel or Miguel Torres.

A-3086019, Hibbard, Sarah Kate.

A-5832446, Hiramatsu, Tarokichi or Isamu or Fujio Hiramatsu or Tarokichi Masagatani or Isamu Masuda.

A-1760798, Hon, Bng Kin or Yee Yew Ging.

A-8227104, Hong, Chin or Charles Wing.

A-7030309, Hotte, Claire Theresa.

0301-16880, Hunter, Clorinda Goltra.

A-9776737, Jarzyna, Zygmunt Tadeusz or Teddy or Zygmunt Jarzyna.

A-3694430, Jerusalemy, Marcel Tautu Rene Ceran or George Marcel Archer Ceran or Marcel Ceran.

A-1457103, Jiminez, Guadalupe.

1000-16239, Johnson, Guelda Winnifred.

A-9769684, Johnson, Samuel Joseph.

A-2246493, Jording, Wilfried Johannes Hinrich.

A-5640340, Joyce, Mary.

A-7137640, Juarez, Maria Reyes Dolores.

A-7264796, Flores, Victor.

A-7137642, Flores, Maria Gracia.

A-7137641, Flores, Jesus.

A-6343647, Kakanis, Eleftreia (nee Gagoulou).

A-9666175, Kalodoukas, Konstantinos.

A-8217411, Kamouh, Alexander.

A-6162181, Kanhan, Lee.

A-5275332, Karlich, Joseph or Giuseppe Karlich.

1303-5855, Keeton, Gladys Mildred.

A-6197801, Kemeny, Emery or Emery Grand.

A-6197802, Kemeny, Alice or Alice Grand (nee Alice Wahrmann).

A-4287570, Kerchevicius, Pranas or Frank Kershis or Kersis or Pranas Kersevicius.
 A-6430851, Khani, Saleh.
 A-8065883, Khani, Vadjibeh D.
 A-7371875, Kim, Ester Fajardo (nee Fajardo).
 A-7710645, King, Benjamin Alexander or Horace King.
 A-6620806, Kirzner, Fritz (nee Wenkert).
 A-5342277, Kiss, Andrew.
 A-2865680, Koffinas, Kiriakos or Charles Koffinas.
 A-7084206, Kokenes, Voula Meletea or Voulachris Kokenes.
 A-8227710, Konstantios, Demitros.
 A-4774540, Kovacovsky, Albert or Albert Kovacovski.
 A-4726212, Kuchauk, Jenne.
 A-5985516, Kugler, Guillermina Fonseca.
 A-6985593, Kugler, Henry or Enrique.
 A-5985597, Kugler, Sonia.
 A-5985599, Kugler, Erna.
 A-7016073, Kwai Zung Wen or William Zung.
 A-1762445, Kwan, Hugh or Hui Kwan or Kwan Hui.
 A-6440728, Larrosa, Maria Magdalena Alba Iris Santanach y or Alba Santanach.
 A-1503974, Latkovic, Thomas.
 A-9281059, Lauen, Olav Martinsen.
 A-4532673, Lee, Chung Bar or Lee Chung Ball.
 A-2420690, Lee, Jim or Chang Yung Suck.
 A-3824255, Lee, Jun.
 A-7828200, Lee Ok Cha (nee Ok Cha Kim).
 A-75926687, Lee, Shiu Lam or Lam Lee.
 A-8258790, Lee, Wo or Robert Wo Lee.
 V-248218, Lemos, Pandelis Leon Christos.
 V-248184, Lemos, Aspasia Pandelis (nee Lignos).
 A-7995670, Leon, Manuel or Munoz.
 V-1258233, Leon, Rogelio Manuel Sainz Diaz De.
 A-9825497, Lesica, Zygmunt.
 V-1429250, Levitan, Rose (nee Shoshana Fisher).
 A-6698885, Li, Ching-Sen or Johnson or Johnny Lee.
 A-949333, Li, Ming Tao or T. L. Cuo or Andrew C. Huang.
 A-6691202, Li, Liu Wen Hwa or Liu Li or Wen Hwa Liu or Mrs. T. C. Tsao or Mrs. T. H. Dan or Mrs. C. G. Chang or Mrs. Martha Yang.
 A-8082987, Loach, Margaret Mary De.
 A-7755824, Loh, Mei Hung.
 A-6061412, Loh, May E. (nee Hu).
 A-8015263, Loman, Jervis Frank or Frank Loman.
 A-6645659, Lopez, Daniel Morales or Daniel M. Lopez or Freddy Lopez.
 A-6503941, Lowy, Leopold.
 A-6491564, Lowy, Sara (nee Rosenberg).
 0300-370734, Lung, Lee Ching or Lee Mon Che.
 A-6206875, Chu, Daisy Wong or Hung Gee.
 A-5684424, MacDonald, George.
 A-7886799, Mah, Harry Hong or Cheung On Mah.
 A-4323896, Majcunich, Mirko.
 A-7247310, Malach, Chil.
 A-5275244, Manabe, Akira.
 A-6985435, Mandel, Luis or Louis.
 A-4682813, Manzo, Anna Mary (nee Meola).
 0803-9187, Martinez, Francisca Hernandez.
 A-7350317, Martinez-Barajas, Salvador or Salvador Martinez-Hernandez or Salvador Monjarrez or Salvador Martinez Gonzalez or Salvador B. Martinez.
 A-4954714, Mavros, Dimitrios Theodoros or James Theodore Mavros.
 A-5070379, McKenzie, Louis or Louis Malmstrom McKenzie.
 V-500502, Medina, Ana Gomes Coelho (nee Coelho).
 0300-267184, Melloni, Gian Franco.
 A-9545285, Mihalios, John.
 A-7184087, Miller, Kitty.
 A-7383644, Miller, Sonia (nee Walte).
 A-5928448, Ming, Chu.

A-3658220, Minici, Luigi.
 A-1269082, Moeller, Karl Heinrich.
 A-6447293, Mootoo, Conrad Augustus.
 A-3280486, Mora-Capetilla, Tomas.
 A-9093489, Moraitis, Georgios John.
 A-7420855, Moraes, Pedro.
 A-7420856, Morales, Petronila Lydia.
 A-3899004, Moreno, Leonardo Gallardo.
 A-7282989, Moskowitz, Hersch or Hersch Rubin Moskowicz or Moscovici.
 A-6830322, Moya-Aranda, Alfredo or Alfredo Moya or John Tello.
 A-7083539, Navarro, Ramon Ramirez.
 A-5919077, Ness, Agnar Mathias.
 A-7399088, Ng, Yu Fong or Fong Ng or Hawng Wu or Yu Fong Wu.
 A-2540342, Ntentakis, Demetrios Christos or James Dedes or James Dedas or Demetrios Dentakis or Demetrios Dentakis.
 A-9543657, Nunes, David.
 A-1111655, Occhio, Antonio D'.
 A-7078465, Orintas, Joseph.
 A-7078466, Orintas, Ona (nee Martistius).
 A-7841252, O'Rourke, Jimmi Rudi.
 A-3626106, Osup, Nana Jose or Jose Osup. 0300-400180, Oviedo, Virginia Carranza.
 A-9619615, Paasila, Reino Olavi.
 A-9687738, Pak, Chan.
 A-6504789, Pao, Koo Shun.
 A-7141375, Papakonstantis, Panagiotis or Panagiotis Papaconstantis.
 A-4862572, Pappas, Angelo or Angelo Papakonstantis.
 A-6746535, Paraskevopoulos, Dimitrios Theodoros.
 0300-369869, Paulogiannis, Georgios or George Pauljohn.
 A-7927365, Peliz, Armando Manuel Buria Y.
 A-9124390, Peros, Tome.
 A-1350276, Peters, Olga Virginia Jenner or Olga Jenner or Frances Jenner.
 A-1100034, Petherbridge, Archie Reginald Mardon or Albert Johnson.
 A-4879289, Pettigmano, Giuseppe.
 A-1147376, Pohlen, Kurt.
 A-7003467, Pohlen, Gerda Salomea.
 A-1579913, Pohlen, Eva Kathe.
 A-7003468, Pohlen, Michael Ernst Fran.
 A-2594460, Posmas, Antonias or Tony Posmas.
 A-8217436, Pyros, Eleftherios or Larry Philip Pyros.
 A-7188954, Ramihez, Marcos or Marcos Ramirez-Arredondo.
 A-8217842, Ramos, Holly Terril.
 0300-401997, Rauly, Julio Martinez or Julio Simon Martinez Y Rauly.
 A-1316364, Reinke, Karl Otto.
 A-6437076, Rigan, Teologos.
 T-540793, Rivadeneira, Roberto Flores or Roberto Flores.
 A-6041081, Rivera, Jose or Jose Leiva-Rivera.
 A-7273965, Rivera-Marichilar, Juana or Juana Rivera-Marichilar.
 A-5290627, Robinson, Ahmed Beye Abdallah or Spencer John Bernard Robinson.
 A-7476957, Rodriguez, Carlos Pesquera or Carlos Pesquera.
 A-7863358, Rodriguez-Mendez, Miguel or Miguel Mendez-Rodriguez.
 A-8217451, Rosa, Salvador.
 A-1466895, Rose, Rosa (nee Klein).
 A-7084656, Rossolimo, Xenia (nee Skugarovsky).
 A-6730096, Saduddin, Adil or Adil Eff Arif Sad Ed Din.
 A-7873823, Saguinsin, Maria (nee Perez).
 A-8258553, Salazar, Melton de la Garza.
 A-4293970, Salvatierra, Federico or Federico Salvatiere.
 A-8190281, Sang, Mok or Sang Mork.
 A-9769257, Sanna, Salvador or Joseph Anthony Rizzo.
 A-4096037, Sarbia, Liugi or Louis.
 A-3806236, Sardos, Theodore Markos or Theodore Salvavardos.
 A-6903928, Sarian, Hratchia Khatchik.
 A-8258454, Scarino, George or Giorgio Marinella.

A-7298928, Schlittner, Ernst.
 A-5138284, Schlontz, Alexander.
 A-5521626, Schlontz, Magdalena Lena.
 A-5509620, Schmidt, William or Willie Wilhelm.
 A-4130477, Schnur, Sara.
 A-8106425, Scialbi, Cosimo.
 A-8117991, Sclavounos, Evangelos.
 A-5230025, Scuto, Angelo or Oddo Scuto.
 A-4873810, Serensen, Hugo or Paul Serge Sergis.
 A-1981866, Sgarbossa, Francesco or Frank Sgarbossa.
 A-3525276, Sgarlata, Vincenzo.
 A-3880896, Shapiro, Julius.
 A-9190770, Shin, Wong King.
 0179-1400, Short, Lillian Pauline (nee Faquin).
 0803-7638, Silva, Feliciano or Feliciano Silva-Vargas or Felix Silva.
 A-8010656, Silvestri, Gaetano.
 A-4386029, Simone, Filippo or Phillip De.
 A-6256642, Sion, Elio.
 A-2357310, Slivka, Mike.
 A-7469095, Smith, Alvena Viola or Alvena Viola Waters.
 A-7445783, Smith, Ferdinand.
 A-1987701, Sober, Louis.
 A-5394324, Soma, Alex or Alexander.
 A-7138051, Sourvanos, Christos.
 A-6747044, Steinberg, Gisella.
 A-6747044, Steinberg, Mordhai.
 A-6703352, Steinfeld, Wilhelm.
 A-5964022, Stewart, Rose Marie or Rose Marie Deterra or Rose Marie Lockner.
 A-2353665, Stiliadiadis, Ioannis D.
 A-7036759, Stokes, Margaret Cecelia.
 A-1921617, Suden, Hudson Ben or Hassan Bensuden.
 A-3524710, Suey, Ng.
 0502-6615, Sullivan, Mary Winifred.
 A-3064091, Tai, Ping or Pong or Pang Tai.
 A-6708746, Tan, Lawrence Kok Joon.
 A-6803915, Taub, Chaim Leib.
 A-2246666, Theodoratos, Stavros or Steve Theodore.
 A-7117923, Theodore, Carole Avgerinos (nee Mandarakas).
 A-7243455, Tomlinson, Charles Victor.
 A-3523615, Tom, Chow or Joe Ton.
 A-8217481, Tong, James.
 A-5928231, Tong, To.
 A-5862020, Toot, Mary Isabel (nee MacDonnell).
 A-8217212, Torresola, Mario Seijo.
 A-4140059, Trumpet, Alpheus Leonard.
 A-7050743, Turnbull, Bernice.
 A-7137252, Tzitzikas, George.
 A-6642022, Ulett, Sepherin Joshua Gonzalez or Sepherin Ulett.
 A-3640910, Ullah, Mossob.
 A-1133075, Valentine, Alfred Christian.
 A-2189310, Vaughn, Lewis Harcourt or Vernon Volney.
 A-5117528, Veino, Naaman Alexander or Naman Veinot or Naaman Vino or Norman A. Veinot.
 A-6078324, Velasquez-Estrada, Miguel.
 A-4165323, Vella, Peter.
 A-7809824, Villia, Luis Rene or Louis Rene Villia.
 A-6332516, Vinje, Ragnheld F. or Ragnhild Vinje.
 A-3134630, Virgulti, Giovanni.
 A-9076097, Vitelli, Edward or Eduardo Hugo.
 A-1115187, Vitoratos, Evangelos or Angelo Victor.
 A-6458943, Wagner, Baron Vyne.
 A-8015786, Walker, Kenneth Eugene or Kenneth Scott.
 A-6803912, Weisz, Josef.
 A-7924496, Whitehouse, Gertrude Mary (nee Smith).
 0300-378541, Williams, Albert or Allie Mohamed.
 0300-260194, Williams, Jimmie or Jaimie Williams.
 A-6853248, Wilson, Clarice Isolene (nee Thompson).
 A-7141337, Wislocki, Wladzimierz.

A-7367967, Wolberg, Dora.
 V-130095, Wolberg, Szloma.
 A-9658290, Wong, Ngai or Wong Tai.
 A-6452008, Woo, Diana Hsui-Fang Tan.
 A-6962964, Woo, Jenny I. Tsung Chiang.
 A-2485977, Yatrou, Steve or Stamatios Yatrou.
 0300-394297, Yee, Chin or Frank Chin.
 A-9653772, Yee, Wong Chun.
 A-2645491, Ying, Chin Len or Chin Gaing Wee.
 A-3627918, Yow, Yuen.
 A-4960770, Zernowitz, Rubin Zedick or Reuben Shell or Rubin Shell.
 0300-293675, Afzal, Shaik.
 A-9154112, Agerup, Karl Wilhelm.
 V-1043953, Aguiar, Dawn Elaine (nee Howard).
 1411-4237, Aguirre, Lucas Ramirez.
 A-5013042, Ah, Ning or Ah Ning.
 0707-6205, Alberti, Eliane.
 A-6985308, Ametller, Vose.
 A-8010571, Andersen, Victor Alfred.
 A-4582325, Anderson, Harold George.
 T-1495399, Anderson, Mary Killeen.
 A-2041904, Aoki, Asaka (nee Asaka Kubota).
 A-6654767, Apfelbaum, Anna or Anna Waldhauser (nee Balog).
 A-7983331, Arbore, Nicola.
 A-6100620, Arellano, Ignacio alias Ignacio Arellano Garnica.
 T-1151193, Arellano, Rosa Maria alias Rosa Maria Arellano Olmedo.
 A-2077051, Armour, Harry Wilford.
 0300-374434, Armstrong, Samuel alias Norman Reid alias Samuel Nathaniel Armstrong.
 V-677870, Artenian, Zovinar (nee Der-Bedrossian).
 T-218444, Babin, Joseph.
 A-7567257, Bach, Helen Fenech (nee Leverenz).
 A-9804952, Balado, Marcial Tobias.
 0501-13400, Ballon, Armando Hector.
 A-4766268, Barbieri, Mafaldo.
 A-3149789, Baronti, Enorio alias Mario Baronti or Enario or Enrico Baronti.
 A-7983007, Barro, Jesus Lopez Y.
 A-4622319, Bathe, Herman Otto George.
 A-7511888, Bau, David Hong-Toh.
 A-7510471, Bau, Deanna.
 A-7983181, Bau, David, Jr.
 A-4743638, Beck, John Oscar.
 0330-400083, Bellistri, Domenico.
 A-7491055, Benes, Emilie Anna.
 A-7476825, Benes, Boris Metej.
 A-5174564, Benis, Peter Dunat.
 A-8106602, Bennett, Zachariah.
 0330-337211, Biase, Francesco Di.
 0700-14290, Biondi, Maria Carmela.
 0700-14291, Biondi, Filippa.
 0700-14292, Biondi, Paolina.
 A-7961944, Blanchard, Barbara Jean (nee Rendall).
 A1083447, Blanco, Salvador.
 A-3877998, Boer, Johan Lecheree de.
 A-4213911, Bonanno, Josephine Leto (nee Leto).
 A-1492804, Bonney, Freda Leona.
 A-7421535, Borjas-Nieto, Benito.
 A-3863930, Bower, Everett Earl.
 A-7415421, Bracero, Juana Luisa (nee Perez).
 A-4201613, Braut, Ivan Marijan alias John Braut.
 A-6904297, Brawer, Lajos alias Louis Braver.
 T-2585512, Brown, Richard Nelson.
 A-4264348, Brusendorff, Gertrude.
 A-7479493, Bryan, Alfred alias Alfredo Augustus Bryan.
 1700-1645, Caalim, Josefina Ramones.
 A-1822420, C Vamara, Seydou or Suede.
 A-7185313, Campo, Oswald Salvatore.
 V-371493, Campos, Mario Armando de.
 T-733877, Canedo, Olga alias Olga Emelia Martinez Yanes.
 A-8203935, Carver, Marjorie Somerton (nee Noseworthy).
 A-3965927, Casagrande, Agostino.
 A-5169081, Cassidy, Lillian Fabiola (nee Martin).
 A-6069922, Castelyn, Amelia Maria (nee Erias).
 A6060920, Castelyn, Alfred Francis.
 A-8069921, Castelyn, James Vincent.
 0300-413852, Celantano, Antonio or Anthony.
 A-7137826, Cervantes, Antonio.
 A-7137597, Cervantes, Rosa Mendiola de.
 A-6224480, Chang, Chen-Siang.
 A-6843451, Chang, Diana Lee alias Shun Yee Lee.
 A-7656091, Chang, Lo Chiang.
 0500-41420, Chao, Chi-Mei Hwang.
 A-4007835, Chin, Wan.
 0501-19167, Ching, King or Ching King or Charles C. King.
 0501-19168, King, Zi-Mei Fan nee Zei-Mei Fan.
 0501-19169, Fan, King.
 0501-19170, Nan King.
 A-7726654, Chinn, Harold Tai.
 A-5963618, Chung, Ping Chich alias George Chung.
 A-7632259, Cheo, Lucy Ho (nee Luch Chu-Hsuan Ho).
 173/344, Chow, Tien Bao.
 A-7089748, Chu, Jen Chu.
 A-7095974, Huan-Ying, Chu Mao.
 A-7197026, Ciazzo, Ettore Renato.
 V-1451159, Cipollone, Raffaele or Ralph.
 A-7786457, Clarke, Neville Hilton.
 1100-27380, Clevenger, Eva Festyne or Evon Festyne Clevenger.
 0300-215585, Cobos, Andres.
 0300-39217, Cobos, Isabel.
 0300-319862, Cohen, Joseph or Coleen.
 T-1491134, Cole, Gerald LeRoy alias Gerald LeRoy Neil.
 A-6368676, Collins, Grace Louise.
 0501-19322, Consigli, Polixeni.
 A-6258805, Cornelius, Catherine Elizabeth.
 0300/407116, Cukier, Mordechai or Mordechai Zucker.
 A-7419760, Cummings, Anna Frances.
 A-3556173, Cura, Francisco.
 A-1512603, Cutri, Salvatore.
 A-8227202, Das, Beatrice Laurena alias Beatrice Laurena Battersey or Laurena Dauncey.
 A-7180815, Davidsohn, Max.
 T-2364705, Davis, Alma Justine.
 T-1495409, Dean, Jane.
 A-3861802, Delgado, Antonio Theathilo.
 A-7266119, Delgado, Jose Ruben Ceerayes.
 A-4478491, Dellagrannatikas, Joannis or John G. Dellas.
 T-2659488, Dicks, Francisco Alfredo or Francisco Durant.
 A-6181553, Donesky, Peter William.
 0500-43325, Dorost, Touran Nassir (nee Zadeh).
 A-6762264, Dow, Ernest Archibald.
 A-6851771, Droin, Rosa or Rosa Amelia Sanchez.
 A-6306749, Dudmuyk, Anton Dragan or Anton Dragan or Anton Klym alias Andrij Lucin.
 V-850636, Duncan, Ivy Louise (nee Williams).
 A-7967980, Enderle, Emiko (nee Mori).
 T-1496115, Eriqat, Abdul Kareem Muhammed.
 A-6608343, Espantman, Shah-Bahram.
 0803-9073, Espinoza, Amada (nee Rios).
 0803-8099, Espinoza, Jose Palomina.
 A-6872628, Estornel, Gloria Zayas.
 A-0923843, Estrada, Rosa Marie (nee Mercedes).
 T-1496045, Ferguson, Frederick Arthur.
 T-1510111, Fernandez, Casto Juan or Casto Juan Fernandez Carballido.
 A-3082893, Fidelman, Sally.
 A-9557659, Figueiros, Antonio Martinez.
 1400-21955, Flores, Maria Isabel Martinez de.
 1400-21956, Silva-Martinez Rogelio.
 T-1890643, Fong, Donald Dennis alias Ronald Dennis McLeod.
 T-1134211, Fong, Stanley.
 0501-19290, Foseidengen, Valborg.
 A-7276662, Foster, Phaedra Evangelidou (nee Phaedra Athanasios Evangelidou).
 A-5162320, Francis, Harold Moore.
 A-6437037, Frediani, Concepcion Arrieta.
 0300-301240, Freilich, Aron.
 T-1320959, Frett, Ovilda Isadora.
 T-767504, Frias, Dolores Menendez alias Susana Memendez Fernando.
 A-8196925, Friedrich, Elmer Harry.
 0300-282156, Frost, Dorothy alias Dorothy Urenicz or Dorothy Urlewicz (nee Franzel).
 V-1383635, Fuss, Leiselotte, or Liseleotte.
 T-1510112, Gallier, John Alexander.
 A-8117822, Garcia, Catalino Luis Martinez.
 0300-399311, Garcia, Francisco Marino Camino.
 0803-7937, Garcia, Miguel alias Miguel Garcia-Bermudez alias Mike Garcia.
 0300-377583, Garcia-Artes, Luis.
 A-4350980, Garland, Norman.
 A-1988335, Gaskin, Wattward Melville.
 A-6982792, Gasper, Fred Tyron.
 A-5969422, Gebhardt, Afra (nee Afra Satzger).
 T-1537519, Ghersini, Anthony.
 A-5299818, Girkowski, Kurt Herbert alias Kurt Girkowski alias Kurt Willud.
 A-8017505, Gomez-Michel, Salvador.
 A-7418459, Gonzales, Florencio Cabrera.
 A-7423259, Cabrera, Maria Alicia Partida De.
 A-2322458, Goto, Fuku Kaoru (nee Fuku Covita) formerly Fuku Imazeko.
 T-2659490, Green, Alvin.
 A-5581813, Greenidge, Alma alias Alma Theodora Greenidge or Alma George Theodora George.
 A-6912091, Grinoch, Etelle or Ethel Esther (nee Elia).
 A-6999685, Guidici, Andrea.
 A-8039998, Gumbs, Claudette June Arlene.
 A-8039999, Gumbs Maxine.
 A-7379645, Guzman-Sanchez, Benancio.
 A-6494372, Gyulai, Zuzanna Mirjam.
 A-7052654, Haar, Wynand Van De or Wayne Van De Haar.
 A-4224799, Hallas, Spiros Nicholas.
 A-7224929, Hamel, Joseph Etienne Gustave or Gustave Hamel.
 A-9741203, Hansen, Borge.
 1000-20672, Hernandez, Amparo Rivas.
 T-2760803, Hernandez-Cerna, Jose Jesus.
 0300/273881, Herrera, Calixto alias Calixto Herrera-Rodriguez.
 A-7176716, Hassik, Jonnes.
 A-9209170, Hermo, Angel Sanisidro.
 A-8258759, Hing, Jung Four alias John Fau Ting alias Chaing Wah.
 A-6931256, Hoffman, Ramona formerly Mayr.
 A-7173936, Howe, Willie.
 V-890214, Howe, Christine.
 A-6441500, Huang, Yi.
 V-150195, Huang, Siao-Ming.
 A-9519906, Hui, Chung alias William Hui.
 A-7445931, Hunter, Eric alias McCarthy.
 A-6195754, Hwang, Kao.
 V-606478, Hwang, Ning Tso (Sheila) (nee Ning Tso Chen).
 0300-81456, Hylton, Cecil.
 0300-420810, Hylton, Cecil Howard.
 A-4151645, Ikekawa, Fujiko.
 A-7013105, Jablonski, Joy Campbell.
 A-4130482, Jacobs, Silvia.
 A-6870391, Jacobs, Silvia Villar (nee Silvia Villar Gonzales) alias Silvia Villar Muller.
 A-5182694, Jederlinic, Anton alias Anton Yederlynic.
 A-9782934, Jerez, Jose Zanabria.
 A-3920503, Joe, Wai Kin alias Low Shee or Lo Ah Sam.
 A-1163558, Johnson, James.
 A-7858096, Jones, Audley Ivan.
 0502-6640, Jung, Bing-Ho.
 A-5621923, Kall, Jennie or Zelda Kall.
 A-9579031, Kamarinos, Georgios or George Camarinos.
 0300-416080, Kastanis, George or Georgios Kastanis.
 A-9164046, Kavouras, Demetrious or James.
 A-7858548, Kee, Chong.
 A-7027436, Keen, Gee Sue or Keen Gee.
 0300-395431, Kenakis, Stelios or Steve.
 V-277789, Kim, Jean Yong.
 A-5595261, King, Frederick Oliver.
 A-4265837, King, Yip Shu or Yip Lin.
 0300-255473, Kishel, Simba alias Simba Roztein.

V-195362, Kittrell, Diana Patricia formerly Denesse Jennifer Brown.
 A-6916366, Khaddaj, Amer or Khaddage.
 A-6916365, Khaddaj, Adia or Khaddage or Sana (nee Jadaon).
 A-9684027, Kong, Lam For alias Lam Kwong.
 A-9686509, Koon, Chow or Chow Kuen or Koon Chow.
 A-7978716, Kow, Goon or George Yickson Goon alias Joseph Akow.
 A-9578777, Kow, Yip or Kow Yip.
 A-3518298, Kralovsky, John.
 A-7112344, Lababas, Arnulfo Ovejas.
 0100-24612, Lalonde, Theresa Raymond.
 A-5107183, Lam Kenneth Y. or Lam Kan Yue.
 A-7794423, Larkins, Milliecent Alvira (nee Gumb).
 A-3685901, Lattaris, George Velisaris.
 T-2585505, Layton, Henrique.
 T-1495492, Lee, Kwong Chuen.
 A-6176312, Lee, Moses Harvey.
 1700-4972, Lee, Soon Bok Woo.
 A-3969381, Levy, Hilda Louise Trenfield.
 A-7044040, Leckacos, Alexander or Alex or Lekos.
 0801-17285, Leichuck, Constantina Vasilios (nee Stacopoulou) (Kavafaki).
 A-5643522, Lenfer, William Hinrich or Wilhelm Hinrich Lenfer.
 A-2964368, Leonard, Elizabeth (nee Elizabeth Flanagan).
 T-555013, Lettsome, Nydia.
 T-555014, Lettsome, Oleavine Elecia.
 A-9237018, Lew, Far Choen.
 A-7758218, Li, Anna Kwaynat.
 T-2659496, Liang, Tsu Wen alias Stephen T. W. Liang.
 A-6256078, Linares-Nunez, Roberto Eugenio.
 A-4278951, Lisi, Hannah Gunilla Dee (nee Altonen).
 A-9782638, Lissabet, Porfrio.
 A-1021978, Lobus, Fritz Voldemar.
 T-1496112, Loe, Madeline.
 A-4847015, Looch, Emma Maria.
 V-462503, Lopez, Noris alias Noris Altgracia Rodriguez Lopez (nee Noris Altgracia Rodriguez Morales).
 1308-3715, Lopez-Campos, Miguel.
 1308-4004, Lopez, Gregoria Magallanes de.
 A-4195990, Louis, Cheung alias Louis Cheung alias Louis Car Cheung.
 A-7463608, Lozada, Luz de Santos.
 A-5928469, Lu, Shou Shu or Ru Hsia-Shu.
 A-9831046, Luca, Vincenzo De.
 1300-91588, Lucero, Aurora Grey.
 1300-104600, Lucero, Manuel Pedro.
 A-9070457, Lum, Dong Long alias Dong Lum Long or Tang Ah Lum.
 0400/42180, Mair, Hugh Sterling.
 0300/396793, Malau, Lambok alias Manik Bin Amat.
 0300-344363, Manning, Henriette (nee Noel).
 A-9802186, Manousos, Costas.
 A-9801141, Mantagas, Ioannis Dimitrios.
 A-3833861, Maratos, Anthony or Antonios.
 T-2333305, Mar-Castan, Alberto.
 A-3945750, Mark, Sulhan alias Tuck Ming Mark.
 A-6911836, Marcois, Dionisios Demetreou.
 A-7469743, Maroyan, Toros.
 A-2262331, Martinez, Maria Antonia.
 A-7983315, Martinez, Raul Abreu Y.
 1300-112578, Martinez-Rodriguez, Salvador.
 A-8183960, Mastin, Ida M.
 1700-2321, Mataalii, Siniva.
 T-1510134, Matarangas, Nikolaos.
 A-9836150, McGeechan, George.
 A-4729346, McKay, James.
 0900-57408, McKayle, William.
 V-321644, Meizoso, Jose Martinez alias Jose Martinez.
 0804-6607, Mende, Thomas Julius.
 A-7130517, Mendez-Aebedo, Guadalupe.
 A-7429295, Messer, Heinrich.
 A-6928294, Mikity, Dejan.
 V-1190678, Millhollin, Renee Yvonne.
 A-6211804, Miranda, Guadalupe Pena.
 A-6207865, Miranda, Huvaldo.
 A-6207864, Miranda, Carlos.
 0400/45356, Moldt, Sabine Falkner.
 A-8189667, Morehouse, Olli Sisko Regina Saatamoinen.
 A-2997452, Mota, Francisco Martins Da.
 A-3654022, Montgomery, Marie Eugenia Blanche.
 0300-410997, Morelli, Alberto or Albert.
 T-2643805, Moreno, Tomas Hernandez.
 A-5317956, Moriarty, Michael.
 T-1496046, Mosquito, Marcellina.
 0300-417859, Moustakas, John or Ioannis Mathew Moustakas.
 V-270661, Moyano, Eusbilio Emilio or Eusebio Emilio Moyano-Junco.
 A-6911173, Murayama, Eiko (nee Eiko Hayashida).
 T-1510136, Murray, Jacob alias Jacob De-Costa Murray or George Turner.
 A-9620115, Muyen, Christian Lambertus.
 A-5399776, Myrmirides, George.
 A-8190457, Nacinovich, Mario.
 V-455694, Nasser, Edward Selim.
 A-7244607, Nauz, Carlotta Clariza formerly Carlotta Clariza Medina.
 T-2809542, Nevarez, Maria De La Luz Martinez De.
 T-1495402, Nevel-Meneses, Raymond Salatiel.
 T-1537515, Newhouse, George Arthur.
 0300-390425, Ngol, Woun or Ngr or Yuen Wuy.
 A-9770924, Niforatos, Gerasimos.
 A-8010491, Niles, Eleazar Augustus alias Henry Hewitt.
 A-6295750, Nolan, George Washington alias George William Nolan.
 V-623073, Obando, Heriderto Quinde.
 V-256125, Ojeda, Armando Vera.
 V-1451100, Onofrio, Giovanni Luigi formerly Fontecchio.
 0300-242702, Opperman, Ida (nee Ida Maria Woelzeschek).
 0300-318418, Ormsey, William Augustus.
 A-3209246, Osman, Abdel Rahim Selim.
 A-7491278, Pal, Youngai alias Mary Alice Pal.
 A-7991279, Palma, Angelo.
 A-6239931, Pamuk, Ozhan Mehmet.
 A-9180462, Papaloanou, Nicolaos.
 A-4178139, Pappavasiliou, Athanasious alias Athanasius G. or George Pappavasiliou (Papavasiliou).
 A-7483854, Parmenter, Gladys.
 56245/127, Pathazay, Francis.
 0300-246132, Pathazay, Sophie.
 0300-341471, Patterson, Oreste Garcia.
 A-7457098, Pau, Maria Lydia (nee Reyes).
 A-7744616, Pei, Yu Tsung.
 A-9184519, Pellakis, Michael or Michel Pellakis.
 A-9246569, Pennant, Clarence Augustus.
 V-321647, Perez, Julia Gonzalez, nee Julia Gonzalez y Losada).
 0300-362306, Peters, Rita Scott (nee Rita Eustacia Matthew) alias Rita E. Matthew Peters.
 A-2580755, Phillipopoulos, Evangelo alias Angelo Phillips.
 A-4458743, Phipps, Theophilus or James Phipps or Jimmy Phipps.
 0300-327523, Pierre, Brigitte Jean.
 A-3608118, Pinder, Cecil Samuel.
 A-7419804, Pipe, Edward Henry.
 V-251297, Pipe, Therese Mary.
 A-7248025, Pirjas, Efirosini formerly Skalkou (nee Pahos).
 A-7248026, Skalkou, Maria.
 A-7415936, Polo-Oguin, Jesus.
 A-4667702, Poon, Tsan Sing.
 A-8259607, Quinones, Jose Luis alias Jose Luis Quinones y Zayes.
 0300-413569, Quinones, Nellie alias Juana Nerida Sotomayor y Diaz.
 A-6001713, Radmore, Henry Thomas or William John Clark or Harry Walsh.
 V-2512327, Ramchandani, Kewalram D.
 T-791601, Ramos-Ybarra, Jose Manuel alias Manuel Garcia.
 A-5626789, Reinhard, Martin John.
 A-4152859, Rio, Agustin Iglesias Y Del.
 T-2760804, Rivera, Juan.
 T-2760805, Rivera, Maria Luisa.
 V-1418880, Roberts, Emma Cecilia Duenas De.
 A-8017129, Robles-Garcia, Anacleto alias Armando Del Bosque.
 A-8017131, Robles, Romelia Del Bosque.
 0300-94594, Robinson, Merton Seon or Frank Robinson or Merton Boyce.
 A-8010475, Rodriguez, Esther Nellina.
 0300-344396, Rodriguez, Florangel Valentina Martinez y alias Flora Martinez.
 T-1537516, Rodriguez, Jose Maria or Juan Sanchez-Perez alias Juan Alvarado Ramirez.
 0707-6890, Rodriguez, Julio Contreras.
 1100-22011, Romer, Albert George.
 A-5940933, Rothschild, Sallie.
 A-7386396, Rouse, Teresa Germino.
 V-481337, Rouse, Frank James alias Salvatore Aliotta.
 A-5686350, Rubin, Sophie (nee Florence Sophie Berman).
 A-8010468, Rue, Jose Luis Ramon alias Joseph Luis Rue.
 A-6093508, Runge, Max William Frederick.
 A-4395802, Ruppert, Istvan.
 A-4564500, Ruppert, Louisa (nee Apolt).
 0300-339359, Ruutikainen, Heimo Juko Jorma.
 T-2235195, Rymer, Raymond Alvin.
 A-9799304, Sacio, Bernardino Canares.
 A-4158120, Salazar, Jesus Pasos.
 A-5397174, Pasos, Alena Arivizu de.
 A-7295760, Salazar, Porfirio Escamilla.
 A-7357764, Salgado, Lorraine Giron.
 A-7483280, Saludares, Antonia Bilon.
 A-7190537, Salvatore, Francesca Teresa (nee Mancinelli).
 T-344198, Samms, Caswell Leopold or Samuel Samms or Samuel Taylor.
 A-8190565, Sang, Chung Tin alias William Chung.
 A-7755812, San, Shih Tsung or Johnny Sang.
 A-7278548, Santos, Rosario Lopez Dos (De Santos).
 A-5226238, Savy, Regina (nee Jenny Reina Levy).
 V-192398, Scala, Emidio Di.
 A-8217233, Scamardella, Ciro.
 A-5083536, Schaffer, George.
 A-5719174, Schardt, Anna Margarethe.
 V-772757, Schlegel, Irene Lina Elsie (nee Irene Lina Elsie Zimmermann).
 A-4846246, Schultz, Julius.
 T-483298, Scott, Lilla Elizabeth (nee Smith).
 A-2995373, Seamoto, Binichi.
 0500-37680, Segato, Luigi Sante.
 0501-18257, Segato, Emma.
 A-9503326, Seliste, Bruno.
 A-2526800, Shao, Bing-Kun.
 A-6439812, Shalhoub, Elias Namour.
 0300-272214, Shalom, Nessim or Scialom.
 0300-261016, Shalom, Hannah (nee Cohen).
 A-8117930, Shatara, Olga Badra (nee Olga Badra).
 A-5867098, Sheahan, Mary Kate.
 A-4067865, Shee, Fung or Fung Nguk Hing or Fong Shee.
 T-1495401, Sheng, Sing Shu-Heng.
 A-7921702, Shew, Ann Bernice Soloway.
 A-7575113, Shirato, Masa Aoyama.
 A-7224814, Shoretz, Osher.
 0300-301339, Shoretz, Golda (nee Szorita).
 A-6927296, Shroff, Phiroze D.
 A-6980089, Shroff, Elizabeth Iledan.
 A-5414876, Simotao, Sanmato or Sanmatsu Shimotao.
 0300-357171, Simpson, Oliver.
 A-9658292, Sing, Lum alias Lam Sing or Lam Shing or Lum Som.
 A-9654594, Sing, Wong or Wong Sin.
 1300-124241, Skantzos, Michael.
 A-6866948, Skoff, Raimund Kurt or Raimund M-x Kurt Urban Skoff.
 A-7388547, Skyers, Clarence Fitzrennie.
 0300-304660, Slawitschek, Stephan Alexander alias Stephan Stephan Alexander Mader.
 A-7099285, Smet, Herta Anna De.
 A-8021146, Smet, George De.
 A-7142200, Som, Tom Po.
 1500/36400, Soto, Rita.

A-1784095, Sow, Yip.
 A-6703274, Spence, Harold Valentine.
 A-7197979, Spence, Lindfore E. or Lindsay Bradsman.
 A-1369939, Spitz, Sarah.
 A-6970434, Sprenker, Hans Jurgen.
 A-6970467, Fabian, Reiner.
 A-6970469, Feyerabend, Uwe.
 T-2182432, Springall, Lillian Hellen.
 T-1143303, Springer, June Eira alias Eira June Springer.
 T-1143302, Springer, Phyllis Loraine.
 A-6986369, Stark, Egon.
 A-5617011, Stathopoulos, Nick.
 A-7177497, Steidl, Wilma Gudrun.
 T-2364495, Stephens, Albertha.
 T-2234212, Stephens, Chrystneta.
 0300-367189, Sternbach, Bernath.
 A-7383074, Sternfeld, Frederick.
 A-7383075, Sternfeld, Renee.
 A-6428109, Stowe, Rosemary Cheng or Cheng So Mui.
 A-4420135, Strube, Christine.
 A-1287912, Sukur, Sheik Abdul.
 T-403959, Suliven, Matio Gamilit Junior alias Jose Jimmy Soliven.
 A-7118811, Surkis, Malke or Maria Surkis nee Malke Berkovits or Maria Berkovits.
 A-1451402, Taddeo, Alberto Carmine.
 A-4482414, Tai, Ho.
 A-2548480, Tai, Sang.
 T-353641, Taitt, Mavis Adassa (nee Bailey).
 A-6953281, Tan, Chi-Ming or Tan Chi Ming.
 A-6881670, Tan, Hsing Chow or Bera Tan (nee Hsing Chow).
 T-1495494, Tao, Pung Fai.
 T-1495493, Tao, Pauline Luying.
 A-9765518, Tapino, Vito Antonio.
 A-6381293, Tau-Chao, Fan or Tau-Chao Fan.
 A-6094781, Topacio, Gerardo Jose.
 A-6094780, Topacio, Antonio Francisco.
 A-6094614, Topacio, Magno Wilson.
 V-1328075, Terez, Elda Isabel Eskinach.
 A-5993495, Termentzis, Angelo.
 A-2128539, Todd, James Cyril alias James C. Carter.
 T-1773912, Todman, Clarena.
 A-8106793, Todman, David.
 A-5043011, Toivonen, Sigrid Maria.
 1302-7186, Tom, Hong Yen alias Tom Yen.
 A-8001750, Tomazos, Alfredos Stelios Adamantios or Alfredos Stelios Tomazos.
 A-9543424, Tong, Ah, or Wu Ah Tong or Ah Tong Wu.
 A-3495703, Trigo, Antonio.
 A-1410924, Tsampis, James George.
 A-9653810, Tse, Ysi Sang alias Yei Sang Tse alias Jse Yee Sing alias Tse Yee Sing.
 A-7978942, Tsekouras, Pantelis Georgiou or George Tsekouras.
 A-6685482, Tsien, Shou I.
 PR-941307, Tsien, Chia-Wel.
 0100-23925, Tsolakides, Harilaos Aristides alias Harry Duval.
 0300-409185, Tuck, Chin.
 0900/53308, Tucker, Bruno formerly Bruno Piero Cani.
 A-6848113, Tung, Hsi Hsin alias Sik Sun Tung alias David Tung.
 A-6877755, Tung, Vera I-Di (nee Gien).
 A-7375509, Tyburczy, Cecile Marie (nee Cecile Marie Salach).
 0300-238529, Ungar, Chaim alias Hyman Ungar.
 A-9742788, Vaage, Hans Jakob Hansen or Hans Vage.
 T-2182433, Vaevens, Rachel Mostrey.
 T-799379, Valdes, Raul Ambrosio or Oscar Perez.
 A-3885072, Valmas, Nicholas M.
 A-2292532, Vandertoll, Jan Jarich alias John J. Vandertoll.
 1306-3597, Vasquez-Gonzales, Trinidad alias Jesus Vasquez Gonzales.
 0300-328941, Vega, Ana nee Ana Zoyla Mandado Dias alias Anna Zoyla Mandado.
 A-6450931, Vega, Fernando Amilcar alias Fernando Amilcar Vega Montana.
 A-7921646, Velardocchia, Andrea.
 A-3595335, Velasquez-Garcia, Jesus.

A-6066538, Villar, Arturo Mordoche alias Arturo Villar.
 A-2870426, Vincent, Willias Edward.
 A-5847108, Vralais, Demetrios Spiros.
 55628/634, Vulgaris, Nicholas alias James Chase.
 A-655078, Wah, Wong Shu.
 A-2727592, Washimi, Shokichi.
 V-921576, Weinholzer, Helmut Walter.
 A-2789269, Whittaker, Donald D.
 T-2585506, Williams, Ivan Augustus.
 A-4136730, Williamson, Frederick Sullivan.
 A-6043345, Wilson, Clarence Benjamin alias Sam Clarence Benjamin Wilson.
 T-2783721, Winke, Angos or Angos Perez Macias.
 0300-322440, Wisdom, Stanford Alexander.
 A-3478218, Woldmer, Heiko or Henry.
 A-7768375, Wong, Jah Sang Cynthia (nee Jah Sang Yu).
 A-4377435, Wong, Tze Chwan.
 A-7372107, Wood, Byron alias Ivan Wood.
 A-7609404, Wu, T. C. Sheng.
 1503/5391, Ye, Chu Yee Hing or Hing Ye Yee or Yu Hong Yi Yung or Yee Shee.
 0300-405109, Young, Michael or Michael Yugolow or Michael Youghioglau.
 A-4296843, Young, Sing.
 A-3930372, Yuen, Kwal or Yen Kin.
 A-5276252, Zacevich, Anicento.
 A-9668977, Zairis, Leonidas.
 0500-39521, Zee, Tang Koei.
 T-2333306, Zuniga, Zeonon Plata.
 T-2333304, Alaniz-Gonzalez, Samuel.
 A-1412097, Alibudin, Wahap Bin or "Jimmy."
 T-370705, Alvarez, Juan or Juan Emilio Alvarez Y Blanco.
 T-369058, Alvarez, Josefa Selas De or Josefa Selas Varela or Josefa Selas.
 A-4635948, Ambo, Toraichi.
 A-6690307, Andasola, Ismael.
 A-2880668, Andersen, Gustav.
 A-5629625, Andersen, Marija Lilly (nee Mechberg) or Marija Lilly Ahlmann.
 0300-328500, Anderson, Cecil or Ezra Anderson.
 A-6040972, Antoine, Cecile Carmeale or Cylotte.
 A-2161293, Arita, George Jiro or Jiro Arita.
 A-3609656, Arkouzis, Demetrios Spiro or James Arkouzis.
 T-1497443, Ayres, Encarna Vazquez.
 T-1974895, Bajo, Rodriguez, Adrian.
 A-7066391, Bakalas, George Costas.
 A-8259692, Balzano, Michele or Mike Balzano.
 V-1522239, Barba, Pacita T. (nee Pacita Nartatez).
 A-7930393, Beaumont, Jane (nee Jane Spellman) or Jennis or Jane Spellman.
 A-4018994, Beban, Mate.
 A-7903108, Betti, Cecilia Maria.
 A-2587063, Bettin, Avellino or Lino Bettin.
 A-5093976, Birdsey, George David.
 A-5618321, Borovich, Eli or Ely or Elija or Elija Borovich or Borovic.
 A-1951753, Bourliots, James or Demetrios Bourliots.
 A-7457072, Boutros, Youssef George.
 A-3465762, Bowery, Mary (nee Brayanyovich) formerly Brayany.
 1600-91972, Brown, Robert Clinton.
 T-2672507, Caceres, Juan.
 A-7983112, Camporeale, Carmine.
 A-8227690, Capitani, Attilo.
 A-2705015, Cappelleri, Vincenzo.
 T-2643820, Carbajal, Ricardo Martinez.
 A-8091585, Carino, Virginia Ferrer or Mrs. Alejandro Carino (nee Ferrer).
 A-8091586, Ferrer, Judy or Judy Carino.
 A-6046348, Casas, Encarnacion.
 A-7070683, Casas, Elena Payan de.
 A-7132798, Cengotitabangoa, Maria Esther Gregoria.
 T-2809510, Chan, Ah or Ow Chung.
 T-1495490, Chan, Warren Mun or Mun Wong Chan.
 0707-8264, Chanakos, Athanasia Louis or Elle Tseneou.
 A-6083868, Cheng, Tao-Sheng.
 T-2585513, Chip, Jung Chung.

A-6674086, Chong, Jim Yew or Jung Jim Yew or Chu Yew Chong.
 A-6673275, Chong, Bik Lin or Bik Lin Chuey or Choy Bak Lin or Mrs. Jung Jim Yew.
 A-5769632, Chow, Chuck King or King Tsao.
 A-2755130, Chu, Mi Lu or Chu Mi Lu.
 A-9623640, Coe, Oscar.
 A-7962047, Cortes-Arroyo, Jesus.
 A-3237198, Cowie, James.
 A-1328930, Crane, Rose or Rose Nathanson or Rose Morris.
 A-7395379, Crowe, Young Soon Kim.
 A-7270807, Daras, Andreas.
 1000-21322, Davis, Helen.
 A-2956522, Davis, Walter.
 A-7745633, Delaquis, Camille Lilia Marie.
 A-4558545, Dennhardt, Helmuth Erich or Henry Eric Denhardt.
 A-7415740, Diamantis, Andrea Avelina (nee Andrea Avelina Diaz-Vazquez).
 A-4846179, Diaz, Pedro.
 A-2504474, Dongas, Nicholas John.
 A-6397303, Dorantes, Alejandro.
 A-7709690, Dorsett, William Erick.
 A-1272187, Drago, Pietro or Peter Drago.
 T-1510094, Dumouchel, George Joseph.
 A-7710113, Duncombe, Herbert James or James Duncombe or Harcourt Major.
 1500/48446, Duran-Sigala, Felipe.
 A-3682364, Eng, Ye Yang or Ye Yan Eng.
 A-7186419, Evazkhani, Akbar.
 0500-41197, Felton, Evelyn Rose Dow.
 A-1752702, Fishman, Sydney or Osias or Oscar or Arthur Kronenfeld.
 A-7022547, Fond, Anne Margaret La.
 A-2489535, Foo, Lum.
 0300-400096, Fotinakis, Costas.
 A-1886902, Furuta, Paul Takeo.
 A-1866030, Furuta, Hisayo.
 T-1495489, Gallegari, Domenico Giovanni.
 T-2324327, Garcia, Micaela Eumelia (nee Micaela Eumelia Sainz De La Torre).
 T-2182447, Garcia-Mendez, Roberto.
 A-7224059, Garcia-Pantoja, Octavio.
 A-3071496, Gates, Guadalupe Nodiega de or Guadalupe Noriega.
 A-8021247, Gaviria, Luisa or Maria Luisa Castilia.
 A-9671139, Gibertts-Leyva, Ramon or Ramon Leyva-Giberts.
 A-6362223, Gill, Harry William Cyril.
 A-6362216, Gill, Kathleen Rose.
 A-6362217, Gill, Sheila Margaret.
 A-6362220, Gill, Humphrey Graham.
 V-1172422, Gomes, Silvino Vieira or Silvino Vieira.
 V-424996, Gomes, Mercedes Vieira or Mercedes Vieira-Gomes.
 V-424997, Gomes, Silvina Josefina Vieira or Silvina Josefina Vieira-Gomes or Silvina Vieira Gomes.
 T-2809519, Gomez, Henry Valdes or Enrique Gomez.
 A-6419585, Gonzales, Aniano Cruz y.
 A-6385420, Gonzalez-Monfort, Julian Jose Hirian.
 A-7054557, Gonzalez, Maria or Maria Gonzalez-Monfort or Maria De Los Angelos Leon.
 A-7415754, Gonzalez-Saldana, Eleuterio.
 A-6494138, Gosalves-Romero, Rosario.
 A-4921290, Gouacide, Michael Florent.
 A-7415864, Graham, Patrick or Patrick Lewis Graham.
 T-2182612, Gray, Mrs. Bridget or Mrs. Kocher (nee Moore).
 A-6677320, Grindeland, Stella Muriel (nee Proudlock).
 0800-95682, Groves, Reginald Alexander.
 A-5617750, Guastella, Francesco.
 0300-276120, Guerrello-Velasco, Alberto.
 A-5831290, Guerrero-Toscano, Anastacio.
 A-4204501, Guerreri, Shirley (nee Shirley Goldman) or Shirley Schafran.
 A-7013311, Schafran, Alan.
 A-9769696, Gullberg, David Fritjof Sune or Sune Dave Gullberg.
 A-3602318, Hall, Victoria Ruiz de.
 8817/464, Harris, Melvia (nee Nolan).
 A-4557911, Hartwig, Martin John or John Hartwig.

A-7978951, Hernandez, Jesus Labrade.
 T-2760182, High, Mary Violet (nee Chow).
 A-6204775, Higuera, Cristobal or Cristobal Higuera Hernandez.
 A-7118461, Hines, Edward Frederick or Edward F. Hins.
 A-6009272, Ho, Dorothy or Ho Ying Leong.
 A-7371862, Hoff, Frank or Steigler.
 A-6033472, Hoo, Kou-Chung.
 A-5316816, Hudulin, John or John Korunich.
 A-4925149, Hutchinson, Doris Elizabeth or Doris Elizabeth Hutchinson Brice.
 A-7835193, Hwang, Cirila Casquite.
 A-6034451, Ibanez-Tovar, Antero.
 0300-412356, Islam, Fazlak.
 0501-19600, Jennick, Frank Deckers.
 A-1523318, Joseph, Ahmad or Joseph Ahmad and Ahmad Abdallah Josef.
 A-7127111, Kalantzis, Julia George (nee Julia John Tsiteloni).
 T-2783729, Kalin, Molly or Molly Medline.
 A-3914805, Kan, Hong Yung or Hung Yung Kan or Al Young or Charley Young.
 T-2305139, Karjus, August.
 V-5818422, Kassavetis, Ifigenia George (nee Coronos).
 T-1510113, Keen, Owen Leopold.
 A-1752505, Keenan, Vera Sarah or Vera S. Keenan.
 A-9765954, Kew, Lee or Lee Fook.
 A-6170224, Khan, Mustapha Mohamed.
 0300-412754, Koen, Lee or Li Kuan or Lee Sop.
 A-9765669, Kolodziejczek, Hieronim Henry.
 A-3457910, Komisaroff-Kremer, Vera.
 A-2317970, Kontos, Steve or Stavros Kontominos.
 A-2077722, Kouvaras, Christos.
 A-5878526, Kun, Mak Ying.
 A-5378372, Larrance, Patricia Shaen (nee Hammersley).
 A-9799769, Lauscher, Kurt.
 T-2334460, Ledee, Joseph Emanuel.
 A-9134170, Lee, John or Lee Yen.
 A-4788941T, Lefas, Isidores Demetrios.
 0500-33120, Lefler, William C.
 A-8227712, Leitao, Jose Franco.
 0800-73267, Leitz, Mary Margaret.
 A-7427619, Lembesis, Ioannis or John Lembesis.
 A-2572761, Leotsakos, Michael Dimitrios.
 A-4598006, Liakiardopoulos, Vasilios or Bill Likas or William Likas.
 A-9708962, Lip, Chin or Chan.
 A-5964920, Lopez, Juan.
 A-8190019, Los, Gerard.
 A-7203760, Lotito, Ilarione.
 T-2760820, Loudarios, Nikitas John.
 1209-10390, Luera-Sandoval, Cleofas Manuel or Manuel Luera Sandoval.
 A-7351141, Maahs, Heini or Henry or Heinrich or Herman Maahs.
 T-2783724, Maciel-Garcia, Antonion or Antonio M. Garcia.
 A-4548611, Macpherson, Eric George.
 T-1955057, Malagutti, Luciana Grace.
 A-7092588, Manchan, Luke or Luke Fred Manchansingh.
 A-7070305, Mandy, Norma Kathleen (nee Moore).
 A-2838016, Mangione, Pietro.
 A-7384783, Marcus, Hans.
 A-6461430, Margolin, Efraim.
 A-6447292, Marshall, Kenneth Renton or Kenneth Marshall.
 A-6340934T, Martinez, Agustina Mariano or Severina Baoingan Mariano.
 A-6686130, Martinez, Josephine Nellie Puentes de (nee Josefina Manuela Puentes).
 A-7263752, Martinez, Matilde (nee Bravo) or Garcia.
 T-109265, Mastrocola, Mario Vincent.
 T-1497417, Masuda, Isao.
 A-2924517, Maxwell, James or Fred Mortimer.
 A-6886897, Meisels, Joseph.
 A-1549047, Melian, Francisco Ramos or Frank Ramos.
 V-315224, Mendoza, Ignacia Martinez-Barriecanal de.
 1209-9365, Miller, Florence Mary (nee Laurin).
 A-4433579, Miller, Harry Sam.
 T-1497435, Mitsilios, Nickolaus or Nick Preston or Nick Mitchell.
 A-6976876, Mohn, Per Haakon or Pete Mohn.
 1100-24407, Montelongo-Garza, Anacleto.
 T-1510108, Montesantos, Constantinos or Gus.
 1607-19815, Montes-Garza, Juan.
 A-8082932, Mosquera, Melva or Melba (nee Oblitas-Pino).
 A-7391988, Munoz, Gavino.
 A-7391986, Munoz, Alejandro.
 A-7391987, Munoz, Florencia.
 A-7391985, Munoz, Antonio.
 0800-93194, Murillo, Federico Ramirez.
 A-3831898, Murphy, John Joseph.
 A-3733866, Nagee, Ali Said.
 A-6589744, Nalecz, Mieczyslaw or Mitchell Nalecz.
 A-6563770, Natividad, Jesus.
 A-8057299, Navarro-Moreno, Luis.
 T-1497430, Nishi, Eikichi or Akiyoshi Yamaguchi.
 A-4363383, Nizzi, Maria or Maria Amidel.
 T-2760814, Ohashi, Taro.
 T-2760815, Ohashi, Fusae.
 T-2760816, Ohashi, Victor M.
 T-2760817, Ohashi, Clara M.
 A-7117182, Oliveira, Jose Munoz or Jose Munoz.
 T-1479857, Oppedisano, Angelo.
 A-7033646, Ortega-Lujano, Luis.
 A-6922686, Ostreicher, Samuel or Fojtech or Vejtech Weinstein.
 A-7424126, Ostreicher, Rozalia or Razalia Weinstein (nee Weiss).
 0800-43320, Oztekin, Muammer Ahmet.
 A-7112463, Paldomino-Escobar, Seferino or Alfonso Arriaga-Campos or Roerto Gonzalez.
 PR-949584, Pan, Li-Chi.
 A-7394778, Pan, Lucy S.
 A-7782888, Pao-Ching, Sunn or Pao-Ching Sunn.
 A-3432349, Papp, Nick.
 A-4570715, Peltola, Jaakko Ilmari.
 A-6851362, Peng, David Kwanghua.
 A-9729035, Pepe, Jose or Joe Pepe.
 A-7962166, Perez, Olga (nee Olga Meyer).
 A-8017165, Perez-Perez, Luis.
 A-5489890, Perla, Filomena Angelini.
 A-7733715, Pian, Theodore Hsueh-Huang.
 0704-4614, Pietro, Amelia Tammetta Santil Di.
 0704-5159, Pietro, Fernanda Santi Di.
 A-7079716, Pini, John Athos.
 A-1612771, Pirovulos, Kostos or Constantinos.
 T-2659472, Pokropowicz, Maria Exposito Pelayo.
 A-7780164, Puccinelli, Samuel.
 A-2104721, Quaranta, Francesco.
 T-2182441, Ramirez, Gregoria Villarreal De.
 T-2182508, Raimrez-Rodriguez, Martin.
 A-5912975, Rebello, Antonio Dos Santos or Antonio Rebelo.
 A-7445940, Regino-Mendoza, Epifanio.
 A-7962062, Reinisch, Simon.
 T-555960, Rhymer, Rufus Alvin.
 T-2334461, Rhymher, Leslie Lorenzo.
 T-2334464, Richardson, Ruel Wilfred.
 A-4727813, Riedl, Christian.
 A-5594951, Robertson, Lorayne (Lorraine) Nelson.
 A-4095701, Robus, Charles John.
 A-6066942, Rodriguez, Augustin Gomez.
 T-1506025, Rodriguez-Rodriguez, Juan.
 T-1719381, Rosales, Francisca Del Carmen Galvez Rodriguez.
 V-1269005, Roth, Clara.
 A-4669645, Ruschak, John.
 T-93172, Salvemini, Vito.
 T-2760199, Sang, Wong Chan Lal.
 T-2760331, On, Ernest Wong Yuen.
 A-4232931, Santos, Apolonio Eligio or Alberto Eligio Santos.
 V-91619, Sassouni, Armen.
 0800-82635, Sauro, Guerrino or Warren Sauer.
 A-6769411, Sauve, Howard James or Dale James Sauve.
 A-5518906, Seltzer, Abe.
 A-7031739, Seltzer, Laura.

A-5518947, Seltzer, Ray.
 A-7031808, Seltzer, Shirley Celia or Shirley Cilia Seltzer.
 A-4548933, Shao, Chu Kao.
 A-8310344, Shao, Huan Wen Lee or Huan Wen Lee or Hen-Wen Lee or Mary Lee.
 A-3633709, Shee, Jeung (nee Jeung Klu).
 A-7036141, Sherrod, Dorothy Allene.
 T-2760838, Shong, Ng Lee or Ng Kim Yat.
 A-1357121, Siemensma, Thiomotheus.
 A-5456861, Simulevics, Fruze or Fruze Rupeks or Ulozas.
 T-1495410, Singh, Partop.
 A-8217151, Sitbon, Jeanne D'Arc.
 A-3056555, Slobodnik, Vasil or William.
 A-2630172, Smart, James Allen.
 A-5895355, Smyk, Ann Violet.
 1500/41442, Solis-Rios, Felipe.
 V-1273204, Sonnekalb, Ingrid.
 A-6593089, Sperber, Jose Rodriguez.
 A-6944236, Staggs, Lucie Marie.
 A-6944237, Staggs, May Estelle.
 A-7915071, Stemmer, Emanuel or Emanuel Mendel Stemmer.
 A-2748926, Stoia, Joseph.
 A-4534548, Sullivan, John or John O'Sullivan.
 A-6591058, Sutherland, Maida Alethea.
 T-2783730, Talavera-Torres, Victor.
 A-7962057, Tam, Piu Chiu or Tam Pui Chiu.
 36777-2-3, Tam, Foong Sui or Chow Foong Sui.
 36777-2-4, Tom, Eugene or Eugene Tan and Tam Chen Tsiem or Chen Tsiem Tam.
 A-5621827, Tambakis, Panagiotis or Peter Tambakis or Peter Tamvakis.
 A-8258585, Terry, Blas Celerino.
 T-2334465, Thompson, Samuel Melvin.
 A-8259705, Tjong, Rudy or Harry Chang or Eugene Haw.
 A-2038816, Tobias, Leford.
 T-2626333, Tolentino-Beltran, Jesus.
 A-1677929, Torrealba, Juan or Juan Rafael Torrealba Carvacho.
 A-1698952, Toscano, Antonio.
 A-6064023, Tovar-Cantu, Florencio.
 T-2626319, Tovar, Simona Gamboa De.
 T-395202, Triana, Leydia Irene Diaz De.
 T-714773, Quintana, Jose Pedro Triana y.
 A-8091952, Uribe-Santiago, Jesus or Jesus Uribe.
 T-2626375, Urrutia-Ayesa, Estilita or Estilita Canas.
 A-5187309, Valenzuela, Rebecca Trejo de.
 A-7469261, Valladares-Medrano, Alvaro.
 1500/35906, Vasquez, Maria De Jesus Roman De.
 A-1877637T, Vloten, Gertrude Van or Quesada (nee Junska).
 A-9153566, Wah, Chong or Cheung Wah Chow.
 A-4395584, Walsh, Charles Rudolph.
 A-7438933, Walsh, Sighlit Georgia Helga or Sighlit Georgia Helga Wilke.
 A-4647745, Ward, Michael or Eric Michael Ward or Michael Eric Ward.
 A-5274295, Ward, Edith (nee Fritz) or Cavins.
 V-614473, Watkins, Mary Carmen (nee Mary Carmen Dean) or Mary Dean Schwartz.
 A-8258777, Webster, Frank Victor.
 A-7292474, Williams, Aubrey George.
 T-1892717, Wilson, Winston Minter or Clarence Wilson.
 A-6878024, Wolf, George or Georg Wolf.
 A-7079713, Wong, Henry Sam.
 T-1333561, Woodcock, Karin.
 A-6848665, Wu, Chung.
 A-6379911, Wu, Helen Lu-Chen.
 A-2370924, Wu, Kwang Tsing.
 A-6982878, Yue, Nadine Jean (nee Nadine Jean Li).
 A-6982878, Yue, Wen-Yao.
 A-2567172, Yuen, Koon Shau or Koon Sham Yuen.
 A-7145751, Zacarias, Perfecto.
 A-7188092, Zacarias, Maria De Jesus Urena De.
 1400-19555, Zaragosa-Parada, Francisco.
 1400-19554, Zaragosa, Jesua Preciado de.
 1400-19556, Zaragosa-Preciado, Guadalupe.
 1400-19553, Zaragosa-Preciado, Juan.

1400-19557, Zaragosa-Preciado, Carmen. A-9670685. Dardamanis, Dimitrios. A-6851619, Chang, Ching Chieh. A-7118671, Chang, Hsien Wei. A-6095030, Raymond, Leslie or Leslie Roteman.

REPORTS ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. CARLSON, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which were referred for examination and recommendation two lists of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted reports thereon pursuant to law.

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. WILEY:

S. 2128. A bill to further amend the Mutual Security Act of 1951, as amended, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 403).

(Under authority of the order of the Senate of June 11, 1953, Mr. WILEY, on June 13, 1953, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported the above bill, and it was subsequently read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.)

By Mr. KENNEDY:

S. 2129. A bill for the relief of Romana Michelina Sereni; and

S. 2130. A bill for the relief of Simonella Evonne Magliulo (Christa Inga Magliulo); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KENNEDY (by request):

S. 2131. A bill for the relief of Francesco Carosi (Lorenzo Santini);

S. 2132. A bill for the relief of Lee You; and

S. 2133. A bill for the relief of Salvatore D'Amico; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

S. 2134. A bill for the relief of Nicolo Hronech; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

S. 2135. A bill for the relief of Fernando A. Rubio, Jr.; and

S. 2136. A bill for the relief of Sam H. Ray; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WELKER (for himself, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. LANGER, Mr. DWORSHAK, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. JENNER, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. BUTLER of Maryland, Mr. WILLIAMS, and Mr. MARTIN):

S. 2137. A bill to prohibit the blending of wheat imported as unfit for human consumption with wheat suitable for human consumption; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. KEFAUVER (for himself, Mr. HENNINGS, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. GILLETTE, Mr. GREEN, Mr. MORSE, Mr. HILL, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. HUMPHREY, and Mr. LEHMAN):

S. 2138. A bill to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, to repeal certain provisions of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

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

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 2139. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special series of postage stamps in commemoration of the life and works of Dr.

Lyman Copeland Draper; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MALONE:

S. 2140. A bill to reduce the individual income tax; to the Committee on Finance.

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

By Mr. LANGER:

S. J. Res. 89. Joint resolution to prohibit the detonation of atomic bombs or nuclear devices or weapons within the United States; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

BLENDING OF IMPORTED WHEAT UNFIT FOR HUMAN CONSUMPTION WITH WHEAT SUITABLE FOR HUMAN CONSUMPTION

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, recently the Subcommittee To Improve the Criminal Procedure, of the Committee on the Judiciary, held hearings with respect to the importation of Canadian wheat unfit for human consumption. I introduce for appropriate reference a bill which is sponsored by myself, the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], my colleague, the senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN]. The bill would prohibit the blending of imported wheat unfit for human consumption with wheat suitable for human consumption.

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

The bill (S. 2137) to prohibit the blending of wheat imported as unfit for human consumption with wheat suitable for human consumption, introduced by Mr. WELKER (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSION OF RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for about 5 minutes in a discussion of a bill which I am introducing today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator may proceed.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], and myself, I am today introducing proposed legislation to extend the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

When the House adopts the reciprocal trade bill and it comes over to the Senate, I shall propose the substitution of this legislation. I am introducing it now so that it can be printed and Senators can be considering it.

Mr. President, I consider this one of the most important pieces of legislation with which I have been associated during this entire session.

Unless this Nation does something to revive its foreign trade we shall suffer economic reverses at home and our allies and friends abroad will suffer even worse reverses.

We have been talking about trade, not aid, but unless we do something positive soon, we shall have neither.

Mr. President, I want to mention a situation with which I happen to be familiar because it involves two important agricultural products from my own State.

One of these is cotton. For the current marketing year, which ends on July 31, cotton exports will be 3½ million bales. This is a 2-million-bale decline from the marketing year which ended last July 31. It is 1 million bales below the 5-year postwar average.

Another important crop in my own State is tobacco. Exports of tobacco are down 25 percent. Mr. President, I mention these just as examples and because I happen to be very familiar with them because of their importance to my own State. However, what I have said about them is true, in differing degrees, of many agricultural and manufactured products.

Farm exports in 1952 fell 15 percent in annual value—from \$4,040,000,000 in 1951 to \$3,425,000,000. Wheat is down 6 percent. Dairy products are down nearly 50 percent.

Comparing last year with 1951, let me mention declines in exports in various manufactured products.

Synthetic fibers and manufactures are down 9 percent.

Coal and related products are down 16 percent.

Automobiles and related products are down 16 percent. I might mention parenthetically that this condition is not even good for General Motors, and therefore certainly cannot be good for the country.

Chemicals and related products are down 16 percent.

Office machines and parts are down 25 percent.

Cotton manufactures are down 20 percent.

Wood and paper are down 16 percent.

Foreign trade, of course, is a tremendously complicated problem—so many factors are involved. Last February the Public Advisory Board for Mutual Security, composed of business, labor, farm, and public leaders, reported to the President that debtor nations simply cannot repay the United States, as creditor, unless tariffs are lowered and simplified.

The fact is that the nations with which we usually trade simply do not have the dollars to buy our goods, and will not get them unless we buy from them in return, and simplify our tariff structure to the point where it will be possible for us to do so.

Cotton is again a good example. European spinners are buying cotton on a day-by-day basis, because they do not have the funds to stock it. That this condition is rather general is indicated by a study by the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe which re-

ports that "deterioration of Europe's position in the world economy has been far greater than was appreciated when postwar recovery plans were established" and that "this deterioration has been progressive."

I certainly do not wish to represent the bill that we are introducing today as a solution to this problem. It will not solve it. It will simply help. It is a step in the right direction.

The philosophy which I have followed in drafting this bill is to return the reciprocal-trade program, insofar as possible, to the spirit of Cordell Hull. The spirit of this program when Mr. Hull left it was one to encourage foreign trade. Through the years, with the adoption of one after another crippling amendment, it has lost that spirit.

There is nothing revolutionary about this proposal. I am placing in the RECORD a technical explanation of the bill and also an examination of the negotiating authority that would be left in the reciprocal-trade program under this proposal.

I hope that Senators will examine these provisions. They will see that there is in this proposal nothing that will add hardships to domestic manufacturers.

In closing, I will say that the proposed legislation is not inconsistent with President Eisenhower's proposals. He has asked for another study of foreign trade. Let the study proceed. I am for it. But while it is proceeding, let us do what we can to revive that trade. Let us not increase the problem while waiting for the results of the study.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD following my remarks a section-by-section analysis of the bill; and following that, to have printed in the RECORD a statement entitled "An Examination of Experience Under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements and Negotiating Authority That Will Be Possible Under My Proposal."

A return to the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act would be possible under my proposal.

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

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF SENATOR KEFAUVER'S TRADE-AGREEMENTS BILL

The first section gives the act a short title, viz: "Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1953."

Section 2: This section extends the authority of the President to enter into foreign-trade agreements for a further period of 3 years from June 12, 1953.

Section 3: This section repeals sections 3 and 4 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, which embody the so-called *peril-point* provisions.

Section 4: This section supplements the repeal of the *peril-point* provisions by restoring language of the original Trade Agreements Act requiring the President, before concluding an agreement, to seek information and advice with respect thereto from the United States Tariff Commission, among others.

Section 5: This section provides that subsection (b) of section 516 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (which enables an American manufacturer to protest customs rates and classifications) shall not apply with respect to any article of a class or kind covered by a foreign-

trade agreement. This provision was in the original Trade Agreements Act but was eliminated in the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951.

Section 6: This section authorizes the President to suspend the application of section 5 or section 11 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951 in the case of any country, when he finds that such action will contribute to the establishment of international goodwill or promote the cause of world peace. Section 5 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951 permits the President to withhold concessions in any trade agreement from imports from the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and imports from any nation or area dominated or controlled by the foreign government or foreign organization controlling the world Communist movement. Section 11 of that act requires the President to take such measures as may be necessary to prevent the importation of a long list of furs, dressed or undressed, which are the product of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics or Communist China.

AN EXAMINATION OF EXPERIENCE UNDER THE RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS AND NEGOTIATING AUTHORITY THAT WILL BE POSSIBLE UNDER MY PROPOSAL

The original Trade Agreements Act was passed in 1934. It has since been renewed seven times.

The authority conferred on the President is subject to certain basic limitations: No duty can be decreased or increased by more than 50 percent; no article may be transferred between the dutiable and the free list; the serious injury concept is included in both the *peril point* and *escape clause* provisions; the act is not permanent legislation, and must be renewed, and thus reviewed periodically.

In the period from 1934 to 1947, when the GATT was negotiated, the United States entered into 29 bilateral agreements. In 1947, agreements were in effect with the following

Tariff schedule	United States dutiable imports, 1949		Reduction in rates from Jan. 1, 1945, to Aug. 1, 1951	Remaining reduction authority
	Thousands	Percent		
1. Chemicals, oils, and paints	\$78,451	34	16	
2. Earths, earthenware, and glassware	59,461	32	18	
3. Metals and manufactures of	338,414	28	22	
4. Wood and manufactures of	97,551	38	12	
5. Sugar, molasses, and manufactures of	345,179	31	19	
6. Tobacco and manufactures of	75,337	41	9	
7. Agricultural products and provisions	484,893	22	28	
8. Spirits, wines, and other beverages	89,560	55	6	
9. Cotton manufactures	22,649	22	28	
10. Flax, hemp, jute, and manufactures of	141,755	42	8	
11. Wool and manufactures of	234,209	25	25	
12. Silk manufactures	21,477	44	6	
13. Manufactures of rayon or other textile synthetic	7,233	44	6	
14. Papers and books	21,399	35	15	
15. Sundries	223,359	21	29	
Free list taxable	454,419	0.5	49.5	

Although the remaining reduction authority as shown in the table, for some categories of goods, seems still to have some scope, experts have expressed the view that not a great deal of negotiating room remains. The principal area for a new agreement having a substantial effect on United States rates is apparently with Japan. The averages given in the table do not necessarily represent an accurate picture of bargaining scope: (1) Many individual rates have been lowered more than the average for the category in which that rate is included might show; and (2) in the nature of things, it is those individual rates which attach to articles of primary interest to the foreign exporter which will have been negotiated already to a point below the category average. Thus, the more important the item to the exporting country, the more likely (in the absence of a serious injury finding) it is to be already at a rate less than the average.

27 countries: Argentina, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Ecuador, El Salvador, Finland, France, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Iran, Luxembourg, Mexico, the Netherlands, Paraguay, Peru, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, the United Kingdom, Uruguay, and Venezuela. Agreements with Czechoslovakia and Nicaragua were not in effect. The effective agreements involved, on a 1939 basis, reduction or binding of rates of duty on almost 70 percent of dutiable imports.

The 1945 renewal imposed the 50-percent limitation on rates in effect in 1945, rather than on the basis of 1934 rates. This permitted further rate reductions, the exact amount being in each case dependent on what had previously been done on a specific rate.

In 1947, the GATT was negotiated with 22 other countries. When the GATT was enlarged at the Annecy negotiations in 1949 and the Torquay negotiations in 1951, it came to include 34 contracting parties. Of these, 13 of the most important out of the 27 bilateral agreements in effect in 1947 were terminated or suspended when the GATT went into effect. Most of our trade agreements are thus incorporated into GATT.

The effects of our trade negotiations are partially shown by the reduction in ad valorem equivalent of United States duties on dutiable imports from 25.8 percent in 1934 to 13.3 percent in 1951. Averages are misleading, however, since high tariffs exclude imports, and since these averages are based on imports. There are, for example, 492 rates in our tariff which still exceed 50 percent ad valorem. These imports, perhaps mostly because of these high rates, account for only 2 percent of our total dutiable imports (1949 figure).

Given the 50-percent limitation and the negotiations which have already taken place, the following table indicates the negotiating scope still left to the United States without regard to the *peril point* or *escape-clause* provisions:

United States dutiable imports, 1949	Reduction in rates from Jan. 1, 1945, to Aug. 1, 1951	Remaining reduction authority
Thousands	Percent	Percent
\$78,451	34	16
59,461	32	18
338,414	28	22
97,551	38	12
345,179	31	19
75,337	41	9
484,893	22	28
89,560	55	6
22,649	22	28
141,755	42	8
234,209	25	25
21,477	44	6
7,233	44	6
21,399	35	15
223,359	21	29
454,419	0.5	49.5

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference the bill which I have been describing, and ask that it be printed at this point in the RECORD. It is very brief.

There being no objection the bill (S. 2138) to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, to repeal certain provisions of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. KEFAUVER, for himself and other Senators, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc. That this act may be cited as the "Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1953."

SEC. 2. The period during which the President is authorized to enter into foreign-trade

agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended and extended (19 U. S. C., sec. 1351), is hereby extended for a further period of 3 years from June 12, 1953.

Sec. 3. Sections 3 and 4 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, approved June 16, 1951, are hereby repealed.

Sec. 4. Section 4 of the act entitled "An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930," approved June 12, 1934, as amended (19 U. S. C., sec. 1354), is hereby amended by striking out the matter following the semicolon and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "and before concluding such agreement the President shall seek information and advice with respect thereto from the United States Tariff Commission, the Departments of State, Agriculture, Commerce, and Defense, and from such other sources as he may deem appropriate."

Sec. 5. The provisions of subsection (b) of section 516 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (19 U. S. C., sec. 1516), shall not apply with respect to any article of a class or kind which is named or described in any obligation undertaken by the United States in a foreign-trade agreement entered into under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U. S. C., sec. 1351).

Sec. 6. The President is authorized to suspend the application of section 5 or section 11 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951 in the case of any country, when he finds that such action will contribute to the establishment of international good will or promote the cause of world peace.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF JAMES L. GUILMARTIN TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Thursday, June 18, 1953, at 10 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of James L. Guilmartin, of Florida, to be United States attorney for the southern district of Florida, vice Herbert S. Phillips, retired. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of myself, chairman, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF ARTHUR WILBUR CROCKER TO BE ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Tuesday, June 23, 1953, at 10 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Arthur Wilbur Crocker, of Maryland, for the position of Assistant Commissioner of Patents. At the indicated time and place all such persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of myself, chairman, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF NOGI A. ASP TO BE EXAMINER IN CHIEF OF THE PATENT OFFICE

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Tuesday, June 23, 1953, at 10 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Nogi A. Asp, of Washington, as Examiner in Chief of the Patent Office. At the indicated time and place all such persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of myself, chairman, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF WILLIAM COZART CALHOUN TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Tuesday, June 23, 1953, at 10 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of William Cozart Calhoun, of Georgia, to be United States attorney for the southern district of Georgia. At the indicated time and place all such persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of myself, chairman, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF EDWIN R. DENNEY TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, EASTERN DISTRICT OF KENTUCKY

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Tuesday, June 23, 1953, at 10 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Edwin R. Denney, of Kentucky, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Kentucky, vice Claude P. Stephens, term expired. At the indicated time and place all such persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of myself, chairman, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF WILLIAM F. TOMPKINS TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Tuesday, June 23, 1953, at 10 a. m., in room 424, Senate

Office Building, upon the nomination of William F. Tompkins, of New Jersey, to be United States attorney for the district of New Jersey, vice Grover C. Richman, resigning. At the indicated time and place all such persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of myself, chairman, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF J. JULIUS LEVY TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, MIDDLE DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Tuesday, June 23, 1953, at 10 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of J. Julius Levy, of Pennsylvania, to be United States attorney for the middle district of Pennsylvania, vice Arthur A. Maguire, resigned. At the indicated time and place all such persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of myself, chairman, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF JOHN W. McILVAINE TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, WESTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Tuesday, June 23, 1953, at 10 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of John W. McIlvaine, of Pennsylvania, to be United States attorney for the western district of Pennsylvania, vice Edward C. Boyle, resigning. At the indicated time and place all such persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of myself, chairman, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF GEORGE H. BOLDT TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE, WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Tuesday, June 23, 1953, at 10 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of George H. Boldt, of Washington, to be United States district judge for the western district of Washington, vice Charles H. Leavy, retired.

At the indicated time and place all such persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of myself, chairman, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF LAUGHLIN E. WATERS TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Tuesday, June 23, 1953, at 10 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Laughlin E. Waters, of California, to be United States attorney for the southern district of California, vice Ernest A. Tolin, elevated. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of myself, chairman, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF JOSEPH P. WILLSON TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE, WESTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Tuesday, June 23, 1953, at 10 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Joseph P. Willson, of Pennsylvania, to be United States district judge for the western district of Pennsylvania, vice Owen M. Burns, deceased. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of myself, chairman, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF BYRON H. CARPENTER, TO BE EXAMINER IN CHIEF OF THE PATENT OFFICE

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Tuesday, June 23, 1953, at 10 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Byron H. Carpenter, of Maryland, as Examiner in Chief of the Patent Office. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of myself, chairman, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF JOHN STRICKLER TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, WESTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Tuesday, June 23, 1953, at 10 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of John Strickler, of Virginia, to be United States attorney for the western district of Virginia, vice Howard C. Gilmer, Jr., term expired. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of myself, chairman, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

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

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

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

Addresses delivered by him to the 1953 graduating class of the University of Southern California on June 13, 1953.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

Address delivered by Senator GILLETTE before Pennsylvania Federation of Democratic Women at Erie, Pa., on June 9, 1953.

By Mr. MARTIN:

Address delivered by him before the National Convention of Building Owners and Managers at Pittsburgh, on Thursday, June 11, 1953.

Editorial entitled "Why Isn't Our Foreign Aid Paying Off?" published in the Philadelphia Inquirer of June 12, 1953.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

Address delivered by him at the International Convention, United Hatters, Cap, and Millinery Workers Union at New York on June 9, 1953.

Address delivered by him at the United Jewish Appeal National Action Conference, held at the Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C., on June 6, 1953.

By Mr. WILEY:

Excerpts from addresses delivered by Senator MUNDT and Hon. George N. Craig at the luncheon of the All-American Conference to Combat Communism, held in Washington, D. C., on May 23, 1953.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT:

Address delivered by Ambassador G. L. Mehta, of India, at the Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C., on Wednesday, May 20, 1953.

Editorial entitled "Mr. Eisenhower at Dartmouth," published in the New York Times on June 15, 1953.

By Mr. MUNDT:

Article entitled "Even the Neighbors Kill Weeds," written by Carl W. W. Sorenson and published in the Farm Journal for July 1953.

By Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska:

Editorial entitled "The Bricker Amendment: More Important Than Ever," published in the Morning World-Herald of Omaha, Nebr., on June 11, 1953.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

Resolution adopted by the Young Democrats of Medford, Mass., and five editorials published by New England newspapers dealing with the economic problems of New England.

By Mr. THYE:

Editorial entitled "Europe Farm Editors Miss Their Butter," published in the Washington Post of June 12, 1953.

Editorial entitled "Wisely Spoken," published in the St. Paul Pioneer Press of June 11, 1953, dealing with the President's speech before the National Junior Chamber of Commerce in Minneapolis.

Article entitled "Attacks on Eisenhower Falling To Hurt Him," written by Frank R. Kent, and published in the Washington Sunday Star of June 14, 1953.

By Mr. GORE:

Editorial entitled "MAYBANK Sets Them Straight," published in the Nashville Banner of June 13, 1953.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

Letter from Hammond Fowler, chairman of the Tennessee Railroad and Public Utilities Commission, to various railway and public utility commissions, with reference to the Tennessee Valley Authority.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

Essay entitled "What the American Marine Means to My Community," written by Miss Joan Tanzer, of St. Paul, Minn.

By Mr. PURTELL:

Statement prepared by him relative to the 100th anniversary of the founding of the Aetna Life Insurance Co.

By Mr. BUTLER of Maryland:

Editorial entitled "The Star-Spangled Banner—In Commemoration," published in the Sunday Sun, of Baltimore, on June 14, 1953.

FOLDING OF SPEECHES FOR SENATORS

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, in connection with the exchange of remarks I had with the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] on the floor on Thursday, June 11, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the body of the RECORD a statement of the facts in the case, substantially as I summarized them in a press release I issued on the same day.

I also ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a letter I have addressed to the superintendent of the folding room of the Senate, a copy of which I have also sent to the chairman of the Rules Committee and the ranking member of the committee. I suggest that this letter be given consideration by the Members of the Senate since it raises questions of both procedure and policy in which all Members of the Senate must be interested as it involves factors affecting the proper and efficient discharge of the work of the Senate.

I also ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a news article which appeared in the New York Times on Friday, June 12, reporting on the debate and the entire incident of the folding room.

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

JUNE 15, 1953.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HERBERT H. LEHMAN IN REGARD TO SENATOR McCARTHY'S FLOOR CRITICISM

Senator McCARTHY on Thursday, June 11, clearly illustrated what creeping McCarthyism means. Because I have attacked McCarthyism—not Senator McCARTHY as an individual but rather what he stands for—he undertook in a Senate speech on Thursday to attack me, personally. He charged me with trying to defraud the Government

by mailing under my senatorial frank 100,000 copies of a speech which, he said, the Government had refused to accept or to mail.

The truth is of quite another color. The only true thread in Senator McCARTHY's tissue of fabrications is that I had made a speech in New York, entitled "Creeping McCarthyism." I made that speech but did not insert it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as, of course, I could have. I had it printed by a commercial firm, paying for the cost of the printing and thus sparing the Government Printing Office this burden. The copies were routinely delivered to the Senate folding room which advised my office—I myself never heard about it—that the folding room would not fold the speeches and insert them in envelopes because it was not a congressional reprint.

This surprised my staff since the folding room has been doing this kind of work for my office and all other senatorial offices for a long time. However, since the folding room took this position in this case, my office arranged to do the folding outside the Capitol, with the cost of this work to be personally paid by me. I was unaware of this development when Senator McCARTHY took the floor on Thursday to make his unsubstantiated charges.

At no time was any question raised concerning my right to send these speeches out under my frank. This is not, of course, within the jurisdiction of the folding room. Nor have I ever heard any question raised by the Post Office Department or by anybody else concerning my right, or any Senator's right, to send his speeches out, under frank, to his own constituents. I routinely send out my speeches to my constituents in exactly the same manner that most Senators send out weekly reports of their activities. This is part of my job of reporting to my 15,000,000 constituents.

One fact more: instead of 100,000 copies of that speech, there were only 18,000. I wish it had been 100,000, but my mailing list, unfortunately, is only 18,000.

Senator McCARTHY is up to his old tricks—smear, innuendo, and multiple untruths. Because I attacked McCarthyism, he attacks me. It is brash of him to try to question my personal honesty, but he is brash enough to try anything. I will compare my personal honesty with his, any time, any place.

Senator McCARTHY cannot intimidate me. I hope that I can help to keep Senator McCARTHY from intimidating the American people.

I find Senator McCARTHY's attack especially audacious because only last year the Post Office Department was trying to collect from Senator McCARTHY a sum of money for mailing, under his franking privilege, a considerable number of commercial advertisements for a book he wrote. I am advised that he sends out a weekly newspaper column under his frank, and I do not know what other material. But I do not begrudge him that privilege, if it is granted him by the Post Office Department.

But that is not the real issue. The real issue is whether Senator McCARTHY can browbeat those who dare to criticize his methods, who do not agree with his shocking procedures. I will match not only my honesty but also my Americanism and my record of public service against Senator McCARTHY and let the people decide who is best serving the public interest.

I shall continue my fight for freedom of thought and of expression, regardless of Senator McCARTHY.

JUNE 15, 1953.

Mr. JOHN T. CHAMBERS,
Superintendent, Folding Room,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAMBERS: In regard to the incident which occurred within recent days in-

volving the availability of the folding room for the folding and insertion into envelopes of copies of a speech I had made and which I had directed be sent to individuals in New York on my mailing list, I have some observations and some questions.

As I understand it, my office was advised that the folding room would not fold these particular reprints because they were not in the form of a CONGRESSIONAL RECORD reprint. This ruling by the folding room was not brought to my personal attention. However, as a result of the debate which took place on the floor of the Senate on Thursday, June 11, I inquired into the facts.

As you know, my office sought at first to arrange to pay for the folding of these reprints in view of the ruling that you could not fold them, in the usual way, as part of the service available to all Members of the Senate. Subsequently, my office arranged to have these reprints folded outside the Capitol. I understand that you ruled that the folding room was permitted to handle only congressional reprints, official Government documents, and other matter directly concerned with the business of the Senate. I do not, of course, know in detail the rules under which the folding room is operated. I am reciting the substance of the ruling as I understood it from members of my staff and from reading the newspapers.

I would be much obliged if you would advise me exactly what the rules in question are. I would certainly want to abide by them. However, I raise the question of what is the criterion in judging what material is related to the business of the Senate. Is it your opinion that a speech delivered by a Member of the Senate, even though it be delivered outside the Senate, but which deals with issues which are before the Senate, is not part of the business of the Senate? If such is your ruling, in what class would you consider press releases issued by individual Senators and the mimeographed or printed reports which many Senators send periodically to their constituents, as well as other material reflecting a Senator's personal views which are not expressed on the floor or in committees of the Senate?

As I said, I want to abide entirely by the rules of the Senate in this as in other matters. If you will advise me what the rules are, I will be glad to conform, but I certainly feel that the application of these rules should be reasonable and uniform in their interpretation.

I would appreciate an early reply to this inquiry. I am sending copies of this letter to the chairman and the ranking member of the Rules Committee for their information.

Very sincerely yours,

HERBERT H. LEHMAN.

McCARTHY, LEHMAN IN SENATE BATTLE—NEW YORKER, ACCUSED OF ABUSE OF FRANKING, SAYS CHARGE IS INTIMIDATION ATTEMPT
(By Clayton Knowles)

WASHINGTON, June 11.—Senator HERBERT H. LEHMAN, Democrat, of New York, charged an attempt at intimidation today as Senator JOSEPH R. McCARTHY, Republican, of Wisconsin, attacked him on the Senate floor for "rather gross abuse" of the free mailing privileges accorded Members of Congress.

Mr. McCARTHY maintained that the New Yorker had been denied the franking privilege when he sought to send out 100,000 copies of a pamphlet entitled: "Creeping McCarthyism—Its Threat to Church, School, and Press."

As emphatically, if not as loudly, Mr. LEHMAN retorted that the charge was "entirely unsupported by facts" and that it was made "in exactly the pattern and with the same motive that has been followed by the Senator from Wisconsin for a long time."

"The pattern and the intention is to intimidate, to frighten, to call off all those who are in disagreement with him," declared Mr.

LEHMAN, who has long criticized the methods employed by Mr. McCARTHY.

Mr. LEHMAN said he was not easily intimidated and drew further assurance from long public service which he said had made him "very certain of his position, at least with regard to the sincerity of his position."

"I have no apology to make," he said, "for pointing out to the people of the country the great threat to their freedoms which has come through the efforts, and I am sorry to say the partially successful efforts, of certain people in this country to silence those who oppose the group that wishes to impose complete conformity and complete orthodoxy on every thought and every action in this country."

Mr. LEHMAN dealt in only the most general terms with the precise charge made by his political foe because, as he said later, he did not then know of the details of the matter. He did not deny, however, that he planned to use his frank in mailing the pamphlet which, in its entirety, consisted of a speech he made at the New York State Democratic Committee dinner at New York on April 29.

He said he considered it the duty of every Senator to inform his constituency as widely as possible of threats to their interest.

While Mr. McCARTHY professed some uncertainty about whether 100,000 copies of the pamphlet were to be distributed under frank, he did say that the Senator's (Mr. LEHMAN's) office sent down 100,000 franked envelopes, but they refused to send out the material.

Mr. LEHMAN replied that, if any mailings were made, he was sure it was not more than a small fraction of the number stated.

CHALLENGES EXCHANGED

During the bitter exchange between the two men, Senator McCARTHY repeatedly challenged his colleague to call his office and find out precisely how many copies were to have been mailed. Just as often, Mr. LEHMAN said he would make a complete disclosure of how he has used the frank during his 4 years in the Senate if Mr. McCARTHY, in turn, would do the same.

"I will accept any offer the Senator wants to make if he will tell me how much illegal use he has made of the franking privilege," said McCARTHY.

Mr. LEHMAN denied any illegality was involved and a subsequent check at the Senate folding room—Mr. McCARTHY kept calling it the mailing room—disclosed that the New Yorker was correct.

Joseph E. Baldasaro, foreman of the folding room, reported that the material Mr. LEHMAN sought to mail was not actually denied the frank. All that he refused to do was to fold the material and insert it in envelopes.

OFFICIAL DUTY EXPLAINED

Only official Government documents, such as farm bulletins, or reprints of matter that has appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD can be inserted by this Senate agency. For this reason, it was explained, Senators or their staffs must fold and insert correspondence even though that mail later goes out under the frank.

Mr. Baldasaro said he reported the situation at 9 a. m. this morning to his superior, John T. Chambers, folding room superintendent, who supported the preliminary ruling. Mr. Baldasaro then informed Senator LEHMAN's office of the change.

The foreman said no franked envelopes came with the pamphlets which were in the thousands but not in the tens of thousands.

"How did Senator McCARTHY learn about the matter?" a reporter asked. Mr. Baldasaro, obviously uncomfortable, was silent.

Mr. Baldasaro and other folding-room employees, however, said they had no knowledge of the sampling of the kinds of mail Senators were sending out.

Earlier, Mr. McCARTHY, explaining his knowledge of the LEHMAN incident to re-

porters, said he had ordered a 1-day sampling to be used to obtain facts with which he could discuss the \$1,700,000 added to the post-office deficit from use of the frank. He said he always had considered that dead-head mail carried under the frank should be charged up to Congress or the appropriate executive department or agency.

Sometime later, Mr. LEHMAN had a somewhat different explanation of how Mr. McCARTHY came by his knowledge. He said he had learned that a member of Mr. McCARTHY's personal staff had been stopped as he sought clandestinely to take a copy of the pamphlet from the folding room.

Did you mean steal, the Senator was asked, and he replied: "I'd say 'steal,' yes."

The Senator was able to say then that the proposed mailing came to 18,000 pamphlets, which he had printed privately "at a cost in excess of what it would have been to him if he had first inserted the speech in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and then had it reprinted by the Public Printer."

CONTROL OF NATURAL GAS PRICES

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the State of Wisconsin has been in the forefront of the battle to protect the consumers of our nation against arbitrary increases in natural gas rates. Such increases have done tremendous harm in feeding inflationary pressures. Wisconsin has battled through the courts for the right of the Federal Government to prevent gouging of consumers.

In this connection, there appeared in the May 28 Milwaukee Journal an editorial regarding the recent court of appeals decision affirming the right of the Federal Power Commission to control independent producers of natural gas.

On the same day there appeared in the Washington Evening Star a column on the same issue. It brought to the attention of its readers the very appropriate comments made by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] who has been in the forefront of those seeking to protect consumers. The Senator from New Hampshire has not hesitated to speak out on this, as on so many other issues, with his great moral courage, his frankness, and his devotion to the public interest.

I send to the desk the text of the editorial and article and ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the body of the RECORD, at this point.

I earnestly hope that the fight which Wisconsin has waged so devotedly will now result in final success for 160 million American consumers.

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

[From the Milwaukee Journal of May 28, 1953]

NATURAL GAS REGULATION GAINS

Ordinary common sense certainly supports the United States Court of Appeals finding that the Phillips Petroleum Co. is operating as a natural gas company when it sells gas for Wisconsin to the Michigan-Wisconsin Pipeline Co.

The same common sense supports the court's decision that, as a natural gas company, the price Phillips charges to pipelines for gas is subject to regulation by the Federal Power Commission. The findings are, of course, subject to appeal to the United States Supreme Court.

The only thing that should surprise anyone about the court of appeals decision is that it should have been necessary to have it.

When Wisconsin's attorney general's office and public service commission asked the FPC 2 years ago to rule on the reasonableness of rates charged the Michigan-Wisconsin Pipeline Co. by Phillips, it seemed perfectly clear that the FPC had jurisdiction—and the duty to act. It was very clear to the oil companies which owned the natural gas fields—for they were busy getting Congress to take prices charged pipelines out of the jurisdiction of the FPC. It took a Presidential veto to block it.

But the FPC, weakened by congressional refusal to approve any members who might stand up to the oil companies, held long hearings to determine whether it had any power to regulate the gas rates.

The Wisconsin attorney general, Milwaukee's city attorney's office, and representatives of other Midwest cities to which natural gas was piped, argued that there could be no doubt of the FPC's power. They pointed out that it made no sense whatever to have States regulate consumer prices and the Federal Government regulate pipeline prices if the initial price of gas went unregulated. It would be like trying to drive a 3-horse team with only 2 harnesses.

The FPC's final finding that it had no jurisdiction over the initial price of Phillips' gas because Phillips was not a natural-gas company was astounding. It made natural-gas price regulation meaningless. It put the consumer at the mercy of the gas producer.

It is to the credit of the city and the State that they carried their fight into Federal court and won reversal of the FPC decision.

[From the Washington Star of May 28, 1953]
MORE ABOUT THE PRICE OF GAS—WHY CONSUMERS REMAIN UNPROTECTED AGAINST RISING RATES; FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION REFUSES TO FOLLOW LAW

(By Lowell Mellett)

In cities and towns all over the country consumers of natural gas have become accustomed to having the rates increased from time to time. Usually this happens after the local gas company has demonstrated to the satisfaction of the local regulating body that rising costs of one kind and another have made the increased rates necessary. Some of these claims are sometimes disputed by the local regulators, but there is one they cannot dispute. That is the wholesale cost, the price at which the gas enters the pipelines, the price the distributing company pays and passes on to the local gas companies. And this, more than anything else, determines what domestic and industrial users are compelled to pay.

Senator TOBEY, Republican, of New Hampshire, discussed these wholesale prices in a Senate speech this week.

"Prior to the war (World War II), natural gas was sold freely at 2 cents a thousand cubic feet," he said. "Today the average price runs from 6 to 10 cents a thousand cubic feet. And during the past year or so many contracts have been written at a rate of 15 cents, with a few in recent months at 20 cents. I cannot believe that costs of production have risen to such a degree as to justify these radically increased prices."

The Senator could not discuss the justification offered by the wholesalers for their prices, for the wholesalers offer no justification—not to the public, at least. They do not have to. In this respect they are not regulated by the States from which they take the gas nor by the Federal Government. Actually the Federal Power Commission has full authority to act, according to the courts. In a clear and positive opinion written by Judge Henry W. Edgerton, the United States court of appeals reaffirmed this last week, saying, "The Commission should fix the rates at which these sales are made."

Whether the Commission will continue to insist on its impotence remains to be seen.

By refusing to exercise its authority, it is defying the law, as interpreted several times by the Supreme Court.

In 1924, in the days of "the nine old men," the Supreme Court held that the States cannot regulate these rates, saying they are "an inseparable part of a transaction in interstate commerce—not local, but essentially national in character." It said, however, "The contention that, in the public interest, the business is one requiring regulation, need not be challenged. But Congress thus far has not seen fit to regulate it and its silence, where it has sole power to speak, is equivalent to a declaration that that particular commerce shall be free from regulation."

Which left the consumer holding the sack for the time being. But in 1938, Congress did act, putting the Natural Gas Act on the books. The Public Power Commission followed the law, putting a curb on what it found to be excessive prices in a number of cases. The Supreme Court sustained the Commission and upheld the constitutionality of the act.

The gas producers went to Congress and in 1950 succeeded in obtaining the passage of what was known as the Kerr bill. This would have given them the freedom from control they had previously enjoyed. The legislative battle was bitter, but the gas producers won, 176 to 174 in the House, 44 to 38 in the Senate. President Truman vetoed the bill and no effort was made to pass it over his veto. Instead, the producers fell back on the Power Commission, in which there had been some changes in membership, and the Power Commission gave them what they desired—immunity from regulation.

What the Commission will do in the face of the court's rebuke isn't known. The guessing in Washington is that it will attempt to stall until another attempt to pass a Kerr bill has been made. The stalling would take the form of a Supreme Court appeal, although the Court's views already are known.

AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on Saturday morning, June 13, it was my pleasure and privilege to address the State Republican Convention in Madison, Wis. I spoke on the issue of supporting the foreign policy of the Eisenhower administration and giving to the President of the United States and the great team which serves under him our all-out support.

On that occasion, among other things, I said that the people of America elected Ike Eisenhower to the highest office in our land. As I recall, in all the States but two Ike Eisenhower ran ahead of other Republican nominees.

I believe that the message to us is clear: If the Republican Party wants to remain in power after the 1954 election, it must support the President and his program.

Already, a propaganda line is being used by the Democrats. It says: "If you want Eisenhower's program carried on, you should elect Democrats." In other words, the Democrats sense that the people do back Eisenhower's program and it remains to be seen whether we Republicans will sense their support of that program.

I earnestly hope that we shall give the President our all-out support.

He is a great captain. He has with him in the White House a great team, including the able assistant to the President, Sherman Adams, and his staff. They are working night and day under the most staggering of burdens. They

are trying to find paths which will be the best for our country.

They deserve our support and our understanding.

We elected Ike Eisenhower. Let us now help him fulfill the mandate we gave him.

Mr. President, at the convention, I spoke at noon; and then the Governor of the State of Wisconsin spoke. At no time was anything said about my position on the proposed Bricker amendment to the Constitution. I had to catch a plane, in order to return to Washington, and then to leave for Atlantic City, where I had an engagement on Sunday.

After I had returned to Washington, on Sunday morning, I heard on the radio that a resolution condemning me had been introduced in the convention condemning my position against the Bricker amendment. Certainly it was not cricket to wait until after I had gone and then introduce the resolution without my having a chance to make clear my position. If those who engineered this deal wanted to condemn my position, they should have told me so and given me a chance to reply. Wisconsin citizens are noted for fairness. Was this stiletto attack fair? I shall have more to say about that matter to my constituents later.

I said nothing in my speech about the Bricker amendment. I was given 15 minutes to speak. No one told me what was in the air, except one chairman said "the same old gang is priming a candidate against you."

Mr. President, I now send to the desk the text of the speech I made; it will show what was said. I ask unanimous consent that my speech be printed in the body of the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

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

THE CHALLENGES TO THE REPUBLICAN PARTY

It is a great privilege to address this outstanding convention.

It is an honor to appear before you again with so many of our fine Wisconsin Republican leaders. It is a pleasure, particularly to welcome the great chairman of the Republican National Committee, Len Hall.

Because of your very crowded program, I am going to confine my remarks principally to one subject—the foreign policy of the Eisenhower administration.

You all know how dynamic this subject is. You know how much news events overseas are—at this very moment—affecting that policy, particularly, events in Korea.

Here at home, there are, of course, a great many crucial issues of a domestic nature—the tax burden, balancing the budget, assuring preparedness, combating subversive forces, strengthening the Taft-Hartley law—on which I would have liked to submit views.

But, because time is so limited, let me mention just a few particular points on the foreign policy issue and on one item of domestic policy.

BASIC ESSENTIALS OF FOREIGN POLICY

Let me first, however, say that we Republicans—whatever our few differences—are agreed on most of the essentials of our foreign policy.

We know that such policy must basically fulfill one great need—the first law of nature, America's self-preservation.

We know that we must prevent the Soviet Union from succeeding in her strategy of

divide and conquer. This means preventing her from taking over:

1. The vital materials of the world. Here on this continent we have but 9 of the 60 basic materials that we need for defense, in adequate supply.

2. To prevent the Soviet Union from taking over the vast manpower of Western Europe.

3. To prevent her from taking over the tremendous know-how, the technical skills, the factory production of Western Europe.

All this is needed for our own self-preservation.

As the President said in his Minneapolis speech Wednesday night, we are engaged in a military struggle, an economic struggle, a political struggle, a scientific struggle, an intellectual struggle, and a spiritual struggle for the soul of man.

In all this world, the United States is the greatest single remaining source opposing the drive of world communism.

The choice before us is—surviving or perishing beneath that Red drive.

The danger today is the greatest in our history.

We know that the United States cannot and must not be lulled into sleep by the present so-called Soviet "peace offensive."

Even if an enduring armistice should come in Korea, the restless drive of world communism is far from halted. It will go on so long as there are vacuums which it will want to fill.

As chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, reports come to me daily of new Communist threats.

Here at home, in our newspapers, day after day, you in this great audience, read the reports of these threats—exploding in all parts of the globe—military, economic, political, and basically, ideological threats.

BADGER REPUBLICANS HAVE BEEN ALERT

Down through the years, the Republican Party of Wisconsin and of the Nation can be proud of its record of pointing out the growing danger of communism in engulfing Asia.

We can be proud of our record in alerting the American people to the dangerous beachheads which communism has established right here—in the Western Hemisphere—in Guatemala and British Guiana, for example.

The fact that our country still has enormous problems there, as well as in the Middle East, in Africa and elsewhere throughout the world—is merely proof of the critical situation which the previous administration had left us.

WISCONSIN FARM PROBLEM CRITICAL

Before turning to certain details of the foreign policy story, I should like to make a particular point regarding one major domestic problem.

I want to reemphasize a fact of which this audience is keenly aware, namely, the very serious problem which is faced by the great dairy industry of Wisconsin and the Nation.

I have taken up the dairy industry's critical problems, as I know other members of the Wisconsin delegation have—again and again—with the Department of Agriculture.

I will continue to do so, because the dairy crisis—the serious decline in the farmers' milk check, while his expenses have risen—this crisis is not simply a farm problem.

It goes to the heart of the entire prosperity of our Wisconsin economy—the prosperity of labor, of industry, of white collar people, in town, village, or city.

You and I know that the farm market is the greatest single market on the American scene.

If that market is impaired, its loss in purchasing power will quickly be felt throughout the entire remainder of our economy.

And in my foreign relations capacity I know how quickly the loss of American farmers' purchasing power is felt throughout the entire globe.

The Republican Party has rightly pointed out, of course, that the decline in farm prices is not new. It began long before the Eisenhower administration was voted into office.

Since coming into office, the administration has given its most serious consideration to the problem. It has had at work the best people—the best brains—it can mobilize in Government and from private industry—in order to meet this problem head on.

THE MESS WE INHERITED

And, in pointing out that the farm problem is a holdover from the previous administration, let this fact be noted:

The Republican administration, which has been in office less than 6 months, inherited a far bigger mess, a far worse problem, than even we had envisioned last year.

And so, in our natural desire—yours and mine—to see quick, concrete results of the Republican changeover, let us bear in mind the enormous difficulties we face. I refer to the difficulties of the Republican Party in both the legislative and executive branches of the Government—in trying to straighten out the situation—in trying to clear it up and clean it up—within the brief months in which we have been in power.

We've faced a staggering \$267 billion national debt; a 2 1/2-million-man payroll; \$80 billion in unpaid, c. o. d. obligations; mountains of redtape which have had to be slashed.

We've faced the task of moving out of office all levels of un-Republican-minded policy personnel and rescreening other personnel.

The plain fact of the matter is that, since a new security officer was appointed, over 5 dozen individuals have been dismissed from the State Department alone as security risks.

Well now, what about the policies of the State Department? What about our international relations?

ADMINISTRATION HAS MADE MUCH PROGRESS IN FOREIGN POLICY

The answer is that the Eisenhower administration has made great progress in improving these relations.

It has taken the initiative.

It has dramatically interpreted to the world America's effort for peace.

President Eisenhower's great address challenging the Soviet Union to take concrete actions leading to peace, was a tremendous psychological stroke for the cause of freedom.

In it, as you will remember, the President indicated that, so far as we are concerned, we would infinitely prefer not to have to devote so much of our resources to armaments. We would prefer to turn our appropriations to more constructive purposes.

Meanwhile, behind the Iron Curtain, the Eisenhower administration has kept afire the hope of liberty. It has told the enslaved peoples that we are not abandoning them; that we have not forgotten their plight.

In Asia, the administration wisely removed the 7th United States Fleet as a shield from the Chinese Communist mainland.

In the Middle East, it has taken important steps to encourage friendlier relations with the many peoples there who are stirring restlessly in nationalism.

The Eisenhower administration has, moreover, strengthened our European alliance. It has emphasized the importance of each of the European allies doing whatever it could for itself, without over-relying upon Uncle Sam.

We all realistically recognize that there is, of course, no single cure-all solution to our foreign-policy needs. We cannot wave a magic wand and solve all the diverse problems facing us on all the continents.

THE ALTERNATIVE TO OUR LEADERSHIP

We can, however, continue to exercise strong leadership.

We can play our crucial role at this critical hour of history—avoiding both the danger of overcommitting our resources, on the one hand, and failing to assume our just obligations for leadership, on the other hand.

The alternative to American leadership is Soviet leadership.

If we do not furnish a clear light for guidance to the world, then it will look to the murky light which comes from Moscow.

If we do not commit our great moral strength toward keeping the world free, then we can be sure that the fanatic, atheistic strength of world communism will fill the vacuum.

This is the critical alternative we face all along the line.

WHAT WE WILL NOT DO

We are not, of course, going to try to make the world over though we are going to, where possible, make it better.

We are not going to assume that Uncle Sam's resources are inexhaustible, because, we know they are definitely limited.

But we are going to bear our part of the burdens, to maintain a world at peace.

And we are going to keep America strong, prosperous, and free.

We are going to fight un-American forces at home of any and every type—be they Communist or Socialist.

We are going to try to keep the dollar intact, rather than have it lose further its purchasing power.

We are going to keep our institutions strong—to maintain each of the three separate, equal, and coordinate branches of Government unimpaired.

This is the challenge to the Republican Party, and I know that we are going to be adequate to that challenge.

REPORT ON OVERSEAS INFORMATION PROGRAMS (S. REPT. NO. 406)

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, I submit a report on the investigation conducted by the Special Committee on Overseas Information Programs, and I ask unanimous consent that I may make a brief statement in connection with the report.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received and printed; and, without objection, the Senator from Iowa may proceed.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, the report carries the unanimous approval of the Special Committee on Overseas Information Programs and also of the Foreign Relations Committee, the latter having authorized submission of the report.

The special committee was first created by Senate Resolution 74 of the 82d Congress, 2d session, and was continued by Senate Resolution 44 of the present Congress.

Under the resolution creating the special committee, the Foreign Relations Committee, or a subcommittee thereof, augmented by two Members of the Senate outside of the Foreign Relations Committee, was instructed to conduct an investigation into the operation of the United States overseas information programs and to make a report. The special committee has been operating for approximately 9 months; and in addition to the hearings last fall, it conducted an on-the-spot investigation in most of the areas of the world where our information service operates, with the exception of the American Repub-

lics. This investigation is contemplated for later this year.

Since January 3 of this year, extensive hearings have been held on various phases of this program; and eight different staff studies have been developed by the special committee, in addition to the final report.

The 8 staff studies are included with this semifinal report, and I shall ask unanimous consent that they be printed as a report, in 1 volume, rather than in 9 volumes.

Mr. President, the report refers to these various studies; but I want to call special attention to the value of staff studies No. 6 and No. 7, which contain an analysis of reports from a large number of American correspondents overseas and of reports received from the representatives of business and religious organizations, who are represented in most parts of the world.

The committee has attempted a broad examination of the information program, so far as its purposes and accomplishments are concerned. We have attempted to point out the weaknesses and the strength of this operation. I shall not burden the Senate at this time by repeating the details which are contained in the report itself.

The committee expects to complete its inspections of our foreign information activities by an on-the-spot examination of the program in the American Republics, as soon as the press of congressional business will permit.

Mr. President, I desire to take this opportunity to express my appreciation to the other members of the special committee, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], for their zeal and cooperation in this study, and especially to the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the former chairman of the special committee, who, as the author of the highly successful Fulbright scholarship program, has brought historic interest and great zeal to the investigations.

I also desire to express special appreciation to the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], the authors of the Smith-Mundt educational program, which has been a great success. Because the committee is convinced of the essentiality of the United States information program, efficiently and artfully conducted, the committee has sought to explore methods of strengthening this program, and we hope that our studies will be of some benefit.

Mr. President, I now send the report to the desk, together with the eight staff studies, and ask that they be printed, in their final printing, as a one-volume report.

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

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa yield to me?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. I wish to ask the Senator from Iowa whether, as a result

of the study of the information program, the committee has been able to ascertain its effectiveness upon the people behind the Iron Curtain.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. We have ascertained its effectiveness in a limited way, as the report will show. We believe that one of the weaknesses of the program is the lack of machinery to evaluate properly the effect of the program. We believe such machinery can, without too much difficulty, be set up, so that not only the effectiveness of the program can be better evaluated, but better programs, as a result of such examination, can be artfully devised.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa yield further to me?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. Does the Senator from Iowa believe the program has had any effect in causing, among people behind the Iron Curtain, disaffection with their Communist governments?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. In my own personal opinion it has had effect. It is also my personal opinion that it has not had the effect it should have had or should have in the future. But it has had substantial effect, and I believe that is the opinion of every member of our committee.

Mr. WATKINS. Does the Senator from Iowa believe the program has had substantial influence upon the flight from behind the Iron Curtain of citizens and residents of those countries?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. There is a very substantial amount of evidence to the effect that persons have come from behind the Iron Curtain, seeking haven in the free world as the result, especially, of radio broadcasts.

Mr. WATKINS. Does the Senator from Iowa believe the program has been effective in that field?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. It has been effective. Again I wish to say there are plenty of defects in the radio program. It has not been as effective as I believe our American talents are capable of making it. We believe it can be made far more effective, which is a worthy objective, provided it is more artfully operated.

Mr. WATKINS. Would the Senator from Iowa regard the rather large number of persons who are passing into West Berlin from East Berlin as one of the effects of the program?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I would consider the program as having a great influence on that movement, especially Radio RIAS, in Berlin, which is a part of this program, and is being operated by American establishments in Germany. Radio RIAS is not specifically operated by the information program directly, but in conjunction with our information program.

Mr. WATKINS. Did the committee go into the question of what is being done with the persons who flee from behind the Iron Curtain or who are expelled?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. We touched on that matter collaterally. We touched on it by noting that not sufficient effort is being made to give information to many of such persons, and we think more effective devices should be developed to give them some indoctrination as to what

the free world really means and what its objectives actually are.

MR. WATKINS. Did the committee investigate the question as to whether such persons are being screened as they come either into West Germany or into Berlin?

MR. HICKENLOOPER. No. That was considered to be outside the functions of the committee. The field was already large, and the committee had no occasion, for purposes of investigation, to seek other fields which were really outside the reasonable limits of the functions of this committee.

MR. WATKINS. I may observe that my reason in asking the Senator these questions is that a subcommittee of which I am chairman has the problem of taking care of many of the escapees and expellees, and it may be of help to us to have this information. The activities of the Senator's committee should be helpful all the way through.

MR. HICKENLOOPER. Our committee did not specifically go into many of those details. We were considering the question primarily in its overall concept, endeavoring to find the major and fundamental weaknesses of the program, rather than to go into details within a particular area, in an effort to ascertain what was wrong in a given country. We believe that the administration can correct weaknesses of that kind.

MR. WATKINS. I thank the Senator for the information he has given. I appreciate his courtesy.

MR. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

MR. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, if the Senator from Iowa will yield to me for a moment, let me say that I am aware, of course, that he obtained unanimous consent to make a brief statement, and I am not raising any point about that. I should like, however, to ask the cooperation of Senators in expediting the business of the Senate. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, according to which we are now operating, there is general limitation of 2 minutes for discussion. We have the agricultural appropriation bill ready, and we desire to bring up that bill. If we are to get an adjournment by the 31st of July, we shall have to follow pretty closely the legislative program. I do not raise an objection, but I ask that, if possible, discussion be limited to the customary period of 2 minutes.

MR. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I may say it would distress me, indeed, if this little colloquy should delay adjournment, or postpone it beyond the 31st of July. I now yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

MR. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, as one of the coauthors of the Smith-Mundt bill, and as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, I simply wanted to express my appreciation to the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] and to his committee for the work he and his colleagues have done in connection with this matter. I feel that they have made an outstanding contribution to the ultimate effectiveness of what we had in mind when the bill was originally passed. I simply wanted to express my appreciation to the Senator from Iowa, to the Senator from Arkansas [Mr.

FULBRIGHT], and to the other members of the committee for the great job that they have done.

MR. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I wish to say a few words in connection with the report just submitted by the Senator from Iowa, and about the work of the committee. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks an editorial entitled "Our Information Services," published in today's New York Times.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

MR. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I have been a member of the Special Committee on Overseas Information Programs since its inception and served as chairman of the committee for the first several months of its existence during the 82d Congress. However, for most of the period of the committee's active work the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] has served as chairman while I have been one of the members.

MR. President, I take genuine pleasure in paying tribute to the chairman, the Senator from Iowa, for the fine manner in which he has conducted the work of this committee. In the direction of the staff, in presiding over hearings, and in guiding the committee in its deliberations the chairman has been completely fair, forthright, and impartial. To my knowledge, there has never been a single complaint or criticism from any witness—and we have had many of them—or from any observer about the manner in which the hearings have been conducted. We have sat through many hours of hearings and executive sessions together—some of them dull and tedious, others stimulating and rewarding—but on all occasions the chairman has been patient, considerate, and completely objective. The conduct of the Senator from Iowa of this committee can well be studied as a model for others to follow.

I believe the constructive recommendations of this committee and the manner in which its work was conducted will do much to enhance the prestige and dignity of the Senate in the eyes of the people. This achievement is all the more impressive when one considers the nature of the subject matter of this inquiry. Information, propaganda, and cultural relations concern a field of activity which is extremely difficult to evaluate and to understand even by those who specialize in it and yet it is one of those subjects about which nearly everyone has preconceived opinions. So, again I say the Senator from Iowa deserves our gratitude for a superb performance as chairman.

The field of overseas information and education in which the committee has done its work is extremely important, one of the most important of all our international programs. It is one in which there have been great, and even violent, differences of opinion as to approach and method. There is a great opportunity and temptation for the advocacy of quick and easy solutions and pat formulas. As a nation, we are relatively inexperienced in these programs, and because of the nature of our Government and our people it is, perhaps, more difficult for us

to carry on such programs than for any other people.

As a people we are inclined to be too frank and outspoken on many occasions and we are far too impatient in our approach to problems which, by their nature, require a long period of persuasion and education and a readjustment of established patterns of thought and conduct.

As I see it, the problem is how to influence foreign opinion and actions in a direction favorable to the attainment of our international objectives. It ought to be admitted that this is an infinitely complex matter. In political life in this country, we see great diversities in the character and methods used by political figures in influencing people. In part, of course, the methods used will vary in accordance with the types of persons to whom the appeal is addressed. Some groups will respond more readily to an appeal to their emotions, and other groups, with more experience and education, respond more easily to appeals to their reason.

In addition, the methods used to influence opinion will vary according to the type of person or nation making the appeal. Thus the Communists were able to use methods—just as Hitler and Goebbels could—which we could not successfully use, even if we so desired, because of the different character of our Government. The Communists, with some success, can make use of constant repetition by mass media, of overt and blatant propaganda, with little or no regard for the truth. This approach is a vital part of the monolithic structure of Communist organization. But it depends fully as much for its success upon the other elements of that structure—as, for example, secret police, concentration camps, suppression of opinion, force, threats, and all the other paraphernalia of the totalitarian state. Communist propaganda then becomes an essential element of the doctrine that its victim is not to think for himself, indeed, that it is not necessary or desirable that he do so.

Totalitarian propaganda is merely another manifestation of the denial of freedom—it is not designed to persuade, but to overpower. Entirely aside from our own unwillingness to engage in this type of propaganda, and the moral questions involved, it is very doubtful that we could do it successfully. It is so obviously inconsistent with what we stand for, that it would not be credible or persuasive to those who know us slightly, or to those with whom we are most concerned, who have similar traditions and cultures.

The approaches to this problem which seem to be most effective for our purposes are those which are less overt and blatant, less designed to overpower by volume and repetition—which are more subtle, more designed to appeal to reason and to contribute to knowledge, understanding and identity of interest; and which, therefore, take full cognizance of the individual characteristics of the country and the people concerned.

These approaches are not distinguishable simply by the media used, although I believe they have much meaning for the methods by which the media

are used. To give a simple example: A French-made movie favorable to our viewpoint is usually more effective upon a French audience than an American-made one. This example can be multiplied many times in all channels of communication or information.

I do not maintain that the report which our committee has issued contains the answers to all the problems involved. I do say that I believe it is worthy of careful consideration by the administration and the Congress; and I again wish to express my appreciation to the Senator from Iowa for his leadership, fairness, and his many hours of patient endeavor throughout the committee's work.

I also wish to acknowledge a fact which I think is evident in the report of the committee and which also reflects credit upon two other members of the Senate who happen to be Republicans. It will be noted by those who read the report that no recommendations for changes in the basic legislation of the program are recommended. It will be recalled that most of the basic legislation for the overseas information and education programs was sponsored by the distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] and the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] and that it is known as the Smith-Mundt Act. I think it is a tribute to the foresight and to the sound work of these Senators several years ago that, after such an exhaustive study by this committee, we believe that the basic legislation was not only soundly conceived but has withstood the test of time.

EXHIBIT 1

OUR INFORMATION SERVICES

A special committee of the Senate has now submitted its report on the information services of the United States after almost a year of careful study and first-hand investigation. This report is not a smear on anyone. It is a thoughtful job, and its findings will be, and ought to be, received thoughtfully.

One big criticism stands out. There has been a lack of coordination among departments that has led to duplication at home and confusion abroad. President Eisenhower has already taken some steps to meet this in his recommendations for reorganization. There is still much work to be done in this field. There has been, and presumably still is, a considerable amount of waste, partly in the matter of overstaffing and partly in the matter of bad choice and use of materials. An attack on this sort of thing is always difficult, since any arbitrary cut in funds leads immediately to the complaint that muscle instead of fat is being taken away. But unless a large number of sincerely devoted persons are willing and able to go after the fat and get rid of it no other recourse is available.

A large part of our information and intelligence services is the product of improvisation. This necessarily involves a considerable amount of trial and error, and the error has been unavoidable. Some of the errors have been extremely costly—and not merely in money. A more accurately used intelligence service would have avoided some of the tragedy in Korea. A better information liaison could probably have eased some of the present tension. Those are lessons that we have had to learn from experience—and experience can be a hard teacher. The important thing however, is that we learn.

The adverse aspect of the committee's report will undoubtedly be used as ammunition by those who wish to make large cuts in our appropriation for information and intelligence services. The committee itself, it should be noted, has not made such recommendations. It has done a workmanlike job of looking over a large and complex field of activity and it offers no blanket proposals. Because of this we should be careful of jumping to quick conclusions and of using one or another of the committee's findings out of context to push a cause or plead a special case. We will not solve the whole problem by making a simple reduction in appropriation or by a single step in reorganization of function.

If we lived in an ideal, or even a considerably better world there would be no need for such a thing as national propaganda. Our deeds ought to, and could, speak for themselves. We do not, however, live in such a world, and we face the constant assault of a conspiracy against all our cherished liberties. This makes it necessary for us to retaliate in self-defense. It makes it possible, also, for us to take the initiative and to go beyond defending ourselves against malicious distortion of act and motive into the honest preaching of the values to which we are dedicated. This is not only a responsibility but an opportunity.

It is noteworthy, in this connection, that the committee found the person-to-person approach, such as that involved in the exchange of teachers and scholars, one of the most effective media. This is not surprising, however, when the matter of information is viewed in the light of this exchange on the basis of moral values. It is possible for individuals to sustain this emphasis in a way that cannot, unfortunately, be often achieved in a broadcasting program or a news service. There is, as yet no substitute for face-to-face contact in establishing human understanding, although the committee wisely recommends the further exploitation of television possibilities.

In this connection there is the further opportunity, that does not appear to have been stressed by the committee, of closer integration of our own information and intelligence operations with those of friendly countries. The Senators will doubtless agree that there are many cases in which we have thus far made inadequate use of the services of good friends and staunch allies. We always have the tendency to think that what we do here may be better than what could be done by a non-American in another country. This feeling has sometimes betrayed us into substituting an American "slickness" for a simpler and perhaps profounder approach. On matters of that sort we need the constant counsel of our non-American friends.

We have every reason to welcome the Senate committee's study of our problem. We can profit by the findings and can do a better job because of them. We can probably save money and, much more important, we can use our resources more effectively.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I should be less than human if I were not grateful for the Senator's very kind words about me, but I feel that they are undeserved. The Senator from Arkansas was chairman of the committee in the last Congress, and set a most eminent pattern for procedure. I can only say that the committee could proceed as it did only because of the zeal and earnestness of its previous chairman and the other members of the committee and the pattern which had been

established. I merely attempted as chairman to follow the rules and to carry on the work which had been, if I may quote, "so nobly begun." Nevertheless, Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Arkansas for his courtesy and thoughtfulness.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I appreciate the kind words of the Senator from Iowa, but I want to emphasize that the nature of the subject matter of the inquiry was one of the most difficult and most elusive with which Congress has had to deal. I can assure the Senator from Iowa that I was not paying him an idle tribute. I think he did a magnificent job in handling the matter, as he did, because it could get out of hand very easily.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I wish to express my appreciation of the very gracious statements of the Senator from Arkansas concerning the work done by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] and myself in connection with the Smith-Mundt Act. I wish to associate myself, also, with his words of commendation of the chairman, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER].

Likewise, Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the comments of the Senator from Iowa concerning the preceding chairman of the committee, the Senator from Arkansas. I can say as a member of the committee who served on it, both in the Democratic Congress and in the Republican Congress, that when the time came, in the inevitable course of human events, that the chairmanship changed from the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] to the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], there was no change in the conduct of the work. We continued to approach the problem purely in a non-partisan manner. It was not a bipartisan effort; it was a nonpartisan effort to get at the truth, in the hope that the fact the program had undergone some very merited criticism would not be a reason for circumscribing its future or sabotaging its success. I am hopeful that before we vote on the appropriation for this very important feature of our peace program, all the Members of the Congress will read the report, and, in conformity with the dictates of their own consciences, will vote a reasonable and adequate amount of money, so that this program, which is constantly being corrected and improved, may continue to try to bring about world peace in which we are all so devoutly interested.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from South Dakota for his remarks. I know he has made a great contribution to the whole program in the past several years, and I hope the Senate will follow his advice in regard to the appropriation.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I happen to be a member of the Special Committee on Overseas Information Programs and am still a member of the subcommittee, and I wish to join in everything complimentary which has been said about the Senators who have been chairmen, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], who is now chairman, and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT].

who was formerly chairman. They have both done a grand job. Both went forward in their work studiously, without fanfare, seeking to find the facts and the truth.

I have been privileged to serve as a member of this committee from its inception, and I may say that it has conducted a most thorough and constructive investigation. Its methods have been at all times impartial and exemplary. It has heard criticisms and suggestions from hundreds of witnesses both inside and outside the Government, in this country and abroad. And it has weighed the accumulated evidence and documentation in a most responsible and judicial manner.

The report of the special committee, which the chairman has presented today, outlines in a clear and forthright manner the principal weaknesses which have hampered the overseas information program. The constructive recommendations of the report point the way to far-reaching and lasting improvements. It shows how we can take the static out of the Voice of America and speak to the world in the clear and vibrant tones of liberty and peace.

We must so speak out, for we are engaged in a worldwide contest for the minds and hearts of mankind. The message of freedom, must get through to peoples in all lands.

If the recommendations of this committee are followed by the executive branch, the story of America and what it stands for will flow out to all the world more intelligibly and more effectively than ever before.

But we must not make the mistake of believing that an official information program is the only channel through which other peoples hear of this country and form their opinions of our policies and our beliefs. No matter how effective the information program may become, a far greater impact is created abroad by what we do as individuals and as a nation. A speech on the floor of the Senate, a law passed by the Congress, a policy pronounced by the President, all of these can create lasting impressions abroad about America.

I remember, Mr. President, that the Polish youth who was in the gallery a week or so ago told some of us about the President's speech and how it affected him. At that time he was employed in the service of the Kremlin, but he fled from that service. He said the speech went through the minds of all who heard it and gave them faith and hope for the future.

These are times when a special responsibility rests on all of us. We must speak and act with a full awareness of the potential effect that our words and deeds will have on the foreign relations of our country.

Once again, I wish to express my admiration for the careful and thorough manner in which the senior Senator from Iowa has conducted this investigation. I hope that he will be able to report to the Senate a few months from now that the recommendations of his special committee are being applied and are having a constructive effect on our overseas information program.

INTERNATIONAL CLAIMS COMMISSION

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to make a statement concerning the International Claims Commission for not to exceed 6 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Illinois is recognized for 6 minutes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, a matter regarding one of the smaller commissions of the Government has come to my attention, which I think deserves to be called to the attention of the Senate.

The International Claims Commission was established in the Department of State in 1950 by Public Law 455. This Commission has jurisdiction to receive, examine, and render final decisions with respect to claims of American nationals arising out of the nationalization or other taking of property by foreign governments where an agreement for the settlement en bloc of such claims has been made. Two such settlements have been made, one with Yugoslavia, the other with Panama. This International Claims Commission is a quasi-judicial body. The act creating it specifies in section 3c, that members of the Commission may be removed "upon notice and after hearing, for neglect of duty or malfeasance in office, but for no other cause." Congress therefore intended it to be a quasi-judicial body, nonpolitical in nature, which would be independent of the President, and which was placed in the Department of State for purely housekeeping reasons. The United States District Court for the District of Columbia, and the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit, have both held it to be such a quasi-judicial body. Yet this quasi-judicial body is apparently to be forced out of business, and the reasons therefor need to be examined.

In 1950 the International Claims Commission undertook an investigation of a former employee of the Department of State. The investigation disclosed that this employee in the Office of the Legal Adviser of the Department of State had been in charge of all work of the Department regarding claims of Americans arising out of the nationalization of their property by Yugoslavia. He was the person who testified for the Department in advocating the passage of the law creating the International Claims Commission. He was familiar with the work the Commission would have under its jurisdiction.

After the appointment of the members of the International Claims Commission this employee resigned from the Department of State and opened a law office in Washington. The Commission then charged him with unethical conduct in that he solicited claimants whose claims he had reviewed while in the Department of State, and in acting contrary to the canons of the American Bar Association. At the hearing before the Commission it was established that this employee represented claimants with claims totaling \$14 million. If he had been successful in obtaining payment, his share might have risen to \$1,400,000.

He was found guilty of unethical conduct by a majority of the Commission, and forever disbarred from practicing before it. He appealed to the Secretary of State, and the Secretary affirmed the Commission. He brought suit in the United States District Court, which affirmed the Commission, and only a few days ago the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia likewise affirmed the Commission. Thus, we have the majority members of this quasi-judicial body insisting upon a high ethical standard in Government affairs.

Now, how is such action to be rewarded? Is it because the Commission took these steps against a former employee of the State Department that no request for a budget for fiscal 1954 for the operations of the Commission has been made by the State Department? They said a request would be made at a later date. Failure to obtain an appropriation, which, incidentally, is no burden on the taxpayer, as the act provides for deductions from awards to defray expenses, will stop the important work of this Commission, and force it out of business on June 30 of this year. This is important, because such a stoppage will eliminate a court where Americans can seek compensation for property which has been taken from them. It is also important because it will be a failure on the part of our Government to fulfill its obligations under solemn agreements with foreign countries. Finally it is important because it will raise grave problems as to the rights of these foreign countries, under these solemn agreements, to get back the funds created by them, and thus will diminish the amounts available for the payment of American claims.

Or could the reason possibly be—and I advance this as a question, not as a statement—that the administration is seeking the death of this Commission for political patronage? Is it seeking to do indirectly what the statutes prevent it from doing directly? Is it seeking to oust from a quasi-judicial office persons who have set a high standard in public office solely so that they can be replaced by party appointees? Is it seeking to circumvent the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in the Humphrey case, which held that a quasi-judicial officer cannot be replaced by the President? I hope this is not the case, since many of the claimants before the Commission are friendly to this administration, and are also represented by firms which are in an even closer relationship.

Some explanation of the action of the administration should be forthcoming as to why the International Claims Commission is being so treated. I hope that an allowance for administration based upon a percentage of the claims in question may soon be passed by Congress, and the work of the Commission continued.

CAPT. JOY BRIGHT HANCOCK, UNITED STATES NAVY

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be permitted to speak for not to exceed 3 minutes,

so that I may pay fitting tribute to a retired naval officer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from New Jersey may proceed for 3 minutes.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, the United States Navy has recently retired one of its most distinguished members, and we in the Senate would be more than remiss if we were to let this event pass without adding our words of commendation.

The distinguished naval leader of whom I speak is a lady who, for a period of time embracing two world wars, has been making her presence felt wherever the women of the Navy gather.

As a civilian, as an enlisted woman, and as an officer, Capt. Joy Bright Hancock, of my own great State of New Jersey, has served the Nation and the Navy with honor and distinction.

Captain Hancock retired on June 1, 1953, as Director of the Women's Reserves of the United States Navy, a post which she held from July 26, 1946, to the date of her retirement.

Captain Hancock saw the Navy in all of its aspects over her long career of praiseworthy service, and it was fitting that she be at the helm in 1948 when the title was changed from the familiar one of WAVES—or Women Appointed for Voluntary Emergency Service—to the enduring title of the Women's Reserve of the United States Navy.

Mr. President, Captain Hancock received two signal honors on her retirement. First, she was awarded the Legion of Merit as a resourceful and inspiring leader. Secondly, she was made the incarnate symbol of the women of the Navy as the subject of an oil portrait presented to Vice Adm. James L. Holloway by Artist David Komuro.

It is my understanding, Mr. President, that the portrait of Captain Hancock, representing not only this distinguished New Jersey lady, but all the proud women of our Navy, now hangs in Admiral Holloway's office.

I first became acquainted with Captain Hancock when her distinguished father was president of the New Jersey Senate. I remember the occasion of the tragic death of her second husband, a Navy commander, who was lost in the crash of the U. S. S. *Shenandoah* on September 3, 1925. He was the second husband Captain Hancock was to lose in an air tragedy.

Captain Hancock is a very distinguished New Jersey woman, and I am very happy to have the opportunity to pay her this inadequate tribute.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a summary of Capt. Joy Bright Hancock's illustrious career in the service of her country.

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

CAPT. JOY BRIGHT HANCOCK, UNITED STATES NAVY

Captain Hancock was born in Wildwood, N. J., on May 4, 1898. She attended high school in Wildwood; George Washington University and the Crawford Foreign Service School, both of Washington, D. C.; the Pierce

School of Business Administration, Philadelphia, Pa.; and the Paris branch of New York School of Fine and Applied Arts, Paris, France. She had flying instruction at the Henry Berliner Aviation School, Washington, D. C.

As a yeoman (F), first class, United States Naval Reserve Force, in 1918, Captain Hancock was on duty at the New York Shipbuilding Corp. yards at Camden, N. J., and later as chief yeoman (F), she was attached to the United States Naval Air Station at Cape May, N. J. She was mustered out of the service in September 1919, and subsequently became a civilian employee at the Naval Air Station, Lakehurst, N. J.

From 1934 until the fall of 1942 she was in charge of the editorial and research section of the Navy Bureau of Aeronautics and special assistant to the Chief of that Bureau. On October 15, 1942, she was commissioned lieutenant, Women's Reserve, United States Naval Reserve, and was promoted to the rank of lieutenant commander November 26, 1943; to commander March 5, 1945; and to captain July 26, 1946. On October 15, 1948, she was sworn into the regular Navy, with the temporary rank of captain, and the permanent rank of lieutenant commander.

On October 24, 1942, Captain Hancock became Women's Reserve representative for the Bureau of Aeronautics and for the Deputy Chief of Naval Operations for Air. She was transferred to duty on February 25, 1946, as Assistant Director (plans) of the Women's Reserve, and on July 26, 1946, she assumed duty as Director of the Women's Reserve of the United States Navy, in the rank of captain.

For outstanding performance of duty from October 24, 1942, until October 23, 1945, she received a letter of commendation, with authorization to wear the Commendation Ribbon, from the Secretary of the Navy, as follows:

"For outstanding performance of duty as the Women's Reserve representative in the Bureau of Aeronautics and later special assistant for the Women's Reserve to the Deputy Chief of Naval Operations (Air), from October 24, 1942, to October 23, 1945. Discharging with zeal, leadership, and judgment her many responsibilities, Commander Hancock assumed an important role in the development, expansion, and administration of the comprehensive program designed to integrate women in the naval service and utilize their various skills. Maintaining close liaison with the office of the Director of the Women's Reserve, she aided in formulating policies governing the Women's Reserve and has worked with activities in the Bureau of Aeronautics and the Bureau of Naval Personnel on the details of women's training and assignment and in the development of their welfare and recreational facilities. Her recommendation concerning living standards and working conditions of naval shore establishments in this country and Hawaii were essential factors in the increased efficiency of Women's Reserve members in these activities. Commander Hancock's ability, zeal, and devotion to the fulfillment of her tasks were in keeping with the highest traditions of the United States naval service."

On October 15, 1948, Captain Hancock was one of the first eight women sworn into the Regular Navy of the United States, under the Women's Armed Service Integration Act of 1948. At that time she was assigned duty as an assistant to the Chief of Naval Personnel, in the temporary rank of captain, and is serving as an adviser to the Chief of Naval Personnel on Women's Affairs.

In addition to the Commendation Ribbon, Captain Hancock has the Victory Medal, for service during World War I, and is entitled to the American Area Campaign Medal and the World War II Victory Medal.

Captain Hancock has been married twice. Both her husbands were naval aviators, and

both died in the crash of dirigibles in which they were serving. Her first husband, Lt. Charles G. Little, recipient of the Navy Cross, was killed when the ZR-2 crashed over the Humber River, England, in August 1921. Her second husband, Lt. Comdr. Lewis Hancock, Jr., lighter-than-air pilot and also holder of the Navy Cross for World War I service in a submarine, died in the crash of the U. S. S. *Shenandoah* on September 3, 1925.

The U. S. S. *Lewis Hancock* (DD 675), destroyer named in honor of the late Lieutenant Commander Hancock, was christened by Capt. (then Lt.) Joy Bright Hancock when the vessel was launched on August 1, 1943. The *Lewis Hancock* was commissioned September 29, 1943.

Captain Hancock has contributed many articles on aviation and related subjects to Our Navy, Flying and Popular Aviation, Aero Digest, Popular Mechanics, Sportsmen Pilot, and other publications.

THE HELLS CANYON PROJECT

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, at the request of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], who is now returning from Portland, Oreg., I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a letter sent to President Eisenhower on June 12 by 101 representatives of farm groups, business organizations, organized labor, and power consumers in the Pacific Northwest. The letter protests the administration's scuttling of the Hells Canyon project and urges that representatives of the Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, and the Department of Agriculture oppose the partial plan submitted by the Idaho Power Co. before the Federal Power Commission. I further request that the names of the signatories and the organizations they represent also be printed.

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

HON. DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
President of the United States,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We, the representatives of organized labor, farmers, and power consumers in the Pacific Northwest, take the liberty of addressing you from an extraordinary regional meeting in Portland, Oreg.

We respectfully submit to you that abandonment of the Federal high dam at Hells Canyon on the Snake River in Idaho would be one of the most colossal blunders ever committed by any administration, for the following reasons:

1. The junking of the reimbursable multi-purpose Hells Canyon project means the junking of the whole comprehensive development program for the Columbia River and its tributaries as outlined in the Corps of Engineers' "308" review report of 1948.

2. It means abandonment of a broad integrated plan and substitution therefor of a shortsighted piecemeal method, which would render unfeasible several downstream projects, would reduce the potential power capacity of the region from 33 million to 15 million kilowatts, would eliminate the possibility of harnessing these rivers for adequate flood control, irrigation, navigation, and other watershed conservation functions.

3. It would delay and possibly prevent maximum development of phosphate ore resources which constitute an estimated 60 percent of the Nation's known deposits of phosphates for fertilizer purposes. Development of these reserves depends primarily on availability of low-cost electricity from Hells Canyon. It is vitally important that

these phosphate resources be fully exploited in view of our rapidly growing population and the need of fertilizers at reasonable cost to increase production of food supplies.

4. Failure to treat the Columbia River and its tributaries as a unit would forever prevent the Pacific Northwest region from achieving its full destiny as a balanced economy, a market for goods, a source of tax revenue, a self-supporting entity, or its maximum contribution to national defense.

5. Separation of future land reclamation from the financial aid of electric power development means a blackout for our maximum utilization of water on land, which is vital as a means of providing room for our fast-growing population.

6. There is no substitute project for Hells Canyon, nor is either Mountain Sheep or Nez Perce site lower on Snake River a substitute for Hells Canyon storage potential. No storage site can be sacrificed in the comprehensive program. Mountain Sheep or Nez Perce Dam would merely supplement Hells Canyon and not substitute for it.

In addition, we protest strongly the idea of abdicating to an absentee controlled private power monopoly the priceless river sites belonging to the people of the United States on the pretext that Congress has not yet authorized the Hells Canyon project. Such a policy means, in effect, that private power may seize all remaining river sites merely by exerting enough political pressure to delay congressional action for their development, or by proposing spite dams at potential public power sites. This is exactly what the private power companies are doing.

We contend that the rights of the people are paramount to those of any private utility company. It is not necessary to abandon the Hells Canyon site in particular because the Idaho Power Co. has available to it numerous other sites which it can develop for power purposes.

We therefore urge you with all the earnestness at our command that you recommend intervention by the United States Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation and the Department of Agriculture before the Federal Power Commission in opposition to the granting of the license requested by the Idaho Power Co. for development of the Oxbow dam site.

Albert C. Ullman, chairman, Idaho-Oregon Hells Canyon Association, Baker, Oreg.; Elmer McClure, president, Oregon State Grange, Portland, Oreg.; Ed Weston, president, Washington State Federation of Labor, Seattle, Wash.; Henry Carstensen, master, Washington State Grange; Elmer McIntire, executive secretary, Idaho State Federation of Labor, Boise, Idaho; Chester Dustin, director, Oregon Congress of Industrial Organizations, Portland, Oreg.; J. T. Marr, president, Oregon State Federation of Labor, Portland, Oreg.; Owen Hurd, president, Northwest Public Power Association, Prosser, Wash.; Vincent Cleaveland, chairman, Clark County Public Utility District, Vancouver, Wash.; Chauncey Price, president, Washington Public Utility District Association, Carsen, Wash.; J. G. Moeller, vice president, Oregon Farmers Union, Portland, Oreg.; George H. R. Taylor, secretary-treasurer, Idaho-Oregon Hells Canyon Association, Boise, Idaho; Kirby Billingsley, vice president, Columbia River Development League, Wenatchee, Wash.; Graham Dolan, special representative, International Union of Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers; P. C. Spowart, Seattle City Light, Seattle, Wash.; R. R. Gatiss, Montana Statewide Electric Cooperative Association, Kalispell, Mont.; H. D. Rolph, Sr., vice president, National Farmers Union, Portland, Oreg.; George Lackman, president, Montana Statewide Electric Cooperative Association, Billings, Mont.; C. Girard (Jebby) Davidson, lawyer, Portland, Oreg.

Ted F. Berry, Washington Grange News, 3104 Western Avenue, Seattle, Wash.; Clar-

ence M. Carter, Union County PUD, Route 2, LaGrande, Oreg.; Amelia May Bateman, Hells Canyon Dam Association, Clarkston, Wash.; Harold Withrow, Buena Vista Farmers Union, Independence, Oreg.; Lee Wooden, Oregon Rural Electric Co-op Association; John E. Bunn, Klickitat PUD, secretary; White Salmon, Wash.; Less Jasslin, Portland, Oreg.; Harry Tupling, wholesale merchandise, Portland, Oreg.; Charles L. Hensley, precinct committeeman, Portland, Oreg.; R. L. Woolley, Electric Co-op Association, Hermiston, Oreg.; Phil Dyer, northwest region, American Veterans Committee, Portland, Oreg.; Howard Morgan, chairman, Democratic Party of Oregon, Monmouth, Oreg.; Don S. Willner, national committeeman, Young Democrats of Oregon, Corbett Building, Portland, Oreg.; John A. Rademaker, Oregon Farmers Union, 980 Shipping Street, Salem, Oreg.; William W. Widmer, Democratic precinct committeeman, 1125 Southeast 113th Avenue, Portland, Oreg.; Walter Wislow, Electric Union, 8014 North Swift Boulevard, Portland, Oreg.; Vuhrey Martin, Oregon State Building Trader, Portland, Oreg.; Glenn Torbelf, Warren Grange 536, Warren, Oreg.; Ralph Langdon, Chaman Grange, Scopopoe, Oreg.; Vilas L. Shepard, Clatskanie PUD (president), Clatskanie, Oreg.; W. R. Armstrong, chairman of SCS St. Maries, Idaho, Farmington, Wash.; George H. Bailey, chairman, Legislative Committee of Central Grange 276; Alden L. Bailey, manager, Clatskanie PUD, Clatskanie, Oreg.; Albert Niva, representing Morse Men, Tigard, Oreg.; James A. E. Olson, member 5246610, 3890 East 21st, Eugene, Oreg.; Frank R. Brown, Springfield Utility Board, box 638, Springfield, Oreg.; Joseph F. Murphy, Young Democrats, 909 Corbett Building, Portland, Oreg., and Ontario, Oreg.

A. C. Heyman, Farmers Union, Albany, Oreg.; G. A. Peters, commissioner, Lewis County, PUD No. 1, Box 331, Chehahs, Wash.; W. A. Hudelson, Idaho-Oregon Hells Canyon Association, North Powder, Oreg.; Raymond J. Beach, tax-freedom advocate, 7532 Syracuse, Portland, Oreg.; Virginia Nalbin, Progressive Party of Oregon, Portland, Oreg.; Ray Stauffer, chairman, State Progressive Party, 2780 Central Building, Eugene, Oreg.; Ada Niva, Washco Women's Club, Box 503, Tigard, Oreg.; Anna Keirsey, Tigard Grange 748, Box 622, Tigard, Oreg.; Richard M. Schaefer, Jr., IDHCA, Grange power committee, Farmers Union, Lewiston, Wash.; H. D. Rolph, Sr., vice president, Farmers Union, 1525 Southeast 41st Avenue, Portland, Oreg.; Earl Moore, Hood River Electric Co-op director, Route No. 1, Hood River, Oreg.; Preston Royer, Benton PUD, Prosser, Wash.; K. W. Gregg, Idaho Development Association, Nampa, Idaho; Clinton E. Sinclair, Joseph Chamber of Commerce, Joseph, Oreg.; Raymond Kell, Oregon State Grange, 2633 Northeast Meson Street, Portland, Oreg.; Kenneth J. Smouse, second vice president, Oregon Wheat Growers League, Ione, Oreg.; Henry Baker, Morrow County Pomona Grange, Ione, Oreg.; Oscar Peterson, director, Columbia Basin Electric Cooperative, Ione, Oreg.; Norman Haaland, member, 226, AFL, 2321 Southeast 26th, Portland, Oreg.; Oscar G. Gistad, president, Calapooia Farmers Union, Holley, Oreg.; H. R. Bristol, Farmers Union, Route No. 1, Newberg, Oreg.; B. Sasse, Chehalem Grange 780, Route No. 1, Newberg, Oreg.; Mrs. B. Sasse, Chehalem Grange 780, Route No. 1, Newberg, Oreg.; Mrs. Sue A. Bristol, legislative committee, Chehalem Grange 780, Newberg, Oreg.

Tom Bidder, IVOE Local 87, 4225 Southeast Ninth Avenue, Portland, Oreg.; Arch M. Sams, Cape Horn Grange, No. 70, State master, Skamania, Wash.; Dorothy A. Sams, Cape Horn Grange, No. 70, Skamania, Wash.; H. E. Nissen, Charter Oak Grange, No. 582, Vancouver, Wash.; Rolf Jemtegaard, Cascade Pomona Grange, Washougal, Wash.; Mr. and Mrs. Robb W. Casebeer, Evening Star Grange, Portland, Oreg.; Arthur Parrish, Fernwood Grange, Newberg, Oreg.; Howard

M. Crinklaw, Coos-Curry Electric Co-op, Coquille, Oreg.; Willard H. Johnson, Hood River Electric Co-op, Hood River, Oreg.; R. J. Thomas, Portland, Oreg.; Beulah Hand, consumer, 2515 10th Avenue, Milwaukee, Oreg.; Heye H. Meyer, Clark P. U. D., Route 5, Vancouver, Wash.; Joseph A. Ast, Clark P. U. D., Box 165, Camas, Wash.; O. G. Hittle, Cowletz Co. P. U. D., 1329 22d, Longview, Wash.; Walter Wells, Hood River Electric, Box 320, Hood River, Oreg.; C. R. McCoy, Hood River Electric, Parkdale, Oreg.; Lloyd Tupling, Hells Canyon Association, 1308 Warm Springs Avenue, Boise, Idaho; Mrs. Hub Howe, Hells Canyon Association, 537 Thain Road, Lewiston, Idaho; Herbert Howe, Nez Perce County Pomona Grange, 537 Thain Road, Lewiston, Idaho; Frank Carlisle, Fernwood Grange, No. 770, Springbrook, Oreg.; Lucile Kimble, Fern Hill Grange, No. 592, Goble, Oreg.; W. W. Kimble, Fern Hill Grange, No. 592, Goble, Oreg.; A. M. Larson, Carpenters Local 226, Portland, Oreg.; Byron C. Brinton, secretary, Hells Canyon Development Association, care Record-Courier, Baker, Oreg.; G. Lowell Fuller, Baker County Commercial Club, Baker, Oreg.; Lucille Flint, Farmers Union, Box 228, Salem, Oreg.; Gay Ginther, Better Pension Council of Oregon, Meldrum Avenue, Portland, Oreg.; Oscar Ingram, 510 Second Street, Lebanon, Oreg.; Lynn Tuttle, Asotin County Waterways Association, Box 168, Clarkson, Wash.; George Penkill, Asotin County Grange, No. 235, 571 NC 24th, Palter, Wash.; Ben Bulman, Oregon Grange.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATIONS, 1954

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 5227, and that it be made the unfinished business of the Senate. This is the bill making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture. I may say that the effect of this motion, if agreed to, will be to have the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill take the place of Senate bill 1946, which is at present the unfinished business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 5227) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes.

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, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I desire to propound a unanimous-consent request. I may say that I have discussed it with the distinguished Senator from North Dakota, chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. YOUNG], and also the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], who is the ranking minority member of the committee, as well as with other Senators on both sides of the aisle. The proposed unanimous-consent agreement follows the precedent which we have followed for several years past relative to a limitation on debate. I will read the request and then send it to the desk. It reads:

Ordered, That during the consideration of H. R. 5227, the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1954, no Senator shall

speak longer than 15 minutes on any amendment, motion, or appeal; and that on the bill itself, the debate shall be limited to a total of 3 hours, to be equally divided, and to be controlled by the chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] and by the minority leader, the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON].

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CARLSON in the chair). Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from California?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, does the proposed unanimous-consent agreement provide that all amendments shall be germane?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I believe the rule gives ample protection in that regard in connection with an appropriation bill. However, I shall be glad to include the provision if the Senator wishes. I believe the rule adequately covers the situation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that the rule expressly provides for germaneness of amendments.

Is there objection to the request?

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the Senator from Mississippi did not understand the Chair's statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair stated that amendments to appropriation bills must be germane, under the rule.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for a quorum call be rescinded, and that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARRITT in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I wish to proceed for not more than 10 minutes to explain the agricultural appropriation which now is before the Senate.

The bill as passed by the House of Representatives and sent to the Senate is a very good one, and thus our task in connection with the bill is much easier.

The bill provides funds to sustain the far-flung operations of the Department of Agriculture. Through this appropriations bill we must provide sufficient funds for the protection and conservation of the forests of the Nation, the grass, the trees, the bushes—in short, for everything that grows. We also must provide funds to protect the great livestock industry. This bill also appropriates funds to provide protection for the prices of agricultural commodities. The support program has lent great assistance to stabilizing agricultural prices in the United States, and has had a direct and beneficial effect upon the economy of the entire Nation.

At present we have an investment of more than \$127 billion in agriculture; it is one of the largest investments we have made.

Mr. President, it should be noted that approximately 30 percent or more of all agricultural appropriations are for items not directly associated with agriculture. Examples of such items are the school-lunch program, meat inspection service, and many others of a similar nature.

The bill provides overall appropriations of approximately \$57 million for the United States Forest Service. However, the total estimated receipts from the forests of the United States will be approximately \$76,900,000 in fiscal year 1954. In other words, approximately \$20 million more than is appropriated will be returned to the United States Treasury as a result of all forestry operations throughout the United States.

Mr. President, the bill contains some interesting items with respect to research. Our committee received testimony to the effect that for all industry in the Nation approximately \$2 billion is spent for research. Of that \$2 billion, the United States Government provides approximately 47 percent. In connection with agricultural research alone, the total expenditures amount to \$250 million. Of this amount industry is providing \$140 million, and \$110 million is divided approximately equally between the States and the Federal Government. This bill provides appropriations of approximately \$60 million for agricultural research.

At this time let me say a word about what research has accomplished, not only for agriculture, but outside that field. For instance, the patent on penicillin is owned by the Department of Agriculture. Since it is a Government patent, it is free for use by all the people of the United States. When penicillin was first produced, it cost approximately \$40 per 100,000 units. At the present time the cost, as a result of the research which has been conducted, has been lowered to approximately 3 cents per 100,000 units.

Let me say a further word about research. The Republican Party's platform has strongly urged that more funds be provided for research. That program has been urged for years by the Republican Party, and has also been urged by the Democratic Party. In a recent speech, President Eisenhower requested larger funds for agricultural research.

Mr. President, in response to telegrams from almost every farm organization in the Nation, most of which requested \$17 million of additional appropriations for research, our committee voted to add approximately \$1,500,000 of appropriations, to the amount voted by the House of Representatives, and another \$1,500,000 of appropriations for closely associated items in respect to control of insects, other pests, and plant diseases.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, in connection with my remarks, various telegrams which have been received from farm organizations and others, regarding research funds.

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

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., June 1, 1953.
Senator MILTON YOUNG,

Senate Office Building:

Sincerely appreciate your continuing efforts behalf agricultural research. Few in Congress appreciate as you do importance and needs this investments. If present grain crops our area should suffer from preventable causes, your position with growers would be greatly strengthened if you continue to lead fight for reasonable research funds. Am seeking support this program many other States. Does writeup of appropriation bill finish this week?

DON FLETCHER.

FARGO, N. DAK., May 29, 1953.
Senator MILTON R. YOUNG,

Senate Office Building:

As research appropriations for agriculture are crystallized, the membership of the North Dakota Farm Bureau as well as all North Dakotans aware of the meaning of research are vitally interested. We are deeply concerned that production research on small grains is underwritten adequately and first reports on allocations do not seem enough to deal with our problems, not the least of which is rust. If there is any way in which farm bureau can help you underscore our needs please call upon us. The need is crucial.

Regards,

P. J. DONNELLY,
President, North Dakota Farm Bureau.

WASHINGTON, D. C., June 4, 1953.
Senator MILTON R. YOUNG,

Senate Appropriations Committee,

Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.:

The American Farm Bureau Federation makes the following recommendation with regard to the agricultural appropriations bill:

1. That agricultural conservation payment authorization for the 1954 crop program be reduced from \$195 million, as passed by the House, to \$140 million and that funds be made available on the basis of need for non-recurring permanent soil conservation practices.

2. Recommend restoration of funds for research at least to the amounts recommended by the Department of Agriculture. Believe additional funds can be wisely used for research.

3. That appropriations for the Bureau Agricultural Economics be restored to that recommended by the Department of Agriculture.

4. Restore the administrative funds for the Federal extension service to that recommended by the Department of Agriculture in their budget estimate.

JOHN C. LYNN,

Legislative Director, American Farm Bureau Federation.

ATLANTA, GA., June 1, 1953.
Hon. MILTON R. YOUNG,

Senate Office Building:

Let me urge inclusion of \$17 million increase for research for agriculture. All branches of agriculture are greatly in need of further research as early as possible.

TOM LINDER,

Commissioner of Agriculture.

WAYCROSS, GA., June 1, 1953.
Hon. MILTON R. YOUNG,

Senate Office Building:

Please support \$17 million increase for agricultural research over last year. Also maintain nurseries.

Georgia District Supervisor

J. MARVIN STRICKLAND,

President.

ST. PAUL, MINN., May 29, 1953.

Hon. MILTON R. YOUNG,
Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.:

Your support of increased appropriation for agricultural research is urged.

H. MACY,

Dean, of the Institute of Agriculture,
University of Minnesota.

ATHENS, GA., May 30, 1953.

Senator MILTON R. YOUNG,

Chairman, Agricultural Subcommittee of Appropriations, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Earnestly request your committee to support \$17 million increase for research. This amount urgently needed for basic and applied research. Backlog of research findings is being rapidly depleted. Future progress will be determined on new research findings.

C. C. MURRAY,

Dean and Director, College of Agriculture.

MEMPHIS, TENN., June 1, 1953.

MILTON R. YOUNG,

Chairman, Agricultural Subcommittee of Appropriations, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Understand vote will be taken on appropriation for agriculture research at early date. Urge you to support \$17 million increase over last year. Many problems including poultry and livestock diseases and pink bollworm control require research for which funds not now available.

LIPPETT S. ELLIS,

Director, Arkansas Agriculture Experiment Station, Fayetteville, Ark.

GAINESVILLE, FLA., May 31, 1953.

Senator MILTON R. YOUNG,

Chairman, Subcommittee, Agricultural Appropriations, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Respectfully recommend full \$17 million increase Federal appropriations for agricultural research of which \$7½ million designated for grants to State experiments stations. Florida Legislature doing its part by this week increasing State research appropriations with ratio now over 11 to 1 of Federal grants. The additional Federal funds needed for more fundamental research.

WILLARD FIFIELD,

Director, Florida Experiment Station.

AUBURN, ALA., May 30, 1953.

Hon. MILTON R. YOUNG,

United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Earnestly urge your support for \$17 million increase for agricultural research.

E. V. SMITH,

Director, Alabama Agricultural Experiment Station.

ORONO, MAINE, May 30, 1953.

MILTON R. YOUNG,

Chairman, Senate Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations,
Washington, D. C.:

Urge support of \$7½ million increase in appropriation for agricultural research. Solution of agricultural problems severely handicapped by lack of adequate Federal support of State experiment stations. Total Federal funds to Maine station increased only 62 percent since 1940. This is less than one-half the 131 percent increase in index of prices all commodities bought by farmers which corresponds to cost of conducting agricultural research. Total agricultural appropriation of \$17 million needed to provide for increased research costs and some increased work on marketing and other current problems.

GEORGE F. DOW,

Associate Director, Maine Agricultural Experiment Station.

KNOXVILLE, TENN., May 30, 1953.

Hon. MILTON R. YOUNG,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

We respectfully ask your support of the request for an increase of \$17 million over last year's appropriation for agricultural research. Agricultural research lagging far behind research in other fields and our agricultural leaders in Tennessee are asking additional funds for experimental work.

J. H. MCLEOD,
Dean and Director.

BATON ROUGE, LA., May 30, 1953.

Senator MILTON R. YOUNG,
Chairman, Agriculture Subcommittee of Appropriations,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Louisiana will appreciate your committee's consideration of the item sponsored by the national farm organization for research.

W. G. TAGGART,
Director, Louisiana Agricultural Experiment Station.

STARKVILLE, MISS., May 30, 1953.

Senator MILTON R. YOUNG,
United States Senate,

Washington, D. C.:

Respectfully urge increase of \$17 million for agricultural research, \$7½ million for grants to States, and \$9½ million to USDA Bureaus. Research most important but almost completely neglected by House.

CLAY LYLE,
Director, Mississippi Agricultural Experiment Station.

MANHATTAN, KANS., June 1, 1953.

Hon. MILTON YOUNG,
Chairman, Senate Committee on Agricultural Appropriations,
Washington, D. C.:

Urge approval of including additional item of \$17 million for agricultural research. Appropriations for agricultural research have not kept pace with increased cost of research in recent years. Expanded program of agricultural research would be an excellent investment.

ARTHUR D. WEBER,
Dean of Agriculture and Director of Agricultural Experiment Station, Kansas State College.

COLUMBIA, MO., June 1, 1953.

Senator MILTON YOUNG,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Recommend inclusion of \$17 million additional for agricultural research in 1954 appropriations.

J. H. LONGWELL,
Dean, College of Agriculture, University of Missouri.

CLEMSON, S. C., June 1, 1953.

Senator MILTON R. YOUNG,
Chairman, Agriculture Subcommittee of Appropriations,
Washington, D. C.:

The agricultural experiment station personnel is requesting the inclusion of the full \$17 million for research over last year. Of this amount, \$7½ million for grants to State stations and \$9½ million to USDA bureaus.

H. P. COOPER,
Dean and Director, South Carolina Agricultural Experiment Station.

FARGO, N. DAK., June 1, 1953.

Senator MILTON YOUNG,
Chairman, Senate Committee on Agriculture Appropriations,
Washington, D. C.:

Strongly urge your support \$17 million for agricultural research.

H. L. WALSTER,
Director, North Dakota Agricultural Experiment Station.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I should like to review briefly the changes voted by the Senate Appropriations Committee in the agricultural appropriations passed by the House of Representatives.

The Senate Appropriations Committee has voted additional appropriations, as compared with the appropriations agreed to by the House of Representatives, of \$3,981,940.

The total amount of the bill as reported to the Senate by the Senate Appropriations Committee is \$716,729,768.

The appropriations carried by the agricultural appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1953 were \$737,209,833.

The first budget request for agricultural appropriations for the fiscal year 1954 was \$749,852,342. The agricultural appropriations voted by the Senate Appropriations Committee are \$20,480,065 under the 1953 appropriations, and they are \$33,122,574 less than the original budget estimates for the fiscal year 1954.

Aside from the item for agricultural research, to which I have just referred, the major changes provided by the bill as reported by the committee, and as compared to the bill as passed by the House of Representatives, are as follows:

There is one item of approximately \$1,145,000 for additional funds for forest-pest control. This item was urgently requested by the Department of Agriculture as a result of a serious pest infestation in the forests of Idaho, Montana, and Oregon.

The Senate Appropriations Committee voted to increase by \$3 million the appropriation passed by the House of Representatives for the cotton quota program. We believe this is necessary. Yet the total appropriation voted for this purpose by the Senate Appropriations Committee is \$3 million less than the budget request made by the Department of Agriculture.

The bill as reported to the Senate contains an item of \$97 million for the cost of the farm price-support operations during the past year. I believe it will be interesting to the Senate for me to observe that, according to the testimony of the Department of Agriculture, the total cost of all farm price-support operations, since their inception nearly 20 years ago, has been \$1,073,115,955, and there was a net profit of \$4,800,000 from the operations of the price-support program for basic farm commodities. That is according to the testimony submitted not more than 6 weeks ago before the Agricultural Appropriations Subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee.

The other major change was a decrease of approximately \$5 million in the House appropriation for the watershed program. This is an excellent program, but there was some question on the part of the committee as to the authorization of the projects. I hope that can be ironed out later. The other major differences are in the loan authorizations for REA and RTA.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota has consumed 10 minutes.

Mr. YOUNG. I yield myself 2 minutes more.

Mr. President, the other major changes from the House action relate to rural

telephone funds and REA funds. The Senate committee increased the House allowance for REA by \$15 million, to provide a total of \$205 million for the program in fiscal year 1954 for all REA purposes. That includes appropriations and carryover funds. That is as against \$197,298,364 available during fiscal year 1953 for REA purposes.

With respect to REA, the committee bill provides \$67,500,000 as against \$42,500,000 last year. It may be argued that this is too much of an increase over the House figure of \$50 million. I think, however, if one considers the large number of loan applications now pending before the REA Administrator for the rural telephone program, he will agree that this amount is not too high. Loan applications under the rural telephone program now exceed \$100 million. Of course, not all the applications will be approved; but assuming that from 65 to 75 percent of them are found feasible and approved, the amount the committee has recommended will be found no more than adequate.

I believe I have given a general idea of the action taken by the Senate Appropriations Committee with respect to on the agricultural appropriations bill.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as part of my remarks the first 6½ pages of the report of the Senate Committee on Appropriations on the agricultural appropriation bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the report (No. 382) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Report of Committee on Appropriations (No. 382) to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 5227) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes, report the same to the Senate with various amendments and present herewith information relative to the changes made:

Amount of bill as passed House
(direct appropriations) ----- \$712,747,828
Amount of increase by Senate
committee (net) ----- 3,981,940

Amount of bill as re-
ported to Senate ----- 716,729,768
Amount of appropriations,
1953 ----- 737,209,833
Amount of estimates for 1954 ----- 749,852,342
The bill as reported to the
Senate:
Under the appropriations
for 1953 ----- 20,480,065
Under the estimates for
1954 ----- 33,122,574

GENERAL STATEMENT

In reporting the bill to the Senate, the committee recommends total increases of \$9,386,440 and total decreases of \$5,404,500, for a net increase over the House bill of \$3,981,940.

The largest item of increase recommended is \$3 million for measuring cotton acreage in connection with allotments for 1954 crops. The second largest item of increase recommended is \$2,454,000 for construction of access roads in north Idaho and Montana to permit salvage operations required by the infestation of the spruce bark beetle. The remainder of the increase recommended is for adjustments in the various research and control programs of the Department, of which research projects are increased by about \$1,500,000.

The largest item of decrease recommended is \$5 million for the new item of watershed protection inserted by the House.

RESEARCH

The need for continued research in agriculture is universally recognized. The platforms of both political parties have endorsed the providing of adequate funds for research in agriculture, and farm organizations as well as trade associations have repeatedly requested additional funds of as much as \$17 million for such research.

The committee was advised that for all industry the total cost of research is estimated for 1 year at approximately \$2 billion, of which the Federal Government is paying 47 percent. In the case of agriculture, total research expenditures are around \$250 million, of which industry is putting up \$140 million and \$110 million is divided about evenly between the States and the Federal Government.

Since the beginning of time agriculture has provided the basic needs of all mankind. That truism applies to all of us in fuller measure today than ever because agriculture has also become the source upon which industry must depend for raw materials in producing the many things that add to the health, comfort, and convenience of everyday life.

Steel, oil, coal, rubber, and numerous other products are of course vital to our national well-being. But not one of them, nor all of them put together, are as basic to our individual lives or our national strength as food. Yet, the American public and perhaps too many of us in the Congress take for granted that sufficient food will always be available to us when, where, and how we like it.

That is a dangerous assumption. While it is true that American farmers have up to this time met, and sometimes exceeded, the demand for farm products, we must face the fact that the land we now have under cultivation must largely provide for our rapidly increasing population. With approximately 2 million more people to feed each year, and with little new land to move to, the most practical solution obviously is to further increase farm production per acre and per animal.

If the past can be used as a guide to the future, the farmers of this country can and will continue to meet our needs for products of the soil. Agriculture in the United States has made more progress in the last 75 years than in the previous 75 centuries elsewhere in the world. This period of remarkable advancement coincides with the history of research by the United States Department of Agriculture and the State agricultural experiment stations.

Over the past 25 years, agricultural research has increased crop yields by 45 percent; it has increased milk production per cow by 25 percent, and the increase in eggs per hen has increased even more. In 1900, 1 farm worker produced enough for himself and 7 others; he now produces enough for himself and 14 others. From the standpoint of comparative national strength, this progress takes on added significance when we consider that in Russia it takes 1 farm family to produce food for 2 families. In the United States, 8 out of 9 persons in the civilian labor force are working at jobs in industry and business.

While accomplishing its No. 1 job of providing enough food and fiber in peace and war, agriculture has become a tremendous market for the things produced by the non-agricultural industries. Great industrial establishments now make more tractors, trucks, combines, corn pickers, and many other types of farm equipment. The fertilizer business, the producers of pesticides, the electric appliance industry, the automobile and gasoline industries, all owe much, and some of their existence, to farm purchasing power.

In a recent year farmers owned about 4½ million tractors, 2,400,000 trucks, and 4,350,000 automobiles. Altogether, the equipment on farms nowadays is valued at more than

\$15 billion, and the investment has gone up sharply from year to year ever since mechanized equipment started to take the place of horses about 25 years ago.

Each year farmers use about 50 million tons of chemical materials. They use about 16 billion gallons of crude petroleum each year, more than is used annually by any other industry. Each year the tractors and other mechanized equipment on farms requires 320 million pounds of raw rubber or the amount required to put tires on 8 million automobiles. And under present conditions, farmers each year need about 20 billion kilowatt-hours of electrical power, the amount required to supply power to Philadelphia, Boston, Houston, Toledo, and Dayton.

Indeed, the interdependence of industry, labor, agriculture, our national strength, and the well-being of human beings in this country has become an established fact. All will benefit by striving to maintain this interdependence.

It has been roughly estimated that of the agricultural appropriations about half are primarily of benefit to farmers, and the other half is divided between benefits to the general public and benefits mutually between the farmer and the general public.

The cost of helping agriculture to reach its present high degree of efficiency has probably seemed high to many, but the investment has paid high returns. Cash receipts from farm marketings have more than tripled over the past two decades to about \$28 billion. The net income of farm operators over that same period has gone from \$4.3 billion to \$13 billion. The value of farm assets has jumped from about \$68.4 billion to \$127 billion.

A more important yardstick for measuring progress, perhaps, is the fact that per capita consumption of such protective foods as meat, milk, eggs, fruit, and vegetables has increased appreciably. In 1950, for instance, consumers ate 19 percent more meat, poultry, and fish; 29 percent more eggs; 22 percent more dairy products other than butter; and 10 percent more fruit and vegetables than we ate just prior to World War II.

All this progress did not occur by accident. A combination of factors has helped to bring it about: A renewed effort on the part of farmers to apply research findings to their operations; reasonably favorable weather; and last, but not least, the assurance to farmers of returns that have had a fair relationship to the returns enjoyed by other segments of our economy.

There is little reason to doubt that farmers will continue to use good farming practices to the extent of their ability, now that they are convinced of their merits; the weather continues to be an unknown factor; since industry, labor, and consumers have such a high stake in a healthy and prosperous agriculture, the continuation of programs to help keep it that way, requires our most serious consideration.

Despite the progress that has been made in developing and bringing agricultural know-how to farmers, the job ahead is even more challenging. With the increasing number of people to consume food and fiber products, with a declining number of people on farms to produce them, and with relatively little new land on which crops can be grown, there has never been a more urgent need for efficient production, processing, and merchandising of farm products.

Each year insects still do about \$4 billion worth of damage to our farm crops. The annual loss to cotton insect alone is more than \$760 million. Our researchers estimate that we still lose 1 farm animal out of every 10 because of diseases and parasites. Mastitis and brucellosis of cattle still cost \$240 million a year and poultry diseases another \$200 million.

More than half of our timber resources are lost through fire, insects, and disease, and

waste in land clearing and other poor forestry management practices. It would be impossible to estimate, in terms of dollars, the loss of soil fertility that has taken place. It is a fact, however, that about 50 million acres of once productive cropland are too badly eroded for cultivation and another 100 million acres has been reduced because from half to all of the original topsoil has washed away.

As much as 30 percent of some of our fresh fruits and vegetables are lost through spoilage between the producer and the consumer. A few years ago a study in 13 Midwest States showed that one-third of the eggs marketed in those States dropped below grade A quality before they reached the first buyer. These are problems to which renewed attention must be given if we and those who come after us are to maintain the standard of living we now enjoy.

Few will challenge the merits of research and other services that have been and are being rendered for farmers by the United States Department of Agriculture. In many instances the end product of one research finding has more than paid the cost of Agriculture's annual appropriation. Take dextran, for example, which has been found to be a satisfactory substitute for blood plasma in treating shock casualties on the battlefield. While the value of this discovery cannot be evaluated in dollars and cents, it is a forward step in saving lives. The Department's Bureau of Agricultural and Industrial Chemistry has spent \$750,000 on this research—only about one-fifth the cost of a B-36 bomber.

Several years ago the Department's Bureau of Agricultural and Industrial Chemistry perfected a new elastic-type cotton bandage that is particularly suitable for treating severe burns. It has proved under actual combat conditions to be superior to any bandage yet developed both from the standpoint of performance and cost. In fact, the Department of Defense saved about \$5 million on its first order of 10 million bandages. This is about two-thirds of the entire annual appropriation for the Bureau.

The value of work done by the Department's researchers in the field of plant diseases defies computation. The hand of science in combating the effects of stem rust alone no doubt has meant the difference between success and complete failure in the production of cereal crops in this country. Through the use of rust-resistant varieties of oats in Iowa alone, farmers there have harvested the equivalent of an extra crop of oats each year for the past 12 years. The money value in that time amounts to well over \$100 million. All in all, the value of disease-resistant cereals which have been developed by our plant breeders are now estimated to add about half a billion dollars a year to our cereal-crop income.

Research in the breeding, feeding, and management of animals is showing how to produce more meat per pound of feed. New meat-type hogs produce more choice cuts than the average hog, and recent tests indicate the possibility of increasing by 50 percent the daily gain in weight of cattle in the feed lot. Only a decade ago it took 12 pounds of feed and 12 weeks to produce a 3-pound broiler. Now 9 pounds of feed will produce such a bird in 10 weeks.

Research is helping to improve the grasslands of this country, and this fits in well with the overall need to produce more efficiently per acre, per animal, and per man-hour of labor. In North Carolina, for example, it has been proven that an acre capable of producing 50 bushels of corn can produce the equivalent in feed of 87 bushels of corn as improved pasture. The estimated return per man-hour of work was \$23 from the improved pasture, compared with \$3.69 from corn.

Soil and water conservation and good land-use practices in general are vital in peace

and war. It is the best assurance that farmers will be able to maintain production in the years and generations ahead. But, as stated earlier, we must more than merely maintain production—we must make each acre and animal more productive than it is now to meet the definitely foreseeable increased demands of more and more consumers. Great progress has been made in this direction, but the Department's Soil Conservation Service estimates that only one-fourth of the total conservation job has been done. Therefore, some idea of the job ahead can be obtained by a brief résumé of what has already been accomplished.

At the present time approximately 2,500 soil-conservation districts and ranches—organized under State enabling acts and administered by locally elected supervisors—include about four-fifths of all the farmland in the country. In these districts, 2 1/4 million farmers or ranchers have completed conservation farm plans or are working toward completion of them with the help of SCS technicians. About 275 million acres are covered by complete plans and about 180 million acres have already received the combined conservation treatment called for by them.

Under the agricultural conservation program, which is administered largely by local county and community committees, 52 million acres of pasture and range have been improved by reseeding; 18 million acres are being protected through the construction of standard, broad-based terraces; permanent cover has been established on 2 million acres of land subject to erosion; 5 million acres have been leveled for irrigation; sod waterways have been established on 315,000 acres; trees have been planted on 900,000 acres; 824,000 small dams have been built on farms and ranches to retard soil losses and reduce flood damage. All this and only one-fourth of the job is done.

One-third of the land area of the United States is in forest land. If properly managed, these forests could produce all of the timber needed in the foreseeable future for an expanding economy. Unfortunately, however, the current annual drain on saw timber is in excess of the annual growth. Most public forest land is now managed for continuous production and many of the more progressive private owners of forest land are practicing excellent forestry. But much of the timber cutting on private lands is still not up to good forestry standards.

The Department's Forest Service administers the national forests which consists of about 180 million acres of public lands. These forests each year make a major contribution not only to the Nation's welfare but directly in cash to the Federal Treasury. Last year, in receipts from the sale of timber, grazing fees, and other special uses, they returned to the Treasury more than the total cost of managing and protecting the national forests.

Much of the Department's work in helping farmers and the handlers, processors, and merchandisers of farm products to do a better job of getting these products from the farm to the consumer is of a continuing nature. The cumulative investment in services rendered for research, soil conservation, marketing, plant and livestock inspection, market news, crop reporting, farm credit, and many others, adds up to a tremendous sum. But it is estimated that the cumulative returns exceed by manyfold the total cost. The investment is one that must be protected lest we lose the incalculable benefits that have been gained.

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

Mr. YOUNG. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. I notice by the report that there have been reductions of \$5,404,500, in appropriations provided by

the House, and that one of the items stricken out is \$5 million for watershed protection. I call attention to the language found on page 15 of the committee report, which reads:

The decrease recommended by the committee is to deny this approach to a recognized problem. The committee is advised that the number of projects intended to be covered by the amount provided are a few of a large number of such projects on which preliminary examinations or surveys have been made but which have not been authorized under the Flood Control Act of 1944.

I should like to ask the distinguished chairman whether he does not believe that these projects would be authorized under Public Law 46 of the 74th Congress, and the Soil Conservation Act of 1935?

Mr. YOUNG. Not being a lawyer, I will not attempt to give the Senator a very expert legal opinion. At least some of the members of the subcommittee on agricultural appropriations believed that there was a close question as to the authorization for these projects. I think appropriations could be made for them on the basis of their being classified as experimental or test projects. I would like to say to the Senator from Kansas, who has a great interest in these projects—and I think they are worthy ones—that the committee did not delete this item because of any belief that the projects were not meritorious. It was rather a question of the legal requirements of their proper authorization. I think the Congress could appropriate for them under the authorization, I believe it was, of 1936.

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

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I appreciate very much the statement by the Senator from North Dakota, but I should like to point out that Public Law 46 of the 74th Congress gives the Soil Conservation Service authority to deal with all matters relating to conservation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a memorandum which I have prepared on this subject.

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

I point out that Public Law 46 of the 74th Congress gives the Soil Conservation Service authority to deal with all matters relating to conservation.

Among the purposes of the act as set out are flood control, the prevention of the impairment of reservoirs, and the maintenance of navigability of rivers and harbors.

In carrying out the provisions of the act, the Secretary is authorized, among other things, and I quote: "To carry out preventive measures, including, but not limited to, engineering operations, methods of cultivation, the growing of vegetation, and changes in the use of land."

That is interpreted by the solicitor's office in the Department of Agriculture and also in the Bureau of the Budget, as giving full authority to whatever is necessary, including the building of suitable structures to deal with this type of a project.

The 48 originally listed projects which passed the House are fully authorized under the provisions of Public Law 46 of the 74th

Congress. They have been approved by the Department of Agriculture and there is full authority for their construction.

I have discussed this matter with the Bureau of the Budget on previous occasions and that is the position they have taken; namely, that it is not necessary that they be authorized under the 1936 Flood Control Act.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I may say to the Senator from Kansas that some of the watershed programs have been authorized by the regular authorizing committees of the Congress. As the Senator says, some of them have not been so authorized. The \$5 million would make possible the starting of about \$29 million worth of projects. There was a question in the mind of some of the Senators as to whether we should support this large program without regular authorization by the authorizing committees of the Congress. I think this is a question which probably can be ironed out in conference. All members of the committee feel that these are worthy projects, and that the program itself is an excellent one.

Mr. CARLSON. I want to make for the RECORD an observation which I believe to be important. I was a Member of the House of Representatives at the time in 1936 omnibus Flood Control Act was passed. As a matter of fact, I was a member of the committee that wrote it.

The omnibus Flood Control Act of 1936 authorized the Secretary of Agriculture to develop watershed programs. It is under this act and amendments thereto that a few watershed projects have been authorized and for a number of years Congress has made appropriations to carry on these projects. However, these appropriations have been exceedingly meager. The projects have developed slowly and none have progressed far enough, as yet, to demonstrate what can be achieved in the way of flood control. In most cases it will be many years, at the present rate of appropriations, before the projects can be completed.

The watershed projects submitted in this bill before the Senate, having passed the House, are not submitted under the provisions of the 1936 Flood Control Act but rather under the authority which the Department of Agriculture has to deal with flood control matters in the original Soil Conservation Act of 1935, which is Public Law 46 of the 74th Congress.

I assure the distinguished Senator from North Dakota that it is my thought that the projects, which were approved by the House committee and which were passed by the House, would be authorized under the 1936 act, which I firmly believe carries adequate authority for projects of this kind.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I am very happy to have the comments of the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. I appreciate very much, if the distinguished Senator will yield further, his statement that the committee will be pleased to give consideration to this matter in conference. I sincerely hope they will. It is a program in which our country is interested. It is a program which ought to be established. We hear a great deal about expenditures for flood control. With ref-

erence to the projects which were approved by the House of Representatives, the local contributions would be 52 percent of the cost. In other words, the Federal Government can get assistance in carrying out some of these projects to control water runoff at its source, which, of course, has an effect on the floods in the valleys. I shall not stand upon the Senate floor to say I believe it will protect the valleys from floods; I do not believe it will; but it should be a part of the program, and I hope the distinguished chairman and the other members of the committee will give serious consideration to this matter when it is taken to conference.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a memorandum on this subject.

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

I take this opportunity to express my sincere hope that the Senate will approve the item which passed the House, providing \$5 million for the development of watershed programs.

If we do not take definite action on the item as it passed the House, I would urge the conferees between the Senate and House to give serious consideration to the inclusion of this item and the final passage of the bill.

All over the country our people have awakened to the realization that soil conservation and the terraces, gully stops, contour farming, check dams and stock ponds, designed to hold the water where it falls, are an essential part of flood control.

Furthermore, they are beginning to realize that these water-hold structures and practices must be applied to the whole upstream watershed areas, of which there are thousands, if we are to take the action necessary to help prevent disastrous floods and flood damage.

The control of water runoff at its source is important as a part of a long-range soil conservation program. At the present time we have a few partially completed programs of watershed control, but at the rate of present work on these projects, it will be many years before they are completed.

The projects in the pending bill are projects that can be completed in from 1 to 5 years and they would give this Nation test or pilot projects that could be used to evaluate their effectiveness on the control of water runoff, soil conservation, and floods in the lower valleys. They are truly test or pilot projects.

I am sure that the Members of the Senate are aware of the tremendous interest in watershed programs which exists throughout the country. As a matter of fact, I am convinced that the country is far ahead of the Department of Agriculture and the Congress on this subject. They are demanding that we take action to get some projects completed at the earliest possible date.

The approval of this item of \$5 million, with a total original cost to the Federal Government of less than \$30 million, would require local contributions of over \$30 million. Therefore, the Federal Government would, in reality, be securing \$60 million worth of work for less than \$30 million. The local contributions would constitute approximately 52 percent and the Federal contribution 48 percent on the final completion of these projects.

It occurs to me that this would be to the distinct advantage of the Federal Government in securing projects that will, in my opinion, add protection and wealth to our Nation of many times more than the original cost.

Mr. YOUNG. The Senator has made a good case, and I am sure the committee will give the matter careful consideration.

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

Mr. YOUNG. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. GRISWOLD. In connection with the matter which the Senator from Kansas has just discussed, I may say I am sure the Senator from North Dakota realizes that there is a real interest in the State of Nebraska in this same problem. I should like to ask whether the committee fully understood that a great deal of the expense would be borne by way of local participation in carrying out most of the program?

Mr. YOUNG. Yes, I think most of the Members of the committee are fully aware of the contribution to be made by the local people. As I said before, I think the committee is generally strongly in favor of the projects.

Mr. GRISWOLD. Has there been much opposition throughout the Nation to this general type of program?

Mr. YOUNG. No, on the contrary there has been very little. I personally believe that the program should have been carried on at the same time and at the same rate as are other big water development programs, including flood control projects. This program is in many respects less costly, and in many cases, it can do a better job of holding water where it falls on the upper reaches of streams than can the larger dams.

Mr. GRISWOLD. I thank the Senator from North Dakota for making clear some of the questions which were in my mind.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the first committee amendment.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Department of Agriculture—Title I—Regular Activities—Agricultural Marketing Act," on page 2, line 12, after the word "Department," to strike out "\$5,500,000" and insert "\$5,250,000."

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I wish to offer an amendment to the committee amendment. I send to the desk an amendment and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, line 12, it is proposed to strike out "\$5,250,000" and to insert in lieu thereof "\$5,290,000."

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, the amendment which I have offered is to increase the amount for the agricultural marketing programs by \$40,000, bringing the total from \$5,250,000, recommended by the committee, to \$5,290,000.

The specific purpose of this amendment is to provide funds to enable the Department of Agriculture to initiate a new market news and statistical service for the turkey industry.

This was originally included in the \$250,000 in increased funds for marketing programs recommended in the Truman budget, eliminated in the Eisenhower budget, restored by the House, and again recommended to be taken out by the Senate committee.

The Department of Agriculture over a period of years has improved its marketing service in many particulars, including the type of weekly production reports which is here proposed for turkey growers.

With production 13 percent above that of the previous year, turkey raisers last year faced a marked surplus which so depressed the market and threatened to destroy the turkey industry, that the Secretary of Agriculture authorized purchases largely for distribution to non-profit school-lunch programs.

From October 1952 to March 1953 such purchases amounted to 48,400,000 pounds of frozen ready-to-cook 1952-crop turkeys.

This represented an investment of \$26,100,000 by the Government.

The purchases were made with section 32 funds provided by Congress to encourage consumption of agricultural commodities by diverting surplus quantities from normal channels of trade.

The recent conference of turkey producers called by the Secretary of Agriculture to explore means to avoid a repetition of such surpluses as occurred last year recommended a weekly statistical service to indicate what turkey hatchings are, month by month or week by week, so that they could keep informed on what is happening. In this way the farmers growing turkeys would be better informed of what the production prospects are likely to be and could expand or contract their output accordingly.

Here is the case of an industry itself seeking, through an entirely reasonable request for a Government reporting service at a nominal cost, to help solve some of the surplus problems with which it is confronted and which are costly to the producer and the Government alike.

I believe, Mr. President, we could save a great deal of money if we make the funds available so that the Government may enter into such statistical reporting service, because, if the producer knew that there would be a sharp increase in the number of poulets hatched and put on feed, he would be likely to cancel orders or reduce in the next month his turkey production. Then there would not be the sharp increase we have witnessed over past years.

Inasmuch as the House committee had this item in its recommendations, I believe the Senate Appropriations Committee made a mistake at the time it reported the bill. It is for that reason that I have offered my amendment. I have had numerous calls with reference to it. I know the importance of statistical reporting in connection with the livestock industry. I think we should have the same kind of reporting for the turkey industry, because it has become one of our major industries and sources of agricultural income.

I hope the chairman of the committee will agree to accept my amendment.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, the Senator from Minnesota has made a very good case for his amendment. I have received many telegrams from all over the United States with reference to the proposed reduction in the appropriation, and I think it would be advisable to take

the amendment to conference. I shall accept the amendment and take it to conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] to the committee amendment.

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, under the subhead "Bureau of Agricultural Economics," on page 3, line 22, after the word "trends," to strike out "\$2,120,000" and insert "\$2,372,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Agricultural Research Administration—Office of Administrator," on page 5, line 19, after the word "building," to insert "whichever is greater."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, line 19, after the word "greater" in the amendment heretofore stated, to insert a colon and the following additional proviso: "Provided further, That transfers not to exceed \$11,000 may be made to this appropriation from the several appropriations of the Agricultural Research Administration for general-use capital improvements at the Agricultural Research Center."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office of Experiment Stations—Payments to States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico," on page 7, line 4, after the name "Alaska," to strike out "\$62,500" and insert "\$75,000," and in line 8, after the name "Puerto Rico," to strike out "\$13,441,208" and insert "\$13,453,708."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Animal Industry," on page 9, line 14, after "(7 U. S. C. 429)", to strike out "\$3,916,500" and insert "\$4,189,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 10, line 4, after the word "products," to strike out "\$8,635,000" and insert "\$8,480,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 10, line 22, after the numerals "1952," to strike out "is hereby repealed" and insert "is amended by adding 'voluntary' before the word 'reimbursements'."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Agricultural and Industrial Chemistry," on page 11, line 19, after the word "thereof," to strike out "\$7,625,000" and insert "\$7,750,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Plant Industry, Soils, and Agricultural Engineering," on page 12, line 12, after the word "airplanes," to strike out "\$11,586,000" and insert "\$12,230,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Entomology and

Plant Quarantine," on page 14, line 4, after word "application," to strike out "\$3,888,760" and insert "\$4,076,900."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 15, line 6, after "(7 U. S. C. 150-150g)", to strike out "\$5,187,000" and insert "\$5,600,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 16, line 17, after "(7 U. S. C. 147a)", to strike out "\$2,600,000" and insert "\$2,750,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 16, line 24, after the word "citizens," to strike out "\$500,000" and insert "\$750,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Control of Forest Pests," on page 17, line 19, after "(16 U. S. C. Supp. V, 594-1-594-5)", to strike out "\$2,300,000" and insert "\$3,350,000," and, at the beginning of line 20, to strike out "\$1,900,000" and insert "\$2,920,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 18, at the beginning of line 2, to strike out "\$3,000,000" and insert "\$3,095,000," and, at the beginning of line 10, to strike out "\$950,000" and insert "\$1,045,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Forest Service—Salaries and Expenses," on page 19, at the beginning of line 18, to strike out "building" and insert "building;"

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 21, at the beginning of line 24, to strike out "\$29,665,700" and insert "\$29,715,700."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 22, line 20, after the word "economics," to strike out "\$5,350,000" and insert "\$5,402,300."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Forest Roads and Trails," on page 23, line 8, after the word "administration," to strike out "\$13,546,000" and insert "\$16,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Acquisition of Lands for National Forests—Weeks Act," on page 24, at the beginning of line 2, to strike out "toward" and insert "of."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 26, after line 19, to strike out:

WATERSHED PROTECTION

For expenses necessary to conduct surveys, investigations, and research and to carry out preventive measures, including, but not limited to engineering operations, methods of cultivation, the growing of vegetation, and changes in use of land, in accordance with the provisions of Public Law 46, 74th Congress; \$5,000,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Soil Conservation Service—Salaries and Expenses," on page 27, line 22, after the word "employees," to strike out "\$60,844,014" and insert "\$60,944,014."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Water Conservation and Utilization Projects," on page 29, line 22, after the word "expended", to strike out "\$425,500" and insert "\$685,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Agricultural Conservation Program," on page 32, line 10, after the word "than", to strike out "\$1,000" and insert "\$1,500."

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, would an amendment on page 32 be in order at this time, or should I wait until the committee amendments are adopted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the Senator's amendment to the committee amendment which is now under consideration?

Mr. WILLIAMS. No. It is on page 32, line 2.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that the amendment would not be in order at this time.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 33, line 6, after the word "counties", to strike out the colon and "Provided further, That not to exceed 1½ percent of the allocation for the agricultural conservation program for any State may be utilized in determining the most needed conservation practices on individual farms for which Federal assistance shall be given," and in line 23, after the word "pernicious", to strike out "political" and insert "political."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Production and Marketing Administration—Agricultural Adjustment Programs," on page 34, line 15, after the word "labor", to strike out "\$35,500,000" and insert "\$38,500,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Marketing Services," on page 37, at the beginning of line 9, to strike out "\$11,486,000" and insert "\$11,496,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Rural Electrification Administration—Loan Authorizations," on page 38, line 11, after the word "program," to strike out "\$50,000,000" and insert "\$67,500,000", and in line 12, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$30,000,000" and insert "\$45,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Farmers' Home Administration—Loan Authorizations," on page 40, line 15, after the word "amended," to strike out "\$7,000,000" and insert "\$6,500,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes the committee amendments.

The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask that it be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 32, lines 2 and 3, it is proposed to strike out "\$195,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$140,000,000."

On line 10, it is proposed to strike out "\$1,500" and insert in lieu thereof \$1,000."

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, the purpose of the amendment is to reduce the appropriation by \$55,000,000 and, at the same time, to reduce the maximum amount of payment which can be made to any single farmer to \$1,000.

This reduction is in line with the amount requested by the Secretary of Agriculture speaking for the administration, and I hope the chairman of the subcommittee will accept the amendment without further debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair advises the Senator from Delaware that the second amendment, on line 10, to reduce the item from \$1,500 to \$1,000 is not in order.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Then I offer the first part of the amendment, the purpose of which is to reduce the appropriation by \$55,000,000. This reduction has been approved by the administration—it has been endorsed by Mr. Alan Kline, the president of the American Farm Bureau—it has been endorsed by Mr. J. T. Sands, legislative representative of the National Grange. Both these great farm organizations are in favor of the lower figure and rather than reject their recommendation I think the Senate should give them a vote of thanks. Surely they should be commended for their unselfish approach to the problem of cutting Government expenditures.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I not only refuse to accept the amendment but I am strongly opposed to it. The Department of Agriculture asked for \$140 million for the agricultural-conservation program, and the payments would only be made on nonrecurring items. This would eliminate fertilizer, phosphate, and many other parts of the soil-conservation program.

The House raised the amount to \$195 million and reinstated substantially the present program. That is covered also in the language of the report of the Senate Committee on Appropriations.

I personally believe that \$500 million, or even more, probably could be wisely spent each year to conserve the soil of the United States, and it would be well worthwhile, because soil is perhaps the greatest of our assets. However, I believe that the compromise on \$195 million reached by the House is a good one. I think the Nation can well afford to spend \$195 million on soil conservation in the coming year.

I understand that amendments will be offered to raise the amount to \$225 million, and anyone could make a good case for that figure. However, I personally believe that the bill as a whole is a good one, so far as agriculture is concerned, and that it is substantially a good bill for farmers. I believe that a reduction to \$140 million on this program would do irreparable harm to the soil-conservation program in the United States.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I wish to say a word about the proposal to reduce the agricultural-conservation program to \$140 million from the \$195 million which the committee has proposed. As I un-

derstand, the Department of Agriculture has been working on a program to be put into effect in the event the appropriation is reduced to \$140 million. Unfortunately, the type of program which is proposed on the \$140 million basis would provide for continuing the program in a few States, primarily what are known as the range States, at a level comparable to that which prevailed when the appropriation was \$250 million. The reduction would come largely in the older farming States, where there are small farms, and where soil improvement probably is needed as much as it is needed on a large part of the western land.

The same proposition was encountered 4 or 5 years ago, when a program was proposed which would have benefited primarily the States where it was possible to improve ranges. Of course, ranges ought to be improved, but it should not be done at the expense of all the other States.

If \$140 million were appropriated, it would probably result in about 25 percent being used for administrative purposes. That is altogether too high an amount for that purpose. If it should be decided that the amount should be reduced to \$140 million, probably it would be better to eliminate the program completely, and then to establish an entirely new program for the improvement of ranges.

I think the amount arrived at by the House and by the Senate committee is fair. It will provide for a continuing of the soil-conservation program in the Eastern States, and in the Mountain States of the West, as well. Personally, I hope it will be possible to improve the ranges and also the farms. There is some question whether liming and the application of other chemicals which have been depleted from the soil is a permanent improvement or not. There is also question whether irrigation ditches or terraces are permanent, unless they are cared for.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I wish to concur in the statement just made by the Senator from Vermont in regard to a continuation of this appropriation in the amount of at least \$195 million. We who are familiar with the program realize that it is not only an important one, but that to reduce the figure to \$140 million would be most serious.

I wonder if I am correct in assuming that the House committee evidently took the figure of \$250 million, which has been the amount appropriated in the past, or which has been at least mentioned in the budget, subtracted \$140 million from that, leaving \$110 million, then compromised by adding 50 percent of that amount to \$140 million arriving at the figure of \$195 million. That is a practical solution, and I hope the Senate will adopt it.

Mr. AIKEN. I do not know how the House arrived at its figure, but it seems to me to be fair. The Department of Agriculture is taking a cut in its appropriations, just as we expect other segments of our economy to take cuts in an effort to balance the budget. If the budget is not balanced very quickly, it will not

make much difference what is done about appropriations. We shall be in serious trouble.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield if I have the time. I do not know whose time I am using.

Mr. COOPER. I noticed that the Secretary of Agriculture has been consistent in support of the proposal to reduce this appropriation to \$140 million, and has said that what are called nonrecurring soil practices would be eliminated. Does the bill now before the Senate eliminate what we have termed "nonrecurring practices," such as the application of lime, phosphate, and fertilizer?

Mr. AIKEN. I am not speaking for the chairman of the subcommittee, but I am certain that it was the purpose and intent of the Committee on Appropriations, in increasing the amount from \$140 million to \$195 million, to make it possible that these common practices of the Eastern States should be continued. As a matter of fact, if the soil is limed, or if superphosphate, manganese, or magnesium, or any of the trace elements, are applied to the soil, and they are not used up, the effect is probably as permanent as terraces, irrigation ditches, or other methods which are called permanent practices, if they are not cared for from year to year.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the committee report sets forth very clearly the intention of the committee. I think it would be well to insert it in the RECORD at this stage. The item is discussed very briefly on page 12 of the committee report.

Mr. COOPER. It was my understanding that it was the intention of the Senate Committee on Appropriations to continue what are called recurring practices, but I wished to have the statement made as a matter of record.

Mr. RUSSELL. I read from page 12 of the report:

The committee has heard with grave concern of the proposed changes to be made in the types of conservation practices for which ACP payments will be made. We believe that it would be a mistake to institute such drastic changes.

The committee, in approving the authorization for soil-conservation practices, intends to adhere to the policy of having these practices instituted by the several State committees as has been the case in past years. The State committees are fully informed as to the practices necessary to carry on a well-balanced conservation program within the State and should be permitted to select these practices at the State level with a minimum of control from Washington.

This is the most cogent part of it, I may say to the Senator from Kentucky:

We do not approve of the changes proposed by the Secretary of Agriculture and his assistants, and have authorized the crop year 1954 ACP payments through PMA committees with the intent that the program in effect in 1953 will be substantially followed in 1954.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. In order that it may be quite clear in the RECORD, I should like

to ask the Senator a question. I am sure that because of his experience the Senator from Georgia knows that in large degree the practices—at least in the Southern States and in the border States—consist of the application of lime, phosphates, and fertilizers, not only in the first year in which there is a seeding but in subsequent years. Is that correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not know that the proportion would be as great in all cases as the Senator has indicated, but that is certainly a material part of the program in the States to which the Senator has referred.

Mr. COOPER. I notice that the Secretary said in the hearings that it was the intention in submitting the figure \$140 million to consider the first application of lime or phosphate as a permanent-type practice, but that under that program the Department would not permit further applications. Is it the understanding of the Senator, as a member of the committee, that under the authorization of \$195 million not only the first application of minerals and fertilizers but, as agreed upon between the county committees and the farmers, recurring applications can be made?

Mr. RUSSELL. It is my understanding of the authorization figure—and this is an authorization for 1954—that it is the intention of the committee, and, I may say, of the Senate, unless some action to the contrary is taken by the entire Senate, that the practices now in effect in any State will be substantially adhered to in 1954, including the practice of fertilizing referred to by the Senator from Kentucky. I am sure the chairman of the subcommittee will bear out that understanding.

Mr. COOPER. Is it the opinion of the Senator from Georgia that the practical effect of this reduction would be borne by farmers—a great many of whom are tenant farmers—who have used the recurring type of soil-improvement practices?

Mr. RUSSELL. I think there can be no question about that. That goes to the amount.

Mr. COOPER. Yes.

Mr. RUSSELL. I may say to the Senator that I propose, at the appropriate time, to offer an amendment which would allow a 10-percent reduction in this program and authorize a program for next year in the amount of \$225 million, so that the reduction would not be so severe. At the appropriate time, I intend to offer my amendment.

Mr. COOPER. I have an amendment of my own to offer. At least, I shall support the Senator's amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. I shall gladly support the Senator's amendment or I shall be happy to have the Senator join me in my amendment.

Mr. COOPER. I shall be very glad to do so.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator. I shall add his name to the amendment, as well as the name of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE].

Mr. President, the attention of the chairman of the subcommittee was di-

verted when we were discussing the nature of the program contemplated for 1954. I had stated that, in my opinion, the Senate committee—and the Senate as well, if it approves this action—intends that substantially the same program shall be adhered to in 1954 as was followed in 1953. I think it would be well for the RECORD if the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee were to make a statement as to whether or not that is his understanding.

Mr. YOUNG. That is the understanding of the chairman of the subcommittee. The committee itself was almost unanimously in favor of carrying on substantially the same program as we have had in the past. The language of the report so states.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, if I may make a final statement, my own State of Vermont was one of the first States to make full use of the ACP. It has worked there probably as well as in any other State in the Union. Agricultural experts estimate that because the agricultural conservation program in New England the price of milk to Boston consumers is about 3 cents a quart less than it otherwise would be today. The program has worked well enough so that the last two sessions of the Vermont Legislature, in both houses, including the legislature which adjourned a week ago, unanimously memorialized Congress to continue this program.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield for a question?

Mr. AIKEN. I am glad to yield, if I have the time.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does the Senator from Vermont believe that the parliamentary discussion which has just taken place, plus the statement of the committee, will be binding upon the Secretary of Agriculture? Does the Secretary of Agriculture, under the original act, have the power to lay out the program?

Mr. AIKEN. I think the discussion which has taken place on the floor will be morally binding upon the Secretary of Agriculture. I am sure the Secretary of Agriculture would not undertake to go contrary to the intent of the Congress. I do not know whether the present discussion would be legally binding or not, but I suspect that it would be. I am not an attorney. I think it would be morally binding on Ezra Benson, which is just as good as though it were legally binding.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does the Senator from Vermont have any assurances that the Secretary of Agriculture will follow the unofficial will of Congress in this matter?

Mr. AIKEN. The Secretary of Agriculture has assured the Congress and the people of the United States time and time again that he will carry out the intent of the Congress, even though it may disagree with his own viewpoint. I have full confidence that that is true.

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

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Will this condition prevail no matter what the total sum may be which is authorized—whether we authorize \$195 million, \$140 million, or \$225 million? Will the method of distribution be the present method?

Mr. AIKEN. If this appropriation is made, it will indicate with certainty the intent of the Congress to continue, in the ACP, those practices which have been used so successfully in all States of the Union since the inception of the program.

Mr. DOUGLAS. And this will be true regardless of the sums authorized?

Mr. AIKEN. I am sure of that.

Mr. GRISWOLD. Mr. President, I should like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee a question.

In the committee report on the ACP program there is reference to the question of the authority of State committees to make certain decisions within the States, as to what type of program they wish to carry out. In the actual operation of the program, if an allotment is made to a State—perhaps a temporary allotment—and then the State committee decides to reduce the program, does that mean a saving to the Treasury of the United States? Would the money then be spent through the Department of Agriculture in other States of the Union, or would there be a saving to the Treasury? There is reference to the State having some control, and not being subject to too much Federal control. If the State reduces a program, does that mean a saving, or will other States spend the money?

Mr. YOUNG. I should like to have the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] answer that question in detail. He is completely familiar with the subject. My understanding is that practices are initiated by the States themselves and approved by the Secretary of Agriculture. The amount of money going to each State would depend largely on the type of practices approved in the State.

However, there is an allocation to the States, under the formula and there is a special provision that no State, under a change of program, shall lose more than 15 percent. I should like to have the Senator from Georgia explain the situation. He is much more familiar with the subject than I am.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. HENDRICKSON in the chair). The Senator from North Dakota asks unanimous consent to yield to the Senator from Georgia in order that he may answer a question.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I appreciate very much the confidence which the Senator from North Dakota has manifested. However, in connection with this specific question I am afraid it is not well placed. There is an allotment made among the several States, under the formula. That allotment is broken down within the State, by counties or local subdivisions of Government—parishes, or whatever the local subdivision may be called.

Mr. YOUNG. That is based upon the type of program approved.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is correct. It depends upon the type of program. Then the money is distributed at the local level by the local committee, after it has inspected to see that there has been compliance with the practices permitted within the State. Heretofore the program has originated at the State level. The State committees would meet and decide what were the most essential conservation practices within the State, and the relative weight to be given to each of those practices, as well as the amount of money which would be available for each of them. The programs submitted to the Department of Agriculture in Washington, and the department has in most instances approved the State programs, although there have been in instances of the department having disallowed certain practices and has not permitted the payments to be made.

Under the old system, which was in effect when the appropriation was in the amount of \$500 million, which was the amount of the appropriation for many years, there was a system of redistribution, but it is my opinion—I do not state it as a fact—that today no such system of redistribution is in effect, and that any sum which is not expended within a State either is carried over in the appropriations for next year by act of Congress, or reverts to the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. GRISWOLD. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is my opinion.

Mr. AIKEN. I may say that the officials of the FMA, or the officials who have charge of the ACP program, have discussed the matter with me, and they insist that the suggestions sent out by the Department of Agriculture under memorandum No. 5 were not final, and that the States still are entitled to make other suggestions as to what should be in the program so as to provide the greatest benefit to each State. Therefore I contemplate that the States' desires will be observed in this respect.

I may say that last year, apparently, several million dollars were not spent. In the early days, as the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] has stated, if a State did not spend its money another State could use it. For many years Vermont used money which was not spent by New York and Maine, and we appreciated that practice very much. However, after a while Maine and New York used all of their allotments, and Vermont could use only what the State was entitled to use under its own allotment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HENDRICKSON in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I request the yeas and nays.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Goldwater	McCarran
Anderson	Gore	McCarthy
Barrett	Green	McClellan
Beall	Griswold	Millikin
Bennett	Hayden	Monroney
Bricker	Hendrickson	Mundt
Bridges	Hennings	Neely
Bush	Hickenlooper	Pastore
Butler, Md.	Hoey	Payne
Butler, Nebr.	Holland	Potter
Byrd	Humphrey	Purtell
Capehart	Jackson	Robertson
Carlson	Jenner	Russell
Chavez	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Clements	Johnson, Tex.	Smathers
Cooper	Johnson, S. C.	Smith, Maine
Cordon	Kefauver	Smith, N. J.
Daniel	Kennedy	Smith, N. C.
Douglas	Kilgore	Sparkman
Duff	Knowland	Stennis
Dworsak	Kuchel	Thye
Eastland	Langer	Watkins
Ellender	Lehman	Welker
Ferguson	Long	Wiley
Frrear	Malone	Williams
Fulbright	Mansfield	Young
George	Martin	
Gillette	Maybank	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I renew my request for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], and myself, I offer a substitute amendment for the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 32, in lines 2 and 3, it is proposed to strike out "\$195,000,000", and insert in lieu thereof \$225,000,000."

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, is it the purpose of the Senator from Georgia to amend my amendment or to amend the committee amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia offers the amendment as one in the second degree. The vote will be taken first on the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia, and then on the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I offer the amendment as a substitute for the amendment proposed by the distinguished Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I understand.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I have 15 minutes in which to discuss this amendment. Therefore, I shall not be able to yield for questions, although I regret that very much.

Mr. President, no man who has knowledge of the facts about the farms of the Nation today can deny the beneficial effects of the soil-conservation program.

One has only to travel throughout the country to see the great strides which have been made in repairing the waste which has been caused by erosion brought about by water and wind and careless cultivation.

When we consider the productive capacity of the farms of America, we realize that in the case of almost every agricultural commodity we are now producing substantial quantities per acre greater than the production before this program was inaugurated and put into effect.

The issue here is whether the entire Nation has a stake in preserving the fertility of our soil.

This program was originally adopted as a half-billion-dollar program, and an appropriation in that amount was authorized. Year after year Congress appropriated half a billion dollars for this important work.

Then came the war. During the war we could not make large Federal Government appropriations for the conservation of the soil. We called upon farmers everywhere to plant crops which were soil-depleting in character; that was requested in order that we might have the food and fiber necessary for ourselves and our allies, so as to gain a victory over the totalitarian states. During the war this appropriation was reduced to \$300 million.

At the end of the war the necessity for increased production momentarily ceased. But we did not restore the program. Instead, it has been whittled away and whittled away, year after year, until now, if this amendment is adopted, the appropriation will be only \$225 million. If not adopted, there will only be available the inadequate sum of \$195 million.

The authorization for the current year is \$250 million. This amendment represents a reduction of 10 percent in the authorization for this important work, which is, I say, a part of the defense effort—to preserve the fertility of the soil, so that we can produce the food and the fiber necessary in case of an emergency.

Mr. President, let me say that if all other appropriation items were reduced in the amount the appropriation for this program has been reduced, the total budget for the Federal Government would not be more than \$60 billion. The original authorization for this program was \$500 million. Therefore, the authorization for the current year represents a 50-percent decrease in the original authorization. My amendment calls for a 10-percent decrease in the authorization for this year. If the appropriations for all items and programs were reduced 10 percent, we would have a balanced budget. Mr. President, the farmers of the Nation should not be called upon to accept a greater reduction than that.

The population of the United States is increasing at the rate of almost 7,000 new citizens every 24 hours—7,000 more mouths to feed, 7,000 more persons to clothe, each and every 24 hours. In the face of that situation, some propose that

we strike down and almost fatally impair the important soil-conservation program.

Last year it was argued that conditions on the farms were so good that the farmers were able to pay for all these practices, that the people of the Nation had no interest in the soil-conservation program, and that there was no occasion for the appropriation from the Federal Treasury of funds for the program.

In reply, Mr. President, I point out that the costs of these practices have greatly increased; in fact, they have almost doubled. Thus we see that this program has been cut in two ways. First, cuts are made in the appropriation at a time when the cost of soil-conservation practices is increasing. Furthermore, at a time when farm income is declining from day to day, it is proposed still further to whittle away the very modest payments which are made to preserve the one great asset that is basic to our existence, and without which we cannot live.

Mr. President, we may get by with fewer airplanes or we may get by with fewer other things, although to do so would seem to some of us to tend to weaken the national defense. However, if we ever permit the soil of the Nation to erode and if we permit the topsoil to be blown away or to be washed into the streams, and eventually into the sea, we shall be losing something which cannot be replaced and as a result our great civilization will be brought to its eventual doom.

Mr. President, if I can read aright the signs of the times, the farmers' income is going to continue to decrease for some time to come. Thus, it is vital that the soil conservation program be maintained.

I deplore the fact that it is necessary to reduce the appropriation for the program by \$25 million, as proposed by this amendment. But certainly we cannot afford to withdraw all the incentives to the farmers to continue the soil-conservation program.

Mr. President, I do not suppose any discussion of the political effects of the vote on this item has any proper place in the debate; but I assure my colleagues that the farmers of the Nation today are placed in such a position that they almost have to count their pennies—not their dollars, but their pennies. If the appropriation made by the Federal Government, as its share in this program which is so vital to our people, is cut down at the very time when the farmers' income is decreasing \$1,500,000,000 a year, the farmers will say that the United States Senate is adding insult to injury, and the farmers will not feel very kindly toward those who vote against this program, which as of today has caused many of the streams to be clear flowing, whereas in the past they were filled with mud.

Mr. THYE rose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota, who is a coauthor of the amendment.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I seek the floor in my own right; I shall not disturb the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. Very well.

Mr. President, conservation of the land of the Nation is favored in the abstract by everyone. I was greatly impressed by the statement made by the President of the United States in his state of the Union message when he said:

We must match the substantial achievements in the half century since President Theodore Roosevelt awakened the Nation to the problem of conservation.

Mr. President, I say to you there is no more vital program to the future security of the Nation than that of preserving the fertility of the soil and seeing to it that generations yet unborn have as their heritage a soil sufficiently fertile to be able to produce the essentials of life.

The farmer produces in its original state about half the annual production of the wealth of the Nation. The other day I read some figures given the wage income of the various groups and classes of our people. The list was led, as I recall, by the steel workers, the automobile workers, the electrical workers, and the coal miners. The workers in those categories have average earnings of \$75 a week. But down at the bottom of the list was the American farmer, with an average across-the-board income to all farmers, including the farm workers, of \$15 a week—for producing the essentials of life, the things that are basic to our existence from day to day. The income of the farmers and farm workers was at the very bottom of the list, and their income is still decreasing. Yet now it is proposed that a great decrease be made in the soil-conservation program.

Mr. President, in view of the great burden the farmer is assuming today, as a result of the squeeze to which he is subjected between declining income and increasing costs of the things he must buy, it is all the more important that this fund be provided as an incentive to him to carry on the soil-conservation practices that will permit us to leave a legacy to those who come after the last one of us has departed from these Halls, which will enable them to also enjoy the bountiful fare and clothing which this generation has known and which has made our country the envy of the world.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I rise to support the statement made by the distinguished and able Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. He has spoken wisely as to why there should be a continuance of the soil-conservation payments. One needs but to go into any community in the Nation to find young men assuming the responsibility of farm management. Whether in the North or in the South, the young men have assumed great financial obligations, as farm operators and farm managers.

A young man who has assumed such a responsibility needs the continuance of the soil-conservation program, in order that he may have an incentive to make applications of lime and fertilizer

to his acres, applications which are sorely needed in order to assure a good stand of grass. If the soil is not properly conserved, there is every chance that when grass seed is sown there will not be a sufficient growth of grass to survive the rigid winter months; and if it does not survive, there will not be legumes with which to build the soil or to furnish forage for livestock. For that reason, knowing that today there is a greater legume acreage over the countryside of the Nation than existed prior to the introduction of the conservation program, I am in full support of it.

I realize that there has been a decline in soil-conservation payments from the figure of \$500 million to the present allowance of \$250 million. We are now faced with the threat of a reduction to less than \$200 million. It is for that reason that I am supporting the amendment.

Mr. President, if we are to leave to oncoming generations a heritage that will be of benefit and value to them, it is the fertility of the land. If the land is depleted and eroded, coming generations will find a lack of the fertility necessary to enable them to work it profitably.

We are familiar with what happened in the ancient world. We know what happened to the great fruit orchards and the great productive fields of Israel and of other sections of the ancient world, once the people ceased to take proper care of their fertile acreage and to protect the soil. Today there are sands which shift back and forth, where once were fertile fields of grain and of legumes, as well as orchards.

Mr. President, is this incentive payment needed annually in order to encourage the type of farm management there should be? I say it is, because every year there is an oncoming crop of young farmers.

Beyond that, Mr. President, there is commonsense in the argument that there must be an organization in the field in order to carry out the program and if the appropriation is reduced below \$225 million, then too great a percentage of it will have to be spent in administrative costs, instead of being spent in rebuilding the soil. For that reason, we are facing an economic question, not only from the standpoint of the preservation of the fertility of the land, but also from the standpoint of wise appropriation procedure, for when there is a staff in the field which is administering a program, they should be given something to administer, rather than merely have them in the field spending money and doing nothing in return for the money spent.

So I plead with Senators to support the appropriation of \$225 million. It will insure a greater return than any other appropriation I know of, not only today and tomorrow, but in the generations that are to follow.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I should like to be able to agree with my colleagues, the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from Minnesota, because they have not overemphasized the value

of the soil conservation program during the past 12 or 15 years of its existence. Our land, particularly the land east of the Missouri River, is in definitely much better condition as the result of this program. If we were to view the situation from that standpoint alone, I would say unhesitatingly that we should provide not only \$225 million, but should provide the full \$250 million, as we did last year.

However, there are other things to be considered. One of the first is whether we intend to operate the Government of the United States as a solvent business. We now have a national debt approaching \$270 billion, which is bound to increase so long as we continue to operate the Government from year to year on a deficit basis. The dollar which the farmer receives for his produce today is worth but 52 percent of what it was worth some 10 or 12 years ago. I think it would be dangerous if we were to let the present condition continue much longer and not bring Government expenditures and receipts into balance.

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

Mr. AIKEN. I yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course, because of the Senator's great familiarity with all agricultural matters, he knows that the appropriation bill for the Department of Agriculture is the only one of the departmental bills in which the amount of the appropriation for the next fiscal year is below the amount appropriated for 1940. An increase has been made several times in all the others. Is there not some limit to what we ought to take out of the farmer's hide? Should we not be at least a little fair in our distribution of the cuts?

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

Mr. AIKEN. I should like first to reply to the Senator from Georgia. He has pointed out that we are cutting the agricultural appropriations lower, perhaps, than we ought to; but I point out that there is another agricultural bill, an expense bill, so to speak, or a charge account, which will be coming in before the end of the next fiscal year, and which will have to be reckoned with. That is a bill carrying several hundred million dollars for the support of farm prices. If the amount in that bill is added to that in the bill now under consideration, I should be very much surprised if we did not find that together they made one of the largest agricultural appropriation expenditures in the history of the United States—possibly the largest.

There are on hand at the present time tremendous crops of certain commodities. Last year the Government subsidized the wheat-export program at 62 or 63 cents a bushel. Taking into consideration the conditions in the wheat market, I shall be very much surprised if it will not be necessary to subsidize it more nearly at 70 or 80 cents a bushel this year. That, of course, represents an expense to the Government for the benefit of agricultural producers.

It is only right that we should maintain a prosperous agriculture, and,

whether we reduce the appropriation for this particular item to \$225 million or to \$195 million, as recommended by the two committees of the Congress, or to \$140 million, or whether we eliminate it entirely, we are still going to have to spend more in order to maintain a prosperous agricultural economy than we have spent for a long time.

If the Russell amendment is rejected we shall then revert to a vote on the Williams amendment, which would reduce the program to such an extent that it would benefit a comparatively small number of the States, and would entail a very large percentage of administrative costs.

So I think we had better follow the recommendation of the majority of the members of the House Committee on Agriculture and the Senate Committee on Agriculture, who deemed an appropriation of \$195 million sufficient in order to carry on a worthwhile program in all the States of the Union. In my opinion, we should not approve either the \$225 million, which represents a \$30 million increase, or the amendment of the Senator from Delaware, which proposes a \$55 million decrease in the amount which the committees of both Houses of Congress have approved and considered to be a fair figure to bring before the two Houses at this time. So I shall go along with the committee recommendation of \$195 million. Under ordinary circumstances, I should like to see \$225 million, or even \$250 million appropriated, because I think it would be a good investment; but we have other things to consider, and, in view of that fact, it appears to me that \$195 million is a fair figure.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I join the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], and other Senators in sponsoring the amendment which proposes to raise the authorization for the agricultural conservation program for the calendar year 1954 from the sum of \$195 million to \$225 million.

I have great respect for the Committees on Agriculture of both the House and the Senate. I have always respected the judgment of the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and the distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], who, I think, know agricultural conditions throughout the entire Nation.

But, in this instance I think the Senate should take a second look at the authorization of \$195 million which is proposed. I believe that the Senate should increase the authorization to \$225 million as provided in the substitute amendment which has been offered by the Senator from Georgia for himself and in my name and for other Senators.

Mr. President, I first want to address myself to the argument made by the distinguished Senator from Vermont, that the increase should not be voted because of the necessity of reducing expenditures. It is an argument which carries force.

When we begin to talk about increasing authorizations and appropriations we are subject to the criticism that we are not willing to economize in governmental expenditures.

But, if the increase to \$225 million should be voted, it will still be a 10 percent reduction from the authorization of \$250 million for 1953. I believe that reduction of 10 percent is enough. The hearings brought out an interesting fact. During the hearing in response to a question by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], it was developed that since 1940 every department of our Government had increased its expenditures in percentages ranging from 185 percent for the Department of the Interior to 1,146 percent for the State Department, and that the only department since that time which has reduced its expenditures is the Department of Agriculture. Its expenditures for the past year represented a 30 percent reduction from its expenditures in 1940.

The chief argument I make for the amendment increasing the appropriation to \$225 million is that we are dealing with the basic resources of the country. During World War II farmers were called upon to actually mine their soil in order to provide the food and fiber required during the war, and, after the war, to help our allies and needy peoples of the world. At the end of the war a reduced program for conservation practices was started with an expenditure of approximately \$250 million a year. It has been steadily reduced.

The actual expenditures for the soil-conservation program for the calendar year 1951 were \$272,930,000.

Expenditures for the calendar year 1952 amounted to \$256,500,000.

For the calendar year 1953, the authorization was \$250 million.

So the average for these years is more than \$250 million a year.

The pending bill proposes to reduce that figure to \$195 million for the calendar year 1954, a reduction of \$55 million from the average appropriations for this purpose.

We must ask the reason for this proposed reduction. It is not necessary, I believe, to argue the merits of the conservation program. Even those who support the reduced authorization admit its merits.

I should like to read a statement from the report of the committee which I think points up the continuing need for this program. On page 2 of the report there appears the following statement:

While it is true that American farmers have up to this time met, and sometimes exceeded, the demand for farm products, we must face the fact that the land we now have under cultivation must largely provide for our rapidly increasing population. With approximately 2 million more people to feed each year, and with little new land to move to, the most practical solution obviously is to further increase farm production per acre and per animal.

On page 4, the committee report states:

It would be impossible to estimate, in terms of dollars, the loss of soil fertility that

has taken place. It is a fact, however, that about 50 million acres of once productive cropland are too badly eroded for cultivation and another 100 million acres has been reduced because from half to all of the original topsoil has washed away.

Again, on page 5 of the report, the following statement is made:

Under the agricultural conservation program, which is administered largely by local county and community committees, 52 million acres of pasture and range have been improved by reseeding; 18 million acres are being protected through the construction of standard, broad-based terraces; permanent cover has been established on 2 million acres of land subject to erosion; 5 million acres have been leveled for irrigation; sod waterways have been established on 315,000 acres; trees have been planted on 900,000 acres; 824,000 small dams have been built on farms and ranches to retard soil losses and reduce flood damage. All this and only one-fourth of the job is done.

So, Mr. President, the real issue for the Senate to decide is whether an author-

ization of \$195 million can carry on an adequate conservation program. I do not believe so.

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

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Did I correctly understand the Senator from Kentucky to say, in his remarks, that whereas the expenditures of the Department of Commerce had increased 1,370 percent since 1940, expenditures for the Department of Agriculture had decreased by approximately 30 percent?

Mr. COOPER. That is shown by a table which is found on page 30 of the hearings on the bill which we are considering.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have that table incorporated in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

Comparison of appropriations and employment of Department of Agriculture with other civilian departments (regular annual appropriations)

Department	Fiscal year 1940		Fiscal year 1953		Percentage increase (+) or decrease (-)	
	Appropriations	Employment	Appropriations	Employment	Appropriations	Employment
Agriculture	Mil. dol.	Mil. dol.	Mil. dol.	Mil. dol.	Mil. dol.	Mil. dol.
Commerce	1,054.9	91,370	733.8	57,935	-30.4	-38.7
Interior	54.2	26,699	797.2	65,172	+1,370.8	+144.1
Justice	191.2	40,547	545.5	60,677	+185.3	+30.3
Labor	52.6	14,720	184.4	32,194	+230.6	+118.7
Post Office	34.6	3,484	222.5	7,815	+543.0	+124.3
State	704.0	303,654	2,793.8	523,779	+251.8	+72.4
Treasury	21.0	6,302	261.7	31,302	+1,146.1	+396.7
	215.9	59,256	655.5	89,460	+207.6	+50.9
Total above agencies (excluding Agriculture)	1,363.5	460,662	5,460.6	810,390	+300.5	+75.9

NOTE.—Employment figures of all departments other than Agriculture taken from Civil Service Commission reports for June 30, 1940, and June 30, 1952.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield for another question?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is the Senator aware of the fact that the comparisons made in that table are not on a comparative basis? The 1940 figures for the Department of Commerce, for example, do not include the Civil Aeronautics Administration, the Civil Aeronautics Board, the United States Maritime Commission, maritime activities, and the Bureau of Public Roads, which were included in the 1952 figures, and if we place the expenditures of the Department of Commerce on a comparative basis with those given in the table for the Department of Agriculture, the increase would be only approximately 86 percent.

Mr. COOPER. I am glad to have the information.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, at the conclusion of the remarks of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], a table showing a comparison of the Department of Commerce appropriations and expenditures for the fiscal year 1940 and 1952. This table indicates the fallacies of the table referred to by

the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER].

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield further?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is the Senator from Kentucky aware of the fact that there is a further loss to the Government through purchases of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and that this loss is not charged off?

Mr. COOPER. I am familiar with that.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that in 1940 there were almost no losses through the Commodity Credit Corporation, but in the current year the losses through the Commodity Credit Corporation are large? So if we lump in the Commodity Credit Corporation with the Department of Agriculture in measuring payments to farmers we will find, I think, that the increase has been as great as that of the Department of Commerce.

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

Mr. COOPER. In a moment.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. ARKEN] so indicated in his argument a

few minutes ago. He said that in the total amount of appropriations for the Department of Agriculture, the money to be spent by the Commodity Credit Corporation in support operations should be considered.

The first budget submitted by the outgoing administration underestimated by several hundred million dollars the amount that probably will have to be spent—according to the hearings—in support operations, principally for wheat and cotton. As I see it, expenditures for support operations and for a soil-conservation program are entirely different propositions. We are dealing now with the conservation of soil, the use of soil, and the continuance of fertility of soil in the future.

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

Mr. COOPER. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that in 1951 the total expenditures under the so-called ACP program amounted to \$245 million; that of the \$245 million, only \$88 million, or one-third was used for permanent soil-improvement practices; and that the remaining two-thirds were used for fertilizers including lime, which are not generally considered permanent?

Mr. COOPER. The question of what constitutes a permanent program is not a matter of law or fixed in character. The Department of Agriculture determines what a permanent practice is today. But what is considered to be permanent practice in one State might be entirely different from what is considered to be permanent practices in the State of Illinois or other States.

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

Mr. COOPER. As soon as I have finished.

What is considered to be permanent soil practice in States such as Utah, New Mexico, and Arizona, where the chief interest is in the conservation of water, is entirely different from permanent soil practices in States such as my State of Kentucky and other border or Southern States, where water is not a great problem.

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

Mr. COOPER. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. On page 637 of the Senate hearings, the statement of the Secretary of Agriculture was that on the basis of permanent-type practices, as defined by him, only \$88 million was distributed in 1951.

According to the 1951 statistical summary of the agricultural conservation program, compiled by the Production and Marketing Administration in November of 1952, the last column, indicates that the total amount distributed for the ACP program was \$245,700,000, roughly three times the amount that the Secretary of Agriculture said was for permanent-type practice. That figure may be found at the bottom of the last column on page 95 of the statistical summary.

As we know, in practice most of the money that has been distributed has been for fertilizer and for limestone. I do not object to that in the case of poor soils or for poor farmers. But does the Senator from Kentucky believe that we should subsidize rich farmers, who have the money with which to buy fertilizer, and who can recoup their out-of-pocket expenses for fertilizers from the sale of larger crops? I am perfectly ready to have a part of this money go to poor farmers, in States having poor soils, but I am opposed to giving money to rich farmers.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair reminds the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] that he has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. COOPER. I ask unanimous consent that I may continue for 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. YOUNG. I would rather yield the Senator from Kentucky 5 minutes of my own time.

Mr. COOPER. I will finish, then. I answer the Senator from Illinois by saying he has changed his argument. There is no suggestion that the increase will go to rich farmers. I do not favor that.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Kentucky yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. COOPER. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Commodity Credit Corporation has been brought into the debate. Is it not a fact that the Commodity Credit Corporation has shown a profit on major crops?

Mr. COOPER. There has been a profit on some crops, such as tobacco.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Commodity Credit Corporation has shown a profit on tobacco, corn, and wheat.

Mr. COOPER. I am not familiar with all the operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. MAYBANK. The distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] said that there would be a bill introduced with respect to the Commodity Credit Corporation. I merely wish to make certain that the Record shows that the Commodity Credit Corporation, thus far, has shown a profit on its sales of major crops. Of course, it was largely carried by the \$100,000,000, provided for it, but it has shown a profit.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I thank my friend. I have only a few minutes remaining, and I do not wish to be diverted by discussions of other questions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Kentucky decline to yield further?

Mr. COOPER. I decline to yield further at this time.

I wish to confine my argument particularly to the point of the appropriation of funds for the agricultural conservation program. The amount ought to be increased from \$195 million to \$225 million. My first point is that it is needed to provide an adequate and satisfactory continuation of the program

which has been under way since the war, a program averaging an annual expenditure of \$250 million a year.

The administrative cost of the program as detailed in the 1954 budget presented by Mr. Truman's administration was about \$38 million. The budget presented by the present administration calls for \$27 million, a noteworthy saving. If \$27 million is taken away from the \$195 million, \$168 million will remain for conservation practices payments to farmers. Compared to 1951, that is over \$100 million less. Compared to 1952, it is about \$80 million less, and compared to the year 1953, it is \$70 million less.

As I understand the hearings, the Department proposes to reduce the amount of money and place emphasis upon what are called permanent practices. But what is the best practice for a particular State depends upon the soil, the water situation and other factors in that State. As I have said, what might be considered the best practice in Illinois, with its rich glacial soil, or in Utah or Arizona, which are interested chiefly in water, may not be the best permanent practice in the Southern States and border States, including my State, where conditions are different.

I can speak from my own experience. I can remember my own county in Kentucky, when I returned from school in 1926. It is a typical county of a border State. It has not the best land or the poorest land. Many of its fields and hillsides were bare and gullied. I have seen a change take place. It has been caused in great part through the use of lime and minerals, and the seeding of grass to prevent erosion of the soil, and to build up its fertility. This program has enriched the soil in border States, Southern States, and other States throughout the country. It has not been the only conservation program, but it has been a good one.

The Senate will make a grave mistake if it does not continue an adequate program by authorizing \$225 million for 1954. The Department of Agriculture has stated, and I agree with the Department's purpose, that it intends to review and analyze its programs. The Department has said that in this year and next year it intends to undertake a thorough analysis and review of the farm program. Why cannot the Department review the agricultural conservation program in these 2 years? I think it unwise for Congress to alter or change the program radically by reductions in authorizations. This year and next year the Department may be able, by voluntary arrangements and through educational programs, to shift the emphasis to the permanent type practices. The Department of Agriculture in this year can give farmers throughout the country an opportunity to be heard on the matter and a better program can be developed.

It is not a question of economy alone. The \$30 million which is involved will be more than repaid in soil fertility and the protection of soil throughout the entire Nation.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

EXHIBIT 1

(Submitted by Senator DOUGLAS as a qualification of table on p. 30 of Senate hearings)
 Department of Commerce, comparison of appropriations and expenditures, fiscal years 1940 and 1952
 [Figured in thousands of dollars]

	Appropriations			Expenditures		
	1940 ¹	1952 ²	Increase (+) or decrease (-)	1940 ¹	1952 ²	Increase (+) or decrease (-)
Office of the Secretary	1,235	1,975	+740	1,298	2,020	+722
Foreign and Domestic Commerce	2,156	10,754	+8,598	2,111	10,370	+8,259
Bureau of Census	28,947	14,810	-14,137	20,486	18,743	-1,743
National Bureau of Standards	2,436	13,803	+11,367	2,405	9,452	+7,047
Coast and Geodetic Survey	3,156	12,669	+9,513	4,000	12,430	+8,430
Patent Office	4,692	12,225	+7,533	4,589	12,086	+7,497
Commerce, miscellaneous	7		-7	500		-500
Bureau of Marine Inspection and Navigation (transferred out of Commerce)	(2,682)	(³)		(2,630)		
Bureau of Air Commerce, ⁴ trust accounts						
Total, general and special accounts (as in 1940 but excluding Bureau of Marine Inspection and Navigation)	42,629	66,236	+23,607	34,889	65,101	+30,212
Office of the Secretary: Salaries and expenses, defense production activities	41,837	+41,837		36,064	+36,064	
Civil Aeronautics Administration	28,224	162,855	+134,631	25,277	171,461	+146,184
Civil Aeronautics Board	3,860	+3,860		3,784	+3,784	
U. S. Maritime Commission: Maritime activities	100,007	218,320	+118,313	98,042	229,687	+131,645
Bureau of Public Roads	333,581	429,725	96,144	169,015	149,819	+280,504
Weather Bureau	6,137	26,970	+20,833	5,852	26,323	+20,471
Inland Waterways Corporation	(⁴)			1,000		+1,000
Total, Department of Commerce (as organized in 1952)	510,578	949,803	+439,225	333,075	963,239	+650,164
Percent			+86			+195

¹ From Combined Statement of Receipts, Expenditures, and Balances of the United States for fiscal year ending June 30, 1940, pp. 226-233, 168, 192, 152, 199.

² From Combined Statement of Receipts, Expenditures, and Balances of the United States for fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, pp. 212-220.

³ Account stated under Civil Aeronautics Authority, independent offices.

⁴ Undisbursed balance June 30, 1951 was \$1,000,000.

Figures in parentheses are not included in totals.

Figures do not include trust funds.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I oppose the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] increasing the appropriation and, at the same time, speak in behalf of my own amendment, which would reduce the appropriation for PMA payments to \$140 million. I know of no better argument to use in opposition to the amendment of the Senator from Georgia than to quote from the statements of representatives of two of the largest farm organizations in the United States, who testified before the Senate Committee on Appropriations. First, I wish to quote from the testimony of Mr. J. T. Sanders, legislative counsel of the National Grange, whose testimony begins at page 1115 of the hearings. Referring to the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Sanders said:

ENDORSEMENT OF CONSERVATION-PAYMENTS REDUCTION

We especially wish to endorse his reduction in the agricultural conservation payments for the fiscal year 1953-54 to the extent of \$110 million from current appropriation of \$251.7 million. We believe that the Secretary and his staff have earnestly and honestly sought out those agricultural-conservation payments that are for measures and supplies for nonpermanent types of conservation work. We believe that these payments should never be used as an excuse and substitute for price supports. However, they should be used as a portion of a skillfully planned part of farmland conservation. The Secretary, we believe, has undertaken to weed out that portion of these payments that do not qualify under this standard.

That would bring the amount down to \$140 million, the same as my amendment.

On page 561, Mr. Allan Kline, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, made this statement:

Now, the \$140 million represents a cut of \$110 million, approximately. This seems to us to be generally in line with our proposal that these payments ought to be made on the basis of conservation needs. They ought to be made for real conservation. They should not be made, as in my own county, for the application of lime or phosphorus.

That is the testimony of representatives of two of the largest farm organizations, who spoke not only in opposition to the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] but also in endorsement of the amendment offered by me.

Mr. President, I repeat, that is the testimony of the representatives of two of the largest farm organizations, not only speaking in opposition to the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia, but also endorsing the amendment offered by myself which figure is supported by the present Secretary of Agriculture.

It was pointed out a few moments ago by one Senator speaking in favor of the increase that in ancient countries the soil was depleted. In studying ancient history, it might be well also to examine what happened to the governments of those countries and the currencies of those countries. In the same history book it will be found that every one of those countries became bankrupt under exactly the same kind of program as is being advocated here today. I refer to the wholesale giveaway programs. It is always much more popular to give away money than to stop the giveaway. If the

amendment of the Senator from Georgia is adopted, it will mean that this year's appropriation for the Department of Agriculture will be 1½ percent more than Congress gave the same department last year. That certainly would not support a tax-reduction program.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator should know that this is the authorization for next year, 1954. It has no relation to the budget of this year, as such. So the figures cannot be completely applicable.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I point out to the Senator that it is easy to project the figures to 1954. However, whatever we authorize this year, we shall pay next year. Therefore, both appropriations and authorizations should be taken into consideration when we pass an appropriation bill.

The Senator from Georgia was pointing out the fact that his figure represented a reduction from the Truman request for authorization, but since when did we recognize Mr. Truman's budget as sacred? If we were to reduce the maximum payment to any one farmer to \$1,000, rather than letting the payments go to a small group, such action would spread the program to the farmers needing encouragement. If we are to reduce appropriations we must begin somewhere. Certainly no one could speak with greater authority for the farmers than the representatives of the two largest farm organizations in the United States. They say they are willing and have taken official action favoring these cuts. It seems the height of folly to give them more money than they are asking for.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like to ask the Senator from Delaware a question. He mentioned the fact that the committee was claiming a decrease in appropriations as compared with 1953, and a decrease under the estimates prepared by the Truman administration. Is it not a fact that the committee is failing to appropriate for the fiscal year 1953-54 approximately \$40 million, for the 1953-54 ACP program, which will come due during that year? On page 12 of the report the committee says:

If the amount provided is insufficient for that purpose—

Namely, meeting the estimate of \$252 million—

the Department is expected to take the necessary action to secure additional funds which may be needed.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. In a moment.

That means, does it not, that there will be a supplementary bill coming in to make good the \$250 million? Therefore the claim of economy which the committee makes in the latter part of its report, of \$39,750,000, is a phony economy. When the bills for 1953-54 are finally footed, both in connection with this appropriation and the sugar appro-

priation, instead of economies of \$20 million as compared with last year, we shall find an increase of \$25 million, which will even exceed the Truman budget.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Delaware yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I shall be glad to yield in a moment.

Let me say in reply to the Senator from Illinois that there is no question that these authorizations will have to be met either next year or the year after.

I also point out that on page 51 there is another item, of \$171,740,395, which is, in effect, an appropriation in this year's expenditures; however, it is not included in the total as compiled on the front page of the committee report. The item to which I refer represents note cancellations to pay for the cost of the International Wheat Agreement. This note cancellation authority has been one of the methods used by the Department to cover up the overall cost of the program.

The Commodity Credit Corporation keeps claiming in its financial statements that its losses are only relatively small over a period of 25 or 30 years; yet the Director of the Budget advises me that the reason it is able to report fairly small losses is that it has been counting as income appropriations by Congress plus its authority to cancel notes. It has not been charging them off as expenditures, as any sensible businessman would do.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield to me?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Will the Senator from Delaware agree with me that when the final bills for 1953 and 1954 are footed, the expenditures will exceed the expenditures for 1952-53 by enormous amounts?

Mr. WILLIAMS. If we adopt the pending amendment, as I previously stated, this appropriation will be 1½ percent more than the amount which was appropriated in the same bill in 1952.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. I heard the Senator from Illinois say that this cut of \$40 million was a phony cut. If it is phony, then the Department of Agriculture is phony, because its estimate of the cost of last year's program was \$211,982,000. It expects to hold expenditures within that amount. If expenditures should be slightly more than that, the committee proposes to authorize the Department to take the money out of the Commodity Credit Corporation fund.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Without entering into the exchange between the Senator from North Dakota and the Senator from Illinois, I point out to the Senator from North Dakota, that the bill as reported by the committee calls for \$20,480,065 below last year's appropriation. The amendment which is now pending proposes to increase this appropriation by \$30 million. If that amend-

ment is adopted, it will mean that the bill will carry an appropriation of some \$10 million more than last year's appropriation, or an increase of 1½ percent.

Mr. YOUNG. That is not an appropriation at all. It is not reflected in this bill. It is an authorization. However, it would cause additional obligations next year.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator from North Dakota will admit that contract authorizations and appropriations both represent obligations of the United States Government.

Mr. YOUNG. That is true.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If we adopt this amendment calling for a figure of \$225 million, and authorize the Department of Agriculture to make commitments to that extent, we shall be obligated to appropriate the money next year; is not that true?

Mr. YOUNG. That is true.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Therefore we must treat these authorizations which are firm commitments, as though they were appropriations, even though they do not enter into expenditures until 1954.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. I think perhaps the Senator from Delaware is in error to a certain extent. As I understand, this bill proposes to authorize, in the calendar year 1954, the sum of \$195 million for the entire conservation program. We must deduct from that amount administrative costs. If we take the average of the past several years, they run more than \$30 million, leaving about \$160 million for the conservation program for farmers. In 1951 and 1952, according to the hearings, payments to farmers were \$276 million. In the next year they were \$250 million; and this year they are almost \$200 million.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, if I understand the Senator from Kentucky correctly, I think he has made an excellent argument in opposition to the increase by pointing out that of the \$225 million, \$60 million to \$65 million will go to pay administrative costs. We have surely reached a sad state of affairs when it costs a third of the appropriation for administrative expenses.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield that I may correct the RECORD?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do not yield at this time. I shall be glad to yield in just a moment after yielding to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. THYE. The Senator from Delaware—

Mr. WILLIAMS. I decline to yield at this point.

Mr. THYE. The Senator from Delaware is mistaken.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I will yield to the Senator in a moment.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. I know the Senator misunderstood what I said. I stated that the authorization was for \$195 million, and that if administrative costs were of the same order as they have been

for the past 3 years, they would average more than \$30 million, which when taken from \$195 million, would leave \$165 million for the program. The Senator made a mistake when he said I had stated \$65 million is available for administrative expenses. I should like to go further and say that the bill calls for only \$27 million for administrative expenses.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I misunderstood the Senator from Kentucky. I still point out, nevertheless, that if the amendment is adopted we will have authorized 1½ percent more for the agricultural program than was authorized for fiscal 1953.

In the next 15 days or so Congress will be confronted with the question of whether or not we shall extend the excess profits tax for an additional 6 months, and we shall also be confronted with the question of whether we will give a general tax reduction to the American people.

It is the height of folly for any Member of Congress to talk about giving the American people a 10 percent tax reduction and at the same time vote for an appropriation which calls for a 1½-percent increase over last year in expenditures. The two actions do not go together, and the sooner that fact is recognized the better.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I merely wanted to make sure that the figures are correctly stated in the RECORD. The appropriation for the past fiscal year was \$250 million, of which \$240½ million was spent. Approximately \$9½ million was not spent, although allocated. The appropriation this year is for \$211 million. The difference between \$211 million and \$240½ million is due to the fact that there were carryovers, as I understand, from the year before. The administrative costs in fiscal 1953 for the Federal, State, county, and community expenses are figured at approximately \$26 million. I believe it is anticipated that those expenses will be lowered a little for the next fiscal year. If I recall correctly, it was thought that the \$140 million appropriation would be administered for about \$21 million, and that the \$195 million appropriation would cost approximately \$1 million more to administer.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator from Vermont is correct with respect to this single item. My statement, that if we adopt the amendment the appropriation would be 1½ percent more than last year, was based on the overall appropriation, because the bill itself calls for \$716,729,768. That is the amount reported by the committee.

The amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia (Mr. RUSSELL) proposes to increase the amount by \$30 million. If we adopt the \$30 million amendment increase, it would mean that we would be adding \$30 million to offset the claimed \$20 million decrease reported by the committee, which would mean that the appropriation would be \$10 million more than the amount appropriated for fiscal year 1953.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I made a comparison between the proposed bill

with the Russell amendment added to it and the amount appropriated last year. I do not know what the percentage would be.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I used the committee report as a basis for my figures.

Mr. AIKEN. I have before me a statement entitled "Reconciliation of 1953 program authorization with 1954 revised budget estimate." The statement has just been handed to me. It reads:

Authorization for 1953 program carried in 1953 appropriation act, \$250 million.

Less operating savings and adjustments, reductions in aerial photography, reserve, etcetera, \$9,400,760.

Revised total, 1953 program, \$240,599,240.

Less operating expenses of 1953 program, \$26,178,700.

Less "other program expenses" (checkwriting, printing, aerial photographs, etc.), \$1,088,440.

I do not believe it is particularly interesting to read all of this statement. However, I ask that it be printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, so we will have before us the authentic figures involved.

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

Agricultural conservation program—reconciliation of 1953 program authorization with 1954 revised budget estimate

Authorization for 1953 program carried in 1953 appropriation act..... \$250,000,000

Less operating savings and adjustments, reductions in aerial photography, reserve, etc..... —9,400,760

Revised total, 1953 program..... 240,599,240

Less operating expenses of 1953 program..... —26,178,700

Less other program expenses (checkwriting, printing, aerial photographs, etc.)..... —1,088,440

Total cash payments and grants of materials and services, 1953 program..... 213,332,100

1953 program payments paid from fiscal year 1953 appropriation as advances of conservation material and services..... 44,521,378

Payments still due to farmers on 1953 program, to be paid from fiscal year 1954 appropriation..... 168,810,722

Add operating expenses of 1953 program..... +26,178,700

Add other program expenses (checkwriting, printing, aerial photographs, etc.)..... +1,088,440

Add cash payments and grants of materials and services on the 1954 program from the 1954 appropriation..... +25,304,156

Total fiscal year 1954 obligations..... 221,382,018

Borrowings from CCC:

Payment to CCC (represents total amount owed to CCC as of June 30, 1953)..... 15,599,982

Agricultural conservation program—reconciliation of 1953 program authorization with 1954 revised budget estimate—Con.

Borrowings from CCC—Con.

To be borrowed from CCC for advances of conservation materials and services on the 1954 programs..... 25,000,000

Net borrowings from CCC..... —9,400,018

Revised budget estimate for fiscal year 1954..... 211,982,000

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, in a few days the Senate will have before it the mutual aid bill. In that bill there will be provided billions of dollars for economic aid to almost every country on the face of the globe.

The distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] is seeking to do something for the farmers of the United States.

If Senators want economy they can get it by voting against some of the economic aid it is proposed to give to many countries some of which I doubt if some Senators have even heard of, even though they may have been valedictorians of their college classes.

I ask unanimous consent that at this point in my remarks there be published telegrams, letters, and postcards which I have received from farmers in the State of North Dakota. I believe that my distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], received duplicates of many of these telegrams and letters. I ask that these telegrams, letters, and postcards be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks. I have brought to the floor only a few of the messages, because I do not wish to encumber the RECORD.

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

NEW ROCKFORD, N. DAK., June 11, 1953.

Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Urge you support farm appropriations recommended by Senate subcommittee, including two hundred and fifty millions for ACP.

LELAND SHROYER,
Chairman, Eddy County Farmers Union.

CARRINGTON, N. DAK., June 11, 1953.

Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Four hundred and seventy-three members of the Foster County Farmers Union urge your support to Senate Joint Resolution 79 and to the Hope bill, 5451.

FOSTER COUNTY FARMERS UNION,
PAUL MARRIAGE, Secretary-Treasurer.

STERLING, N. DAK., June 9, 1953.

Hon. Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

We urge you to support farm appropriations at or above House appropriations, also support Mundt bill.

DRISCOLL PIONEER LOCAL FARMERS UNION,
Mrs. E. A. SCHAUER, Secretary.

CROSBY, N. DAK., June 12, 1953.

Senator WILLIAM LANGER:

We urge your vote for the Mundt bill and full support for adequate agricultural funds.

OLAI KVIGNE,
HARRY THOMPSON,
JOHN KARLBERG,
ORVILLE KNOTSON.

MINOT, N. DAK., June 8, 1953.

Senator WILLIAM LANGER:

Seventy-five members Eureka Local, No. 670, Farmers Union, strongly support (1) full restoration of agricultural appropriations, (2) Mundt bill.

NORMAN J. LIVINGSTON,
Chairman, Eureka Local, No. 670,
Farmers Union.

MINOT, N. DAK., June 11, 1953.

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,

Senate Office Building:

Respectfully urge you to use your vote and influence in support of the recommendation by the Senate Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations. Agriculture's slow climb toward equality with other groups in our economy must not be checked now.

VERNON F. CARLSON.

GLENBURN, N. DAK.

MINOT, N. DAK., June 11, 1953.

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,

Senate Office Building:

Please support Senate subcommittee recommendation on appropriations for agriculture. Absolutely necessary to preserve the much needed present farm programs.

A. C. OLSON.

MINOT, N. DAK., June 11, 1953.

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,

Senate Office Building:

I am an operator of a family-type farm. From past experience of 30 years' farming, I deem it a must that the appropriations recommended by the Senate subcommittee be approved.

WALTER WEMER.

MINOT, N. DAK., June 11, 1953.

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,

Senate Office Building:

We feel that it is imperative that agriculture appropriations be supported as recommended by the Senate Subcommittee on Agriculture. We urge your support and vote to defeat any cut in these recommendations.

FREEDOM FARMERS UNION LOCAL,
DON BIVINS,
SAWYER, N. DAK.

CROSBY, N. DAK., June 11, 1953.

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,

Senate Office Building:

Please don't cut agriculture appropriations below 1952 level. We want ACP.

MELVIN MORTENSON,
ALVIN SVANGSTU,
ALEX MURPHY,
G. T. HOVERSTIN.

NOONAN, N. DAK.

MINOT, N. DAK., June 11, 1953.

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,

Senate Office Building:

Because Agriculture stands on the brink of disaster under present price structure of farm commodities, I urge your vote and support of the recommendations of the Senate Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations.

M. P. FREDA.

MINOT, N. DAK., June 11, 1953.

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,

Senate Office Building:

In the critical situation that agriculture finds itself in today, I ask that you vote for and support the agriculture appropriations

as recommended by the Senate subcommittee.

FARRELL L. NELSON,
TOWNER, N. DAK.

MINOT, N. DAK., June 11, 1953.
HON. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building:

Am counting on you to lead the fight to support the agriculture appropriations as recommended by the Senate subcommittee.

INEZ N. HOLVORSON.

MINOT, N. DAK., June 11, 1953.

HON. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building:

I believe that it is necessary to keep appropriations for our vital farm programs at a high level. Please support the subcommittee's recommendation on agriculture appropriations.

FLOYD FREDA.

MINOT, N. DAK., June 11, 1953.

HON. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building:

It is impossible for us to understand why the family type farmer is being legislated out of the picture while all other segments of our economy are enjoying higher incomes than ever before. Please support the recommendations of the Senate subcommittee for agriculture appropriations to maintain our farm programs.

MCKINLEY FARMERS UNION LOCAL,
IRVIN LARSON, Secretary.

REGENT, N. DAK., June 11, 1953.

Senator WILLIAM LANGER:

We ask that you support farm appropriations recommended by Senate subcommittee, including \$250 million for ACP.

REGENT CO-OP EQUITY EXCHANGE,
WALTER BARTHOLOME.

MOTT, N. DAK., June 11, 1953.

Senator WILLIAM LANGER,

Senate Office Building:

Urge your support farm appropriations bills \$250 million for ACP as recommended by Senate subcommittee.

HETTINGER COUNTY FARMERS UNION,
Mrs. Ed IVERSON, Secretary.

CROSBY, N. DAK., June 10, 1953.

Senator WILLIAM LANGER,

Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.:

Believe that Agriculture Department appropriation should be at least equal to last year's. Do what you can.

IVAN ERICKSON,
Republican County Chairman,
Divide County.

WHEELOCK, N. DAK., June 10, 1953.

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,

Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.:

Urge your continued active support of higher level agricultural appropriations.

CLAIR AMSBERRY,

President Williams County Farmers Union.

HAZEN, N. DAK., June 10, 1953.

Senator WILLIAM LANGER,

Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:

Support farm appropriation when reaches Senate also \$250 million for ACP.

OLIVER COUNTY FARMERS UNION,
JOSEPH JOCHIM, President.

HAZEN, N. DAK., June 10, 1953.

Senator WM. LANGER,

Senate Building,

Washington, D. C.:

Support farm appropriation when reaches Senate. Also \$250 million for ACP.

RED BUTTE LOCAL,
Mrs. DAN KIRCHMEIER,

Secretary,

Mr. OTTO ALBERS,
President.

VALLEY CITY, N. DAK., June 10, 1953.
Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.:

It is the general wish of our 2,000 patrons and stockholders that you use every effort to support the subcommittee appropriation measure, including \$250 million ACP for agriculture. We should all realize that the farmers are the backbone of our purchasing power and in turn benefits everyone.

FARMERS UNION OIL CO.,

LEONARD J. BRAULICK.

MINOT, N. DAK., June 11, 1953.

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,

Senate Office Building:

Take this opportunity to urge you continued support for farm program appropriations. This program is an absolute must for our family type farmer. Without an adequate farm program these farmers face economic disaster.

GLEN PACE.

WOLSETH, N. DAK.

MINOT, N. DAK., June 11, 1953.

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,

Senate Office Building:

We urgently request the agricultural appropriations approved by the Senate subcommittee be aggressively supported. Also the \$250 million recommended for ACP be passed. With the dwindling economy it is more important than ever that the agriculture be maintained on a sound basis.

ARNOLD HAGUE,

President, Ward County Farmers Union.

NEW ENGLAND, N. DAK., June 10, 1953.

WILLIAM LANGER,

United States Senator:

Will you kindly support the appropriations which passed by the House for the farm program and also \$250 million for ACP which is recommended by the Senate subcommittee.

ADOLPH REISENAUER.

ZAHL, N. DAK., June 10, 1953.

Senator WM. LANGER,

United States Senate:

Farmers in Northwest urge your support farm appropriations recommended by Senate subcommittee, including two hundred fifty million for ACP.

HENRY WILLIAMS.

SANISH, N. DAK., June 12, 1953.

Senator WILLIAM LANGER,

Senate Office Building:

I urge you to support agriculture appropriations as recommended by agriculture subcommittee.

G. F. GULBRICKSON.

TOLNA, N. DAK., June 11, 1953.

Senator WM. LANGER,

Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.:

Urge you support farm appropriation bill recommended by Senate subcommittee or at least as large as last year.

ROBERT JOHNSON.

TOLNA, N. DAK., June 11, 1953.

Senator WM. LANGER,

Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.:

Urge you support farm program appropriation bill at least as large as last year.

LEONARD JOHNSON.

CARRINGTON, N. DAK., June 11, 1953.

WILLIAM LANGER,

Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.:

Four hundred and seventy-three Foster County Farmers Union members urge your opposition to any cuts in appropriations for agriculture.

FOSTER COUNTY FARMERS UNION,
PAUL MARRIAGE, Secretary-Treasurer.

FLASHER, N. DAK., June 12, 1953.

Senator WILLIAM LANGER,

Senate Office Building:

Urging you to support farm appropriations recommended by Senate subcommittee. Also asking you to support the \$250 millions for ACP.

FARMERS UNION OIL CO.

BISBEE, N. DAK., June 12, 1953.

Senator WILLIAM LANGER:

We urge support for full agricultural funds to carry on farm programs.

TOWNER COUNTY FARMERS UNION

BOARD,

Mrs. CATHERINE KOESTER,

County Secretary.

APPAM, N. DAK., June 12, 1953.

Senator LANGER,

United States Senate:

Farmers of Northwest urge your support on farm appropriations recommended by Senate subcommittee including \$250 million for ACP.

Board of Directors of Appam Farmers Elevator Co. and Patrons Reuben Esterby, President; Elmer Amundson, Secretary; V. C. Anderson, Nels Hendrickson, Henry Williams, Albert K. Esterby, Soren Sorenson, Alvin Knutson, K. V. Esterby, Herbert L. Hyland, Peter P. Flories, Elias Svenson, O. H. Syland, Edgar S. Hyland, Lester B. Quie, Earl Esterby, Albert Knutson, Clifford Ryen, Melvin Dragseth, Martin Johnson, Herman Sunquist, Bennie Benson.

COGSWELL, N. DAK., June 13, 1953.

Senator WILLIAM LANGER,

Washington, D. C.:

We earnestly beg you to support farm appropriations equal to last year.

Mr. and Mrs. WILLIAM EVEN.

COGSWELL, N. DAK., June 13, 1953.

Senator WILLIAM LANGER,

Washington, D. C.:

We earnestly urge you to keep farm program appropriations at the Senate subcommittee recommendations.

Mr. and Mrs. LAWRENCE KUMMETH.

COGSWELL, N. DAK., June 13, 1953.

Senator WILLIAM LANGER,

Washington, D. C.:

The family type farmer must have farm program appropriations kept up to last year and I urge you to work for at least the recommendations of Senate subcommittee.

Mr. and Mrs. AMOS GRANDIN.

CROSBY, N. DAK., June 12, 1953.

Senator WILLIAM LANGER:

We want no cuts in agricultural appropriations

and urge your backing.

BJARNE HOFSTAD.

THORSTEN KARLBERG.

SIGURD HOFSTAD.

ARNE BJARNSVETD.

GWINNER, N. DAK., June 12, 1953.

Senator WILLIAM LANGER,

Washington, D. C.:

We urge to support farm appropriations equal to last year, which was absolute minimum.

WHITE STONE HILL FARMERS UNION.

MILNOR, N. DAK., June 12, 1953.

Senator LANGER,

Washington, D. C.:

We, the Shuman F U local of 25 farm families, do urge your continued support in maintaining agricultural appropriations at least equal to last year's figure. We feel it necessary if we expect to maintain the family type of farm. Loss of family farm means economy loss to Nation.

ARNOLD FEDJE,
Secretary of Schuman Local.

GWINNER, MINN., June 12, 1953.

Senator WILLIAM LANGER,

Washington, D. C.:

We urge to support farm appropriations equal to last year which was absolute minimum.

SARGENT COUNTY FARMERS UNION.

COGSWELL, N. DAK., June 12, 1953.

Senator WILLIAM LANGER,

Washington, D. C.:

Seventy-five Sargent Harlem Local Farmers Union members, of Sargent County, urge you to work for the support of farm program appropriations recommended by Senate subcommittee. These are necessary to maintain the family type farmers; their loss will mean an economic loss to the Nation.

ED HANSON,

President.

LAWRENCE KUMMETH,

Secretary.

FLASHER, N. DAK., June 8, 1953.

Senator LANGER,

Washington, D. C.:

Depending on you to support appropriations recommended by Senate subcommittee, also need \$250 million additional for ACP.

EDWIN B. TIMPE,

Vice Chairman, Farmers Union Local, No. 779.

BOWMAN, N. DAK., June 9, 1953.

Hon. Senator LANGER:

I urge your support for all farm appropriations recommended by the Senate subcommittee.

ALLEN SEDEVIE.

BOWMAN, N. DAK., June 9, 1953.

Hon. Senator LANGER:

I urge your support for all farm appropriations recommended by the Senate subcommittee.

OLE LEWISON.

BOWMAN, N. DAK., June 9, 1953.

Hon. Senator LANGER:

I urge your support for all farm appropriations recommended by the Senate subcommittee.

ISIDORE FISHER.

BOWMAN, N. DAK., June 9, 1953.

Hon. Senator LANGER:

I urge your support for all farm appropriations recommended by the Senate subcommittee.

JOHN SCHADE.

BOWMAN, N. DAK., June 9, 1953.

Hon. Senator LANGER,

Washington, D. C.:

I urge your support for all farm appropriations recommended by the Senate subcommittee.

JOE SONSALLA.

MARMARTH, N. DAK.

BOWMAN, N. DAK., June 9, 1953.

Hon. Senator LANGER,

Washington, D. C.:

I urge your support for all farm appropriations recommended by the Senate subcommittee.

PERCY KLEEMAN.

BOWMAN, N. DAK., June 9, 1953.

Hon. Senator LANGER,

Washington, D. C.:

I urge your support for all farm appropriations recommended by the Senate subcommittee.

MARTIN KLUKSDAL.

SCRANTON, N. DAK.

BOWMAN, N. DAK., June 9, 1953.

Hon. Senator LANGER,

Washington, D. C.:

I urge your support for all farm appropriations recommended by the Senate subcommittee.

JOE V. PALCZEWSKI.

SCRANTON, N. DAK.

BOWMAN, N. DAK., June 9, 1953.

Hon. Senator LANGER,

Washington, D. C.:

I urge your support for all farm appropriations recommended by the Senate subcommittee.

VIRGIL WEST.

FLASHER, N. DAK., June 8, 1953.

Hon. Senator WILLIAM LANGER,

Washington, D. C.:

Depending on you to support farm appropriations recommended by Senate subcommittee including \$250 million for ACP. Thank you.

HELGE ENGRÉN,

President, Morton County Farmers Union.

BOWMAN, N. DAK., June 9, 1953.

Hon. Senator LANGER:

I urge your support for all farm appropriations recommended by the Senate subcommittee.

NICK MOSBRUCKER.

BOWMAN, N. DAK., June 9, 1953.

Hon. Senator LANGER:

I urge your support for all farm appropriations recommended by the Senate subcommittee.

H. J. BURKE.

BOWMAN, N. DAK., June 9, 1953.

Hon. Senator LANGER:

I urge your support for all farm appropriations recommended by the Senate subcommittee.

H. F. OLSON,

Manager, Farmers Union Elevator.

BOWMAN, N. DAK., June 9, 1953.

Hon. Senator LANGER:

I urge your support for all farm appropriations recommended by the Senate subcommittee.

ANDREW JENSEN.

BOWMAN, N. DAK., June 9, 1953.

Hon. Senator LANGER:

I urge your support for all farm appropriations recommended by the Senate subcommittee.

DONALD BARTEL,

Chairman, Bowman County Republican Committee.

BOWMAN, N. DAK., June 9, 1953.

Hon. Senator LANGER:

I urge your support for all farm appropriations recommended by the Senate subcommittee.

E. H. ERICKSON.

BOWMAN, N. DAK., June 9, 1953.

Hon. Senator LANGER:

I urge your support for all farm appropriations recommended by the Senate subcommittee.

ERWIN HAGEMEISTER.

SCRANTON, N. DAK.

BOWMAN, N. DAK., June 9, 1953.

Hon. Senator LANGER:

I urge your support for all farm appropriations recommended by the Senate subcommittee.

JOHN McCAFFERY,

Manager, Farmers Union Co-op Store.

BOWMAN, N. DAK., June 9, 1953.

Hon. Senator LANGER:

I urge your support for all farm appropriations recommended by the Senate subcommittee.

MORRIS NELSON.

DAZEY, N. DAK., June 9, 1953.

Hon. Senator WILLIAM LANGER,

Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.:

We urge you to support Senate subcommittees appropriations for agriculture including \$250 million ACP.

DONALD ANDERSON,

Chairman, County Farmers Union.

CROSBY, N. DAK., June 9, 1953.

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,

Washington, D. C.:

We request you support agriculture appropriations equal to last year.

S. MELVIN STOKKE,

EINAR NORDBY,

AXEL HAIBERG,

JAMES RAITT,

PERRY E. ROSENQUIST.

KULM, N. DAK., June 9, 1953.

Hon. Senator WILLIAM LANGER,

Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.:

Urge you to support farm appropriations at least equal to subcommittee recommendations including \$250 million for CPA.

LEE HARTMAN,

Chairman, German Northwest Farmers Union Local.

DAZEY, N. DAK., June 9, 1953.

Hon. Senator WILLIAM LANGER,

Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.:

We urge you to support Senate subcommittee appropriations for agriculture including \$250 million ACP.

WARREN RASMUSSEN,

Manager, Dazey Farmers Union Cooperative Association.

KULM, N. DAK., June 9, 1953.

Hon. Senator WILLIAM LANGER,

Washington, D. C.:

Urge you to support farm appropriations at least equal to subcommittee recommendations including \$250 million for CPA.

GOTLIEB HARTMAN,

Chairman, Dickey County Farmers Union.

BOWMAN, N. DAK., June 9, 1953.

Hon. Senator LANGER,

Washington, D. C.:

I urge that you give all farm appropriations your support.

WILLARD GROSS.

BOWMAN, N. DAK., June 9, 1953.

Hon. Senator LANGER,

Washington, D. C.:

I urge that you give all farm appropriations your support.

GEO. ERMANTROUT.

BOWMAN, N. DAK., June 9, 1953.

Hon. Senator LANGER,

Washington, D. C.:

I urge that you give all farm appropriations your support.

CLARENCE PLOUGH.

OMEMEE, N. DAK., June 10, 1953.

Senator WILLIAM LANGER,

Senate Office Building:

We urge your wholehearted support of the agricultural appropriations increases where necessary, especially the 250 million for ACP.

Mr. and Mrs. DUNCAN FRASER.

OMEMEE, N. DAK., June 10, 1953.

Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building:

We urge your support of the agriculture appropriations by the Senate subcommittee, including the 250 million for ACP.

DUNCAN FRASER,

President, Bottineau County Farmers Union.

OMEMEE, N. DAK., June 10, 1953.

Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building:

Please support the increased farm appropriations recommended by Senate subcommittee and the 250 million for ACP.

Mr. and Mrs. ERIC SCHULTZ.

OMEMEE, N. DAK., June 10, 1953.

Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building:

Urge your support of the increased farm appropriation bill as set by Senate subcommittee, and especially the 250 million for ACP.

Mr. and Mrs. JACK FRASER

CROSBY, N. DAK., June 10, 1953.

Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building:

Urge you to support agriculture appropriations at least equal to 1952.

HELMER WALLEN.
VERDEAN F. PETERSON.
JOSEPH H. GALLAGHER.
OWEN C. LANSVERK.
ALFRED JOYCE.

VALLEY CITY, N. DAK., June 10, 1953.

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER:

Urge support of the subcommittee appropriation measure including the 250 million ACP for agriculture.

MARTIN BROCK,
Secretary, Barnes County Farmers Union.

GOLDEN LOCAL NO. 523,
FARMERS UNION, WALSH COUNTY,
Park River, N. Dak., June 2, 1953.

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We, the members of Golden Farmers Union, local No. 523, meeting in regular session June 1, 1953, do hereby request you to use your maximum influence in support of the Mundt bill, which would authorize the raising of the wheat reserve from 350 million to 600 million bushels.

Sincerely,

ERNEST DENCKER,
Secretary.

FORDVILLE, N. DAK., June 12, 1953.

Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: You have been doing a fine job of supporting farm legislation and we thank you for it.

We are urging your full support on the Mundt bill (S. J. Res. 79), of which you and Senator YOUNG are cosponsors. We feel it is the most fair method for our agricultural State and I will do my best to have the Farmers Union local here in Medford Township of which I am president give full support to this bill.

We also urge you to continue to fight for our REA and all farm programs. It's a tough fight and you are doing a good job—more power to you.

We would like to see Secretary Benson sent back to Utah to preach and an agricultural man in his place there. Best wishes for good health.

Yours sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. ANDREW MORSTAD.
P. S.—Our Farmers Union local has 12 farm families behind your vote.

Mrs. MORSTAD, President.

GENESEO, N. DAK., June 12, 1953.

Hon. MILTON YOUNG,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We certainly do not want any cuts in agriculture appropriations, and expect your support against any cuts.

Thanks for the good fight you are putting up for agriculture.

Thank you.

Yours truly,

OLAF W. OLSON,
Mrs. OLAF W. OLSON.

GENESEO, N. DAK., June 12, 1953.

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We certainly do not want any cuts in agriculture appropriations, and expect your support against any cuts.

Thank you.

Yours truly,

MR. OLAF W. OLSON,
Mrs. OLAF W. OLSON.

FORT RANSOM, N. DAK., June 8, 1953.

Hon. Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: The Northland Farmers Union takes this opportunity to thank you for the work you have done in behalf of the farmer. There is still a hard and bitter fight ahead if the farmers are going to get full adequate funds to carry on their work. We are 100 percent behind you in this fight. Keep on as you have and we know that you will win.

Yours truly,

Mrs. CONRAD OLSON,
Secretary, Northland Farmers Union.
(Representing 130 farm families.)

PETERSBURG, N. DAK., June 10, 1953.

Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: We strongly urge that appropriations for our farm program be maintained. This country needs conservation and development of landed resources. Family-type farming should be given preference in any farm program.

Your truly,

NORTH DAKOTA FARMERS UNION,
LOCAL NO. 168,
FRANCIS SEARS, Legislative Secretary.

SYKESTON, N. DAK.
MY DEAR SENATOR: We of the Sykesson Farmers Union local have agreed to request you to help get more appropriations for the farm program's parity and price supports.

Yours truly,

Mrs. JOE STAHL,
Secretary.

WING, N. DAK., June 9, 1953.

Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Building,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: As a family-type farmer I cannot continue to operate under the present conditions without 100 percent of parity. We can't meet expenses without 100 percent. We also want and need soil conservation, FMA and RFA for our family-type farms.

Your truly,

OTTO E. ZOLLER.

AMBROSE, N. DAK., June 9, 1953.

Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: On behalf of the Ambrose Farmer's Union local which is comprised of 35 members we strongly urge you to exert everything in your power to maintain full, adequate agricultural funds which are so desperately needed to carry on farm programs.

Yours truly,

ROBERT GRUNDSTAD,
Secretary, Ambrose Farmer's Union Local.

MINOT, N. DAK., June 8, 1953.

Hon. Senator LANGER.

DEAR SIR: Do everything possible to hold agricultural appropriations as they have been voted in in the House, or raise them.

In other words help us save the family farm.

Sincerely,

H. B. ALMY.

GENESEO, N. DAK., June 12, 1953.

Senator WILLIAM LANGER,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LANGER: I am writing to you to urge your support in the farm program all the way, we are trusting you.

LAWRENCE H. SEE.

SARGENT COUNTY, N. DAK.

GENESEO, N. DAK., June 12, 1953.

WILLIAM LANGER,

United States Senate.

SENATOR LANGER: Farm program appropriations equal to last year is a must. That means you must fight.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. ROLLOF LEE.

THORNE, N. DAK.

We believe agricultural appropriations should be increased to avoid disaster and full support be given the Mundt amendment.

WM. BUSHAM.

THORNE, N. DAK.

We believe agricultural appropriations should be increased and full support be given the Mundt bill.

SIMEON GRENIER.

THORNE, N. DAK.

SENATOR: We believe agricultural appropriations should be increased and full support be given the Mundt amendment.

MARGIT GRENIER.

THORNE, N. DAK.

SENATOR: We believe agricultural appropriations should be increased and full support be given the Mundt amendment.

THEODORE GRENIER.

BRIEN, N. DAK., June 10, 1953.

Hon. Senator LANGER,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I urge you to support farm appropriations recommended by the Senate subcommittee including 250 million for A. C. P.

Very truly yours,

OSWALD SKIFTUN.

THORNE, N. DAK.

We believe agricultural appropriations should be increased and full support be given the Mundt bill.

MR. and Mrs. LUCIEN COSAUSUT.

THORNE, N. DAK.

I fully support the Mundt amendment and believe that agricultural appropriations should be increased.

LUCIEN COSAUSUT.

THORNE, N. DAK.

DEAR SIR: I believe agricultural appropriation should be increased and full support be given the Mundt amendment.

PAUL D. MALO.

THORNE, N. DAK.

We believe agricultural appropriation should be increased and full support be given the Mundt amendment.

MRS. PAUL MALO.

BELCOURT, N. DAK.

We believe agricultural appropriations should be increased and full support be given the Mundt amendment.

MRS. PHILIP BENKE.

BELCOURT, N. DAK., June 5, 1953.

DEAR SIR: I believe agricultural appropriations should be increased and full supports be given the Mundt amendment.

EDWARD BERUBE.

BELCOURT, N. DAK., June 5, 1953.

Hon. Senator LANGER:

DEAR SIR: I would like to see you support the Mundt amendment to the Agricultural Act, and also the agricultural appropriation.

PHILIP BERUBE.

BELCOURT, N. DAK.

I fully support the Mundt amendment and favor increased agricultural appropriations.

EMANUEL CHARLEBOIS.

BELCOURT, N. DAK.

I believe that agricultural appropriations should be increased and I fully support the Mundt amendment.

Respectfully,

MRS. HAZEL CHARLEBOIS.

BELCOURT, N. DAK.

I believe agricultural appropriations should be increased and I fully support the Mundt amendment.

Respectfully,

GUSTAVE CHARLEBOIS.

THORNE, N. DAK.

We believe agricultural appropriations should be increased and full support be given the Mundt amendment.

MR. and MRS. ALFRED ENNO.

BELCOURT, N. DAK.

I believe agricultural appropriations should be increased and full support be given the Mundt amendment.

ANNA MONGEON.

BELCOURT, N. DAK.

I believe agricultural appropriations should be increased and full support be given the Mundt amendment.

PIERRE MONGEON.

JUNE 5, 1953.

Hon. Senator LANGER:

We believe that the agricultural appropriation should be given your full support as it passed the House. The Mundt amendment is also praiseworthy.

Yours truly,

MR. and MRS. EUGENE MONGEON.

BELCOURT, N. DAK.

I fully support the Mundt amendment and believe that agricultural appropriations should be increased.

ALLEN H. STEN.

THORNE, N. DAK.

I believe agricultural appropriations should be increased and full support be given the Mundt amendment.

MRS. FLORENCE MARCIL.

THORNE, N. DAK.

We believe agricultural appropriations should be increased and full support given the Mundt amendment.

THERESA BUSHAW.

BELCOURT, N. DAK., June 5, 1953.

Senator WILLIAM LANGER,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We believe agriculture appropriations should be increased and full support be given the Mundt amendment.

Sincerely,

MR. and MRS. J. M. AUFEIT,

LANGDON, N. DAK., June 5, 1953.

SENATOR LANGER: I urgently request your support of appropriation for farm program at least equal to last year.

Yours truly,

JOHN GUSIN.

TIMMER, N. DAK., June 11, 1953.

Honorable Senator LANGER,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I urge you to support farm appropriations recommended by the Senate subcommittee including \$250 million for ACP.

Very truly yours,

NICK SCHMIDT.

SOLEN, N. DAK., June 10, 1953.

Hon. Senator LANGER,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I urge you to support farm appropriations recommended by the Senate subcommittee, including \$250 million for ACP.

Yours truly,

G. F. HENDERSON.

BREIEN, N. DAK., June 10, 1953.

Hon. Senator LANGER,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I urge you to support farm appropriations recommended by the Senate subcommittee, including \$250 million for ACP.

Very truly yours,

MR. and MRS. EARL CHADWICK.

TIMMER, N. DAK.

DEAR SENATOR: I urge you to support appropriations recommended by the Senate subcommittee, including \$250 million for ACP.

Yours truly,

J. D. BREWSTER.

SOLEN, N. DAK., June 10, 1953.

HON. SENATOR LANGER: I urge you to support farm appropriations recommended by the Senate subcommittee, including \$250 million for ACP.

Very truly,

MR. and MRS. JERRY RHONE, Sr.

BREIEN, N. DAK., June 10, 1953.

HON. WILLIAM LANGER,

Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I urge you to support farm appropriations recommended by the Senate subcommittee, including \$250 million for ACP.

Very truly yours,

MAX POTTER.

BREIEN, N. DAK., June 10, 1953.

Hon. Senator LANGER,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I urge you to support farm appropriation recommended by the Senate subcommittee, including \$250 million for ACP.

Very truly yours,

LAWRENCE ISAACS.

BREIEN, N. DAK., June 10, 1953.

HON. WILLIAM LANGER,

Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I urge you to support farm appropriation recommended by the Senate subcommittee, including \$250 million for ACP.

Very truly yours,

A. L. HENDERSON.

TIMMER, N. DAK., June 11, 1953.

Hon. Senator LANGER,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I urge you to support farm appropriation recommended by the Senate subcommittee, including \$250 million for ACP.

Very truly yours,

TOM BUCKLEY.

BREIEN, N. DAK., June 10, 1953.

Hon. Senator LANGER,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I urge you to support farm appropriation recommended by the Senate subcommittee, including \$250 million for ACP.

Very truly yours,

JOHN J. HIEFRIH.

SALEM, N. DAK., June 10, 1953.

Hon. Senator LANGER,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I urge you to support farm appropriation recommended by the Senate subcommittee, including \$250 million for ACP.

Very truly,

MR. and MRS. ANTON GEISS.

SOLEN, N. DAK., June 10, 1953.

Hon. Senator LANGER,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I urge you to support farm appropriations recommended by the Senate subcommittee including \$250 million for ACP.

Very truly yours,

MR. and MRS. JOHN P. HATZENBUHLER.

SOLEN, N. DAK., June 10, 1953.

Hon. Senator YOUNG,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I urge you to support farm appropriations recommended by the Senate subcommittee, including \$250 million for ACP.

Yours truly,

JOE MATHERNS.

LANGDON, N. DAK., June 5, 1953.

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: I urgently request your support of appropriations for farm program at least equal to last year which was absolute minimum.

OLE L. E. OLSON.

LANGDON, N. DAK., June 4, 1953.

SENATOR WILLIAM LANGER: Please support appropriations for farm programs at least equal to last year.

Yours truly,

GEO. J. KAISKY.

LANGDON, N. DAK., June 4, 1953.

SENATOR LANGER: I urgently request your support of appropriations for farm program at least equal to last year which was absolute minimum.

L. M. PETERSON.

LANGDON, N. DAK., June 4, 1953.

Senator LANGER:

DEAR SIR: I urgently request your support of appropriation for farm program at least equal to last year which was absolute minimum.

Sincerely,

MRS. WALTER MYERS.

LANGDON, N. DAK., June 4, 1953.

DEAR SIR: I urgently request your support of appropriations for farm program at least equal to last year which was absolute minimum.

Sincerely,

Mrs. HAROLD PENGILLY.

DRESDEN, N. DAK., June 4, 1953.

Senator LANGER,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I urgently request your support of appropriation for farm program, at least equal to last year which was absolute minimum.

Sincerely,

Mrs. R. C. DOMRES.

THORNE, N. DAK.

I believe agricultural appropriations should be increased and full support be given the Mundt amendment.

ADRIEN MONGEON.

DRESDEN, N. DAK.

Senator WILLIAM LANGER:

I sincerely hope you will support the farm program at least equal to last year which was the absolute minimum.

FRANK GERTH.

LANGDON, N. DAK., June 4, 1953.

DEAR MR. LANGER: I sincerely hope you will support the farm program, at least equal to last year's, which was absolutely a minimum.

ED CHAPUT.

LANGDON, N. DAK.

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: We urge your support of appropriations for farm program.

Yours truly,

OTTO GERTH.

LANGDON, N. DAK., June 4, 1953.

DEAR SIR: We want full price support for our farm products through 1958.

Yours truly,

ED CHIRBONNES.

LANGDON, N. DAK., June 5, 1953.

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: I urgently request your support of farm prices for 100 percent full parity for farm programs. At least equal to last year which was absolute minimum.

Yours truly,

HOWARD NUILLE.

LANGDON, N. DAK., June 5, 1953.

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: I earnestly beg you to support appropriations for farm program at least equal to last year which was absolute minimum.

Yours truly,

WILFRED CHAPUT.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] has expressed some sentiments with which I find myself in agreement, particularly when he states that if we are going to cut down expenses we must find spots where to do it, and not raise the appropriations in every bill.

Mr. President, the subject before the Senate has been erroneously referred to as a soil-conservation program. We have had previous discussions of this so-called soil-conservation program when we were trying to cut down ACP payments.

There is a vast difference between the Soil Conservation Service of the Department of Agriculture and the ACP payments. We are dealing here with ACP payments, and they are not connected in any way with the Soil Conservation Service of the Department of Agriculture.

Recently the Richmond Times-Di-
patch carried an article entitled "Brain Washing Congress With Limestone Water?" In the course of the article reference is made to a letter sent out by Mr. Robert M. Koch, executive secretary of the National Agricultural Lime-
stone Institute, Inc., with national head-
quarters in Washington, D. C. The letter is dated April 20, 1953, and carried the injunction: "Be sure and keep this letter confidential." It refers to the program which Secretary Benson had recommended to Congress calling for an appropriation of \$140 million for soil

conservation and the elimination of the limestone program. The letter reads:

Briefly, it—the Benson program—puts an end to our national ACP (conservation) limestone program. From now on we would have to sell our own product.

Think of it, Mr. President, the organization would have to sell its own product.

In my opinion the total purchased would not exceed 2 million tons, and probably would only be half this amount. You would have to market the other 26 or 27 million tons without any financial assistance.

We are in a last-ditch fight, and only Congress can save this program now. To offset the tremendously well-planned tactics of the Farm Bureau we need extensive grassroots support.

TABER is wielding a big club *** his battle cry, "Not 1 more cent than Benson wants." I am trying to get directives written into the report of the committee to block the Benson policy of having no lime program. Be sure and keep this letter confidential.

Mr. President, I am glad to help Mr. Koch in not keeping his letter confidential. This has been going on for a long, long time. If we could eliminate the lime-program portions of the agricultural program I believe we could take care of our agricultural needs pretty well. I think it is bad to have it mixed up with the limestone program. I think it is bad to mix up the lime program with the soil-conservation program.

Speaking about grass roots, it was my pleasure last fall to address a meeting of the State Farm Bureau Federation in my State. I pointed out that I had tried to cut the agricultural conservation appropriation to \$150 million. I felt it should be cut to \$100 million, because I think there is a justification for a \$100 million appropriation. I pointed out that I had been unsuccessful, and I stated why I had been unsuccessful. The Farm Bureau Federation adopted a resolution setting forth that they were strongly opposed to continuation of the agricultural conservation program payments, but would favor some type of program for long-term credits for farmers who wished to put into effect permanent conservation practices.

In continuing the development of grass-roots sentiment, those farmers took that resolution to the Seattle meeting of the American Farm Bureau Federation. I attended that meeting, in Seattle, last December; and I addressed that convention. Again I was pleased to see the farmers, without any help from any other source, come to the conclusion that they did not want the former agricultural conservation program payments continued; they wanted them sharply reduced.

Mr. President, the Farm Bureau Federation is not the only farm organization that holds that view; the Grange also shares it. The American Farm Bureau Federation represents 1,450,000 families; the Grange represents approximately 450,000 families. Eighty percent of all the farm families of the United States believe this program should be cut out, and they said so, through their organizations. Yet we constantly hear statements to the effect that we must make these appropriations in the interest of soil conservation.

Mr. President, I receive many letters on this subject. On May 14, I received a

letter from a farmer in Carlinville, Ill. I should have referred the letter to my friend, the Senator from Illinois.

The letter reads as follows:

MAY 14, 1953.

HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
Senate Committee on Agriculture,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Secretary Benson, whom I hold in high esteem, is constantly making the statement, "No real American wants to be subsidized." How such an honest man as he can justify this statement is more than I can figure out.

Why should the Federal Government spend millions of dollars to subsidize the butter producers, if these "real Americans" do not want to be subsidized?

Surely it is not fair either to the average citizen, to the producers of oleo, or even to the dairyman himself to take this tax money and give it to any one class.

Then take farm subsidies. In our county some \$100,000 is given each year to our farmers in subsidies. Two men and four women are employed to pay this money out to the farmer, and all this when our farmers have never been so prosperous.

We own 2 farms, a total of 436 acres. In '51, one of these farms paid us as our share of the crops, a little over 40 percent on the cost of the land, and the past year over 30 percent. The larger farm, 319 acres, paid us almost 22 percent, and this net gain after taxes and all expenses. Yet, notwithstanding, Uncle Sam sends us each year a nice check to help us poor farmers out of the depression.

Why should all other groups of our citizens be taxed for the benefit of this one class?

Why the high cost of living? Largely due to the farm prices supported by Government subsidies.

Why should the people of New Mexico be taxed for the benefit of the farming States?

Is there nothing that can be done about this and done now?

Is the farm vote more important than justice?

Cordially yours,

WILLIAM M. HUDSON,
President Emeritus, Blackburn College.

P. S.—We have just received a check from the Treasurer of the United States for \$130.19 helping us pay for lime and phosphate. How kind.

Mr. President, I believe the proposal made by the committee goes farther than we should go. I agree with the Senator from Vermont that probably we should not go that far.

I prefer the appropriation suggested by the Senator from Delaware, namely \$140 million. Certainly if Congress wants to bring about any economy at all, it cannot afford to provide more than an appropriation of \$195 million for agricultural conservation payments.

So I hope the amendment of the Senator from Georgia will be rejected.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, in order to facilitate the handling of the work at the desk, and since consideration of the new reports on the executive calendar will involve an interruption for not more than 2 minutes, I now move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business. There are only two new reports on the Executive Calendar.

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CARLSON in the chair) laid before the Senate message from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

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

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. LANGER, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Jacob S. Temkin, of Rhode Island, to be the United States attorney for the district of Rhode Island; and

Clarence H. Spence, of Delaware, to be United States marshal for the district of Delaware, vice Paul B. Messick, resigned.

By Mr. BRICKER, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

Charles E. Slusser, of Ohio, to be Public Housing Commissioner.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar under the heading "New Reports."

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Ralph H. Demmler, of Pennsylvania, to be a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Amos J. Peaslee, of New Jersey, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Australia.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, it gives me great pleasure, and I am highly gratified, to support the nomination as Ambassador to Australia of my old friend, and a distinguished lawyer of New Jersey, Amos J. Peaslee. I have known him for many years. He is a most outstanding citizen of my State. It is a great honor to all who live in New Jersey to have him nominated as the United States Ambassador to Australia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

The nomination was confirmed.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of these confirmations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

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

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

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATIONS, 1954

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5227) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], on page 32, in lines 2 and 3, in the nature of a substitute for the amendment of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I wish to say a few words in support of the pending amendment.

I believe in economy, and I believe in a balanced budget. But, Mr. President, I cannot in good conscience take the Senate floor and defend a budget cut which will ultimately work to the detriment of our people. It is for this reason that I support the pending amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], for himself and others, including myself.

False economy, Mr. President, is a danger we must always guard against. As I stated earlier, I believe in true economy, and I have taken the Senate floor on many occasions in an attempt to assist our President in carrying out his campaign pledge of a balanced budget. Be that as it may, I also know that one of the most pressing tasks our Nation faces today is to conserve and preserve our most precious natural resource, our agricultural lands. For without these lands, Mr. President, future generations of Americans will be forced to reduce today's standard of living, and learn to live as citizens of a "have-not" nation. The danger signal is fully apparent today, that unless we take steps to preserve our land, to conserve our God-given natural resources, then generations yet unborn will surely know hunger and agricultural poverty.

The \$225 million this amendment seeks to make available to the Department of Agriculture will go a long way toward achieving this end, Mr. President. It is a necessary end, a vital end, and we must not lose sight of it. We must not sacrifice the long-range welfare of our Nation in a hasty and ill-advised attempt to balance our budget.

Today our Nation has 462 million acres of cropland, and with that much cropland we are supporting a population of over 158 million people. If we are to provide our future generations—the people who will live in our country by 1975—the same amount of food and fiber, and make available to them the same standard of living we of the United States enjoy today, we are going to require 530 million acres of cropland to meet that goal. How will we obtain that 530 million acres; how will we obtain 68 million more acres of land than we now have? Fifteen million acres of it will come from land that now is being used to grow feed crops for work animals; 30 million acres will come by way of re-

claiming our deserts and other presently unsuitable lands. But, these two sources total only 45 million acres. If we deduct those 45 million acres from the required acreage of 530 million, it is easy to see that by 1975 our Nation will still be short some 23 million acres of cropland. We shall be lacking some 23 million acres necessary in order to produce the food and fiber required by our population in 1975—needed if our people 22 years hence are to be fed and clothed on the same standard that our present population is being fed and clothed.

Mr. President, we have done a great job of soil conservation by teaching our farmers how to use fertilizer properly and abundantly; how to do contour plowing; and how, in various other ways, to preserve our croplands. At the same time, our agriculture has been able to produce from the same number of acres, 40 percent more food and fiber than in pre-soil-conservation days.

For instance, let us consider the situation in the case of cotton: 12 years ago, 42 million acres of land were required to produce approximately 12 million or 13 million bales of cotton. Today our cotton growers are able to produce 14 or 15 million bales of cotton on 27 million acres of land. We have increased our production by nearly one-third, but, at the same time, reduced the acreage required by almost one-half. Land formerly devoted to cotton can now be used for other agricultural purposes. That change resulted primarily as a result of the soil-conservation program. I, for one, in face of the progress we have made, and the progress we must yet make, am not willing to abandon that plan and program at this time. We have but scratched the surface in that direction, Mr. President.

I hold in my hand a table showing, percentagewise, the number of farms throughout the United States that have followed and adopted wise soil-conservation practices. In my own State of Louisiana, only 32 percent of the farmers have taken advantage of the soil-conservation program. Put another way 68 percent of my State's farmers could be induced to join the movement and thereby further increase soil-conservation methods. We are losing productive acres at the rate of 500,000 per year and it is most essential that we find ways and means to stop this dissipation of our precious topsoil. We should find other ways and means of conserving our land and that cannot be accomplished by reducing the program. I say that soil conservation should be extended, not so much for the benefit of our present generation, as for generations as yet unborn. I wish to have America thrive, in 1975 at least, to the extent that she is thriving today. I want to assure to my children and grandchildren the same abundant food and clothing that I know today. I do not want our country to be in the position of Persia. Several years ago it was my privilege to visit that country. In the great Valley of Mesopotamia, between the Tigris and the Euphrates Rivers, the land formerly had sufficient fertility to produce enough food and fiber to supply the needs of 15 million people. At that time, Persia had

sufficient land resources to feed 105 million people—much more than her population at that time. Today, however, the situation has changed very greatly. Mesopotamia, lying between the Tigris and the Euphrates Rivers, can barely sustain a population of some 3 million people; and in all of Persia, including the great Tigris-Euphrates valley, barely 15 million people can find a living. That change has resulted because of no soil conservation many centuries ago. The precious topsoil has been permitted to find its way down the rivers, into the Red Sea, and thence into the ocean. The fertile fields of Persia now exist in great swamps, extending into the sea from the mouths of the Tigris and Euphrates Rivers. I do not want such a condition ever to face our country.

Mr. President, up to the present time we have treated, through the soil conservation program, a total of 175 million acres of land. A soil conservation plan is now being developed for 315 million acres. It strikes me very forcibly that it will be shortsightedness on our part to cut this program to a point where a vital sustaining soil conservation program will be discouraged. If we should do so, we violate the trust of future citizens. I hope the Senate will go on record in support of the proposed appropriation of \$225 million, in accordance with the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia in which I joined him, together with others. While it is an increase over the revised budget estimates, it nevertheless represents a cut of 10 percent in the 1953 appropriation. If we make a reduction of 10 percent in the appropriation made last year, I think the Nation's farmers will have done their share in helping balance the budget. We must remember that the Federal budget is a vital thing, and while it must be reduced, that reduction should be achieved with the skill of a surgeon. In cutting appropriations for necessary programs, we must not approach the problem as a butcher with cleaver in hand. I ask the Senate to adopt today a course of prudence. Let us not proceed hastily to deprive our children and our children's children of the abundance we Americans of 1953 have come to accept as never-ending. Let us realize that the future presents tremendous problems, and that a successful solution of these future problems requires today's wisdom.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I wonder whether the Senator, as a former distinguished chairman of the committee, could tell us regarding the distribution of the benefits, under the \$140 million appropriation, as compared to the \$225 million, in accordance with the proposal submitted by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. ELLENDER. In some States it will cut the program over 50 percent below the 1953 program, as in my State. In Arkansas, my recollection is it will cut the program over 40 percent. In my opinion it would simply mean that, if there is projected into the future, such a plan as the one now being advocated by Mr. Benson, it will destroy the entire program.

In this connection, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks a table indicating the use to which the \$140 million requested by the Secretary of Agriculture for the Agricultural Conservation program for fiscal year 1954 would be put. I believe this table will provide the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] and other Senators with a full picture of the reduced program.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed, as follows:

Distribution of funds among States, 1953, and tentative estimate for 1954¹

[Thousands of dollars]

State	1953 program ²	Amount 1953 allocation resulting from needs for permanent-type practices ³	Tentative 1954 program estimate ⁴
Alabama	5,946	1,333	3,025
Alaska	27	12	14
Arizona	1,446	941	1,669
Arkansas	4,574	1,020	2,327
California	4,986	2,453	4,793
Colorado	3,248	1,570	2,619
Connecticut	487	140	253
Delaware	327	33	166
Florida	2,219	757	1,654
Georgia	6,897	1,514	3,508
Hawaii	182	35	93
Idaho	1,645	683	1,300
Illinois	7,936	2,065	4,297
Indiana	5,086	1,424	2,951
Iowa	8,605	2,593	5,271
Kansas	6,381	1,721	3,254
Kentucky	5,851	1,147	2,976
Louisiana	4,035	885	2,053
Maine	917	210	466
Maryland	1,278	309	650
Massachusetts	527	131	268
Michigan	4,549	1,131	2,407
Minnesota	5,496	1,904	3,796
Mississippi	6,253	1,808	3,525
Missouri	8,737	2,112	4,444
Montana	3,455	1,583	3,003
Nebraska	5,969	1,707	3,333
Nevada	281	195	427
New Hampshire	477	106	243
New Jersey	711	115	362
New Mexico	1,775	1,028	1,843
New York	4,635	1,268	2,360
North Carolina	6,042	932	3,073
North Dakota	4,460	1,124	2,269
Ohio	5,280	1,876	3,776
Oklahoma	7,208	1,980	3,791
Oregon	2,103	900	1,821
Pennsylvania	4,923	1,576	2,772
Puerto Rico	820	254	488
Rhode Island	82	19	42
South Carolina	3,184	539	1,620
South Dakota	4,645	1,626	2,760
Tennessee	5,166	994	2,628
Texas	18,455	5,518	11,001
Utah	1,289	712	1,279
Vermont	1,021	153	519
Virgin Islands	12	5	9
Virginia	4,091	1,312	2,619
Washington	2,322	620	1,230
West Virginia	1,549	408	788
Wisconsin	5,167	1,194	2,628
Wyoming	1,949	1,089	1,970
Total	194,676	56,859	116,503

¹ Based on formula contained in 1953 appropriation act.
² Based on conservation needs for practices included in 1953 program.

³ This column indicates the extent to which conservation needs for permanent-type practices as a part of total conservation needs entered into 1953 allocations.

⁴ Based on conservation needs for practices included in tentative list of permanent-type practices being used as guide at State, county, and community levels informing recommendations for the 1954 National ACP. Final list not to be determined until after these local recommendations are received at national level and final determination made as to the practice to be included in the 1954 program. This tentative distribution assumes the application of the full 15-percent adjustment toward conservation needs as permitted by the allocation formula.

⁵ Does not include costs of administration, funds for small payment increase, naval stores conservation program payments, transfer of funds for printing, aerial photography, Treasury, etc.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Is it true that, under the program as submitted by Mr.

Benson, the State of Utah and other arid States would receive more money than they would receive under the \$225 million, which the Senator is supporting?

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Is that not a rather odd result? I wonder whether the Senator will tell us how he arrives at such a conclusion.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am not sure, but I might suggest to my good friend from Arkansas that the reason probably lies in the fact that Utah, being a semiarid State, normally engages in a higher percentage of the so-called permanent-type conservation practices than the State of Arkansas, or, for that matter, my own State of Louisiana. By permanent-type practices, I refer to the building of small dams and the construction of ponds and the like, as opposed to the recurring practices of spreading lime, for example. It would seem to me that since the percentage of permanent practices is normally higher in Utah than in Louisiana, the elimination of recurring-type practices from the program would leave semiarid States, such as Utah, in a better position moneywise than some of the other States. What they are trying to do—at least, what Mr. Benson is trying to do—is to discourage the use of fertilizer and things of that kind, as my good friend from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] has just suggested.

Mr. ANDERSON. I mentioned lime; not fertilizer.

Mr. ELLENDER. Lime is a fertilizer, as I understand.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It is a soil food.

Mr. ELLENDER. It is a soil food; there is no doubt about that, just as nitrogen is a soil food. What is going to happen, in my opinion, as I have just indicated, is that if the appropriation is put on the basis of need, the program as a whole will soon fade out. That is what is going to happen. The farmers will soon lose interest.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. May I ask the Senator, Is it not very odd that a new program for the distribution of these funds should be developed so that the States in which certain Senators are so greatly interested would receive increases at the expense of all the other States of the Union?

Mr. ELLENDER. It is odd, but I do not believe it was done for the purpose of helping the State of Utah, in particular, simply because Secretary Benson is from that State. I hope not, anyway.

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. Mr. President, I shall not be able to discuss some of the figures because I am not on the Committee on Agriculture, but I have listened with interest to what has been said here. But, above and beyond that, I had an opportunity last summer to observe at firsthand some of the things mentioned by the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]. I visited the ancient, once great land of Greece, from which have come some of our very fine citizens. I saw the denuded hills which had once produced sustenance and at least a livelihood for the people of that great nation. Last summer I saw hills denuded and barren of vegetation in many spots, with only

a slight growth of vegetation in other spots.

I talked to two county agents from North Carolina who were sent by the United States Government to Greece to help improve the agricultural situation of that nation in order that she might again become self-sustaining, so far as possible, in the production of foodstuffs. I heard these men tell what they were doing, or what they were trying to do, to restore the soil of that ancient land, destroyed by erosion and through lack of attention.

I voted last year for the \$250 million appropriation for the soil-conservation program, and, Mr. President, when I looked about me in Greece, I was glad that I voted with those in the Senate who had had the foresight to see that what had befallen that great nation might someday befall the United States.

I was impressed just now when the great Senator from Louisiana told about the situation in the Euphrates and Tigris River Valleys, which once produced food for 100 million persons. I believe his statement was that today about 15 million people are able to find sustenance from that land. I saw a little of the land in that area of the world and I know that erosion and the lack of protection of the soil had well-nigh destroyed a large part of the civilization there. I said, when I gazed upon those scenes last summer, that I was glad I had stood with those who did not believe that the soil-conservation program should be ripped and torn apart.

I have heard much said about the American Farm Bureau. Ordinarily I have great faith in its views about matters pertaining to agriculture. But I also know that members of the Farm Bureau and of the Grange came to see me last year to explain this matter to me and to urge that this program be not curtailed, as it was then planned. So I do not believe that we should take away from this program the funds with which to carry it on successfully.

I understand there have been abuses. Conditions which lead to abuses ought to be rooted out; and it should be possible to eliminate them. Certainly we should not take \$30 million away from those who would build up our soil, when we think of the millions, yes, the hundreds of millions, indeed, the billions, we are scattering all over the earth. I do not know how much we are spending in Greece, for instance, or in Italy, or in other parts of the earth, for soil conservation, but it seems to me that if we are to spend hundreds of millions and even billions of dollars throughout the world, we ought to spend some of our money to protect our own soil and aid our own farmers who may be struggling with the problem of preserving their soil against destruction by erosion. I do not believe it would be wise to cut the appropriation in order to save \$30 million.

I voted for practically all of the proposals to cut appropriations, and I expect to continue to do so; but when I see Senators stand here, as I shall see them do within the next week or two, arguing for enormous appropriations to be spent all over the world, I cannot help thinking it is very unwise to do that and yet

at the same time reduce the appropriations for soil conservation right in our own midst and among our own people.

Last summer I met some Americans in Paris. There are so many Americans over there that one can hardly go a block without seeing some of them. What are they doing? They are spending our Government's money in all sorts of schemes and proposals, some of which perhaps are good, but many of which are, it seems to me, silly. Yet we talk about reducing a worthwhile appropriation by \$30 million. In the minds of those who oppose the program, perhaps that might do some good, though some of those who perhaps know more about it believe it would do a great deal of harm to cut this appropriation while letting many other exorbitant proposals pass.

One other thing, Mr. President, and I shall be through. I understand from those who know the figures—and I believe the information was repeated a few moments ago by the distinguished Senator from Louisiana—that under this planned \$140 million appropriation, Utah, New Mexico, and a few other States will receive far more than they get now. Where is it coming from? I was told by the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] just now that 75 percent of his State's appropriation will be cut. He tells me that the amounts for my own State of North Carolina will be cut about 50 percent, and that those for other States will likewise be cut.

What is fair about that, Mr. President? I hope we shall carry on this work, and that we will root out every bit of infamous crookedness and abuse, but that we will not take away the \$30 million, which may mean the difference between keeping or not keeping in good condition some of the soil of America, which in the years to come we will need in order to sustain the population, which is constantly growing.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I wish to speak in opposition to the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], in which he is joined by other Senators from agricultural States, notably, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], and other Senators. I believe the Government can spend the \$225 million very wisely on soil conservation; but I also believe \$195 million represents a very good compromise between the position taken by the Department of Agriculture in favor of \$140 million and the position taken by the House of Representatives. The vote on the House side was very close in raising the funds from \$140 million to \$195 million. I think there was a difference of only 3 votes.

Mr. President, in order to get soil conservation there are other things which are even more important than are soil-conservation payments. I have reference to the income of various farmers. No farmer can do a decent job of conserving and maintaining his soil alone unless he has adequate farm income. Farm price supports are far more important than is even this program.

There is a sizable amount in the bill, and there probably will be more next year, for price-support operations. We have raised funds for agricultural research, which is equally important if not more important. All in all, Mr. President, I think this is a very good bill, and I believe the farmers of the Nation will be quite happy with the appropriation of \$195 million for the ACP program, even though they would perhaps like to have more.

I strongly oppose the amendment to reduce the fund to \$140 million, and I also oppose raising it to \$225 million.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, I have been listening to the speakers as amendments have been proposed, and I desire to say that the statement which has just been made by the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] represents the way in which I look at the question.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, in view of the tremendous prestige of the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] in agricultural matters, I desire to refer very briefly to a statement made by him.

It may be, Mr. President, that it is erroneous for the Government to assist farmers in obtaining fertilizers which will bind up the soil and prevent erosion from dust storms and from water by giving the soil a heavy cover of grass, but there is nothing new in that program. We have had it for many years. We all have a right to change our minds.

The distinguished Senator from New Mexico served ably as Secretary of Agriculture. At the time he did so more money was provided for soil conservation than the amount which is requested in this amendment. Substantially the same program was being carried out at that time. The Department purchased huge quantities of lime and phosphates, some of which were furnished by the manufacturers who wrote the letter from which the Senator from New Mexico read. I do not think the letter has much bearing on the question, one way or the other.

The former Secretary of Agriculture appeared before the committee and urged the committee not to reduce the appropriation. Shortly after that he became a Member of the Senate, and has since been a very valuable Member of this body.

In 1951 when the same program was in effect, an effort was then made to reduce the appropriation. That effort had the support of the Farm Bureau Federation. The hierarchy of the Farm Bureau Federation has fought this program for a number of years.

The Senator from New Mexico, having very recently come from the office of Secretary of Agriculture, addressed himself to the question, and I should like to read a few excerpts from his statement. He said:

The committee is trying to make the amount \$280 million, which I think is low enough. There is no place where money is more needed than in this conservation program. I think it would be absolutely unwise to reduce the appropriation recommended by the committee. I have not hesitated in the slightest to cast my vote against amendments that would reduce it, because I remember the experiences of 1947.

In 1947 the Congress of the United States, in an economy wave, decided to trim the conservation program, and it reduced the amount to \$150 million, and served notice that that would be the last year there would be a conservation program. It was then my responsibility, as Secretary of Agriculture, to go before the committees of the Congress and plead with them not to reduce the appropriation and not to leave a death sentence hanging over the agriculture conservation program.

* * * * *

The Department of Agriculture made its fight, but we lost, and an economy-minded Congress destroyed a part of the soil-conservation program. I remember that some of the Members who helped to destroy it paid the penalty the next time they went back to their constituents and talked to them. I am wishing everyone well in his body, but the quickest way for Senators to hurt themselves and their communities is to destroy the agricultural conservation program.

Mr. President, I submit that every word of that statement is as true and as applicable today as it was in 1951. I, too, remember the experiences of 1947, when the House eliminated the agricultural-conservation program in its entirety, and, after many long and tedious days of conflict, we finally managed to restore \$150 million. That was \$10 million more than was sought by Mr. Benson.

Mr. President, we learn nothing from history, particularly political history, except that we learn nothing from history, particularly political history.

I desire to point out that the condition of the American farmers is more acute at this hour than it was in 1947. Farm income in 1947 was better than it is in 1953. Let those who will, delude themselves with the idea that the upper hierarchy of the Farm Bureau Federation is speaking for millions of farm families in urging a cut in this appropriation. Let them contend against a workable program such as is provided for in the amendment of which I am one of the authors, and they will find, possibly, as the Senator from New Mexico said in 1951, that the quickest way for Senators to hurt themselves is to destroy the agricultural-conservation program.

I urge the Senate now, when farm income is sliding down, not to add insult to injury by pinching pennies on this program which is so vital to the welfare of all the American people in maintaining agricultural production.

Mr. President, I regard this as one of the most significant farm issues before the country, and, therefore, I ask for the yeas and nays on this amendment.

The yeas and nays are ordered.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I think I have some time remaining.

In the year 1947 we had just come out of the war. There were hundreds of thousands of acres of land which had been ripped up from pastures and put into row crops. We were trying to get the row crops back into pastureland again. We felt that the farmer was entitled to money for reconversion. How many years does it take to get it? Do the same factors apply year after year?

I hope the Senator from Georgia recognized, when he was reading from my statement, that in 1951 we thought we had reached the point where we would be operating in the black. We started

into the red in 1951 and got into it more deeply in 1952 and 1953.

There is a difference between what men can do when they have money in their pockets and when they have deficits of many million dollars a year.

Mr. President, I am glad the Senator from Georgia pointed out that the Farm Bureau Federation was on one side of the picture and I was on the other side. I have supported them when I thought they were right and I have been against them when I thought they were wrong. I think that is what we should do, and not take dictation from them.

We recognize that the program cannot go on forever; it has to end sometime. Therefore, Mr. President, I say I do not believe in destroying the program, but I do believe in bringing it down to reasonable figures, and I believe \$140 million is sufficient.

I believe eventually \$100 million will be plenty. I do not think the program would be destroyed further. The money might be given to the lime peddlers in Washington, but the program would not be destroyed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CARLSON in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], for himself and other Senators, as a substitute for the amendment of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS]. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gillette	Maybank
Anderson	Goldwater	McCarren
Barrett	Gore	McCarthy
Beall	Green	McClellan
Bennett	Griswold	Millikin
Bricker	Hayden	Monroney
Bridges	Hendrickson	Mundt
Bush	Hennings	Neely
Butler, Md.	Hickenlooper	Pastore
Butler, Nebr.	Hoey	Payne
Byrd	Holland	Potter
Carlson	Humphrey	Purtell
Chavez	Jackson	Robertson
Clements	Jenner	Russell
Cooper	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Cordon	Johnson, Tex.	Smathers
Daniel	Johnston, S. C.	Smith, Maine
Douglas	Kefauver	Smith, N. J.
Duff	Kennedy	Smith, N. C.
Dworshak	Kilgore	Sparkman
Eastland	Knowland	Stennis
Ellender	Kuchel	Thye
Ferguson	Langer	Watkins
Frear	Long	Wiley
Fulbright	Malone	Williams
George	Mansfield	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] on behalf of himself and other Senators, as a substitute for the amendment of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], to the amendment of the committee. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ANDERSON (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], who is absent. If he were pres-

ent and voting he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

Mr. FREAR (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with my distinguished seat mate, the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR]. If he were present and voting he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote. The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. PASTORE (after having voted in the negative). On this vote I have a live pair with the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON]. If he were present and voting he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote I would vote "nay." Accordingly, I withdraw my vote.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] are absent on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] would each vote "nay."

I also announce that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official committee business and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] is necessarily absent.

On this vote the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] was paired with the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] was paired with the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY].

If present and voting, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] would vote "nay," and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] would vote "yea." The Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] would vote "nay," and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] would vote "yea."

The Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] is absent by leave of the Senate, having been appointed a delegate to attend the International Labor Organization Conference at Geneva, Switzerland.

I further announce that the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are absent by leave of the Senate.

If present and voting the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] would vote "yea."

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] is necessarily absent.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is absent by leave of the Senate on official committee business.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent by leave of the Senate, having been appointed a delegate to attend the International Labor Organization Conference at Geneva, Switzerland.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. If present and voting, the Senator from Washington would vote "yea," and the Senator from Illinois would vote "nay."

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL]. If present and voting, the Senator from Montana would vote "yea," and the Senator from Kansas would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 38, nays 37, as follows:

YEAS—38

Carlson	Hennings	McCarren
Chavez	Hoey	McClellan
Clements	Humphrey	Monroney
Cooper	Jackson	Mundt
Daniel	Johnson, Colo.	Neely
Eastland	Johnson, Tex.	Russell
Ellender	Johnston, S. C.	Smathers
Fulbright	Kefauver	Smith, N. C.
George	Kilgore	Sparkman
Gillette	Langer	Stennis
Gore	Long	Thye
Green	Mansfield	Wiley
Hayden	Maybank	

NAYS—37

Aiken	Dworshak	Millikin
Barrett	Ferguson	Payne
Beall	Goldwater	Potter
Bennett	Griswold	Purtell
Bricker	Hendrickson	Robertson
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Saltonstall
Bush	Holland	Smith, Maine
Butler, Md.	Jenner	Smith, N. J.
Butler, Nebr.	Kennedy	Watkins
Byrd	Knowland	Williams
Cordon	Kuchel	Young
Douglas	Malone	
Duff	McCarthy	

NOT VOTING—21

Anderson	Hunt	Murray
Capehart	Ives	Pastore
Case	Kerr	Schoeppel
Dirksen	Lehman	Symington
Flanders	Magnuson	Taft
Frear	Martin	Tobey
Hill	Morse	Weicker

So the amendment offered by Mr. RUSSELL, for himself and other Senators, to Mr. WILLIAMS' amendment, to the amendment of the committee, was agreed to.

Mr. HUMPHREY subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have placed in the RECORD immediately after the vote on the Russell amendment a statement which I have prepared.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUMPHREY IN SUPPORT OF ADEQUATE FUNDS FOR CONSERVATION WORK

Preservation of our soil is of vital importance to all of us—it is our insurance of future food and fiber supplies for our rapidly growing population.

If this Congress fails to provide adequate funds for technical assistance to our locally organized soil-conservation districts through the Soil Conservation Service, and reduces the incentive share-the-cost payments of the agricultural conservation program, it assumes a grave responsibility of risking our Nation's future food and fiber supply.

In my opinion, educational guidance, technical assistance, and financial incentive are all needed to speed up the job that needs to be done toward conservation farming in America. Each supplements the other, and each has an important role that cannot be ignored. Each must be adequately supported and provided for by the Congress.

AN ALARMING FACT

I should like to call attention to some significant information that came forth in the

course of hearings in the House on the Soil Conservation Service appropriations for 1954.

In response to questions by Hon. FRED MARSHALL, Congressman from the Sixth District of my State, Dr. Robert M. Salter, Chief of the Soil Conservation Service, disclosed an alarming fact.

Dr. Salter told the subcommittee that despite the advances made thus far in the field of soil and water conservation, the productivity of our soil in this country is still going downhill faster than it is being built up.

Dr. Salter says we know how to reverse this trend. He believes it will take about 30 years to complete a once-over conservation job but it will be at least 10 or 12 years, at our present rate of progress, before we can even reach a balance point between soil deterioration and soil improvement.

Research leading to better crop varieties, fertilizers, farm equipment, and similar advances have helped offset that declining soil fertility thus far. But, at the same time that we are improving our yields and maintaining a high national level of farm production, we are still overdriving on our basic soil bank account.

Only 23 years from now, according to authoritative estimates, this Nation will be 70 million acres short of the cropland needed to meet the food needs of our population unless something is done.

Can we afford to wait until we are short of land to do something to start an upward trend in soil productivity? Can we even afford to wait for 10 or 12 years to begin to break even?

The farmers and ranchers of this country bear the primary responsibility. They are not only the users of the land but the guardians as well. But they need help of certain types in order to do the kind of a job that will reverse the downward trend of soil fertility.

THE JOB FOR SCS

One of the things they need most is assistance with some of their technical problems in soil and water conservation. That's what our Soil Conservation Service is doing, just as rapidly as it can. But it's not fast enough yet, obviously, in spite of the fact that SCS has made organizational improvements and established better and faster methods of planning and applying conservation. It is now largely a manpower problem. There just aren't enough technical people available to help farmers as fast as they want the help.

In the face of this need—possibly our most urgent national need—some are proposing this year to cut back these technical services to farmers rather than to accelerate them. The budget reductions proposed for the Soil Conservation Service would mean that next year every 5 soil-conservation districts in the country would have to do with 1 man less. SCS originally estimated it would need \$66,491,000 to keep up with the increasing demand for its services. The revised budget cut this back more than \$6 million. The House restored slightly less than \$1 million.

We are all determined to operate our national programs as economically as possible. But I question the economy of saving \$6 million in 1954 when that means retarding our entire national program of soil and water conservation—a program that soon returns more than it costs, and upon which our national well-being rests so heavily.

LET'S SPEED UP, NOT CUT BACK

Should we not attempt to increase the operating rate of this program rather than reduce it or even maintain its present rate?

I hold that we should not only restore the \$6 million which have been cut from the 1954 budget, but in addition should augment it to a reasonable degree. We should begin to accelerate this program if we are to lighten the ultimate cost to the Nation of soil loss and deterioration. I should like to see what the Soil Conservation Service could

do to step up this rate of accomplishment if it received \$70 million in 1954. I am convinced that we can save the Nation millions in the long run by speeding up this work now. Every year that we fail to step it up means just that much more loss, and that much more delay.

At Omaha, Nebr., last fall, General Eisenhower said:

"The Soil Conservation Service is a competent technical agency *** the only trouble with this kind of conservation work is that it is moving too slowly."

You don't speed it up by cutting down on its funds for technical assistance. Minnesota has had new districts in the past year which the SCS could not service, because they lacked the funds. We are hoping to have more new districts in the year ahead. We want to be sure we can have SCS technicians available to work with our farmers.

KEEP THE ACP

Our farmers in Minnesota have been disturbed over proposals to cripple and render ineffective the agriculture-conservation program, the program of sharing costs of approved conservation practices. Experience has proven that we just won't get as much conservation accomplished without this program.

It's foolish for critics to say farmers shouldn't be assisted in carrying out practices that a good farmer should carry out anyhow. We've known for a long time about the benefits of certain practices, and the dangers of others. Knowledge alone hasn't brought about general adoption of sound conservation farming. We've needed these incentives.

The question isn't what a farmer should do—it's what he would do. And all of us have a stake in what he would do, or wouldn't do, toward conserving our valuable topsoil.

I'm glad the House refused to go along with Secretary Benson's reckless proposal to cut ACP authorizations for 1954 to \$140 million. Instead, the House has voted \$195 million advance authorization. I feel it should be kept at \$250 million level, which is itself a drastic reduction from the level at which this program started. I do not think it should be cut further.

I urge this committee to recognize these conservation programs as a necessary investment in the Nation's future. The farmer cannot bear the burden alone of insuring food for the rest of us. The farmer gets less than half of the food dollar—why shouldn't the rest of the economy share in the cost of keeping our farms productive?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. RUSSELL. As I understand, the Williams amendment has not yet been agreed to. The vote just had was on the adoption of the substitute, I believe.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator is correct.

The question now recurs on the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], as amended. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. A vote in the affirmative would be a vote for an amount of \$225 million, would it not?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is correct—\$225 million as against \$195 million.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The adoption of the amendment of the Senator from Georgia has changed the figure in my amendment from \$140 million to \$225 million.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator is correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I trust that the slight alteration in the Senator's amendment does not dispose him to vote against his own amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I have not changed my opinion that when we vote on appropriations we are in effect voting on a tax cut.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. As I understand, the amendment of the Senator from Delaware has now been amended by the action taken by the Senate on the substitute offered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL].

A negative vote on the substitute as amended would leave the figure as it came from the Appropriations Committee, would it not?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from California is correct.

The roll call will proceed.

The legislative clerk resumed the call of the roll.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. YOUNG. A "yea" vote, as I understand, is a vote for the figure of \$225 million.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A "yea" vote is a vote for \$225 million.

Mr. AIKEN. And a "nay" vote is a vote for \$195 million.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A "nay" vote is a vote for \$195 million. The rollcall will proceed.

The legislative clerk resumed and concluded the call of the roll.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, on this vote I have a pair with the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON]. If he were present and voting he would vote in the affirmative. If I were at liberty to vote I would vote in the negative. Accordingly I withhold my vote.

Mr. FREAR (after having voted in the negative). Mr. President, I believe I am recorded, am I not?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator is recorded as having voted in the negative.

Mr. FREAR. It was my understanding that my pair with the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] related to the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] as a substitute for the amendment of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS]. Therefore it now becomes incumbent upon me to announce a pair with the senior Senator from Oklahoma and to void my negative vote. If the senior Senator from Oklahoma were present and voting he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote I would vote "nay." I therefore withdraw my vote.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASEL], the Senator from Vermont

[Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] are absent on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] would each vote "nay."

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] are absent by leave of the Senate. If present and voting, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] would vote "yea," and on this vote the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is paired with the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] would vote "nay," and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] would vote "yea."

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] are necessarily absent. On this vote the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] is paired with the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Kansas would vote "nay," and the Senator from Montana would vote "yea."

I also announce that the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] is absent by leave of the Senate, having been appointed a delegate to attend the International Labor Organization Conference at Geneva, Switzerland.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is absent by leave of the Senate on official committee business.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent by leave of the Senate, having been appointed a delegate to attend the International Labor Organization Conference at Geneva, Switzerland.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. If present and voting, the Senator from Washington would vote "yea," and the Senator from Illinois would vote "nay."

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is paired with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL]. If present and voting, the Senator from Montana would vote "yea," and the Senator from Kansas would vote "nay."

I also announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 38, nays 38, as follows:

YEAS—38

Carlson	Gillette	Johnson, Tex.
Chavez	Gore	Johnson, S. C.
Clements	Green	Kefauver
Cooper	Hayden	Kilgore
Daniel	Hennings	Langer
Eastland	Hoey	Long
Ellender	Humphrey	Mansfield
Fulbright	Jackson	Maybank
George	Johnson, Colo.	McCarran

McClellan
Monroney
Mundt
Neely

Russell
Smathers
Smith, N. C.
Sparkman

Stennis
Thye
Wiley

NAYS—38

Aiken	Duff	McCarthy
Anderson	Dworshak	Millikin
Barrett	Ferguson	Payne
Beall	Goldwater	Potter
Bennett	Griswold	Purtell
Bricker	Hendrickson	Robertson
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Saltonstall
Bush	Holland	Smith, Maine
Butler, Md.	Jenner	Smith, N. J.
Butler, Nebr.	Kennedy	Watkins
Byrd	Knowland	Williams
Cordon	Kuchel	Young
Douglas	Malone	

NOT VOTING—20

Capehart	Ives	Pastore
Case	Kerr	Schoeppe
Dirksen	Lehman	Symington
Flanders	Magnuson	Taft
Frear	Martin	Tobey
Hill	Morse	Weicker
Hunt	Murray	

So Mr. WILLIAMS' amendment, as amended, was rejected.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, the committee amendment is still open to amendment, as I understand.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The original text of the bill is open to amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask that it be stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 32, line 2, it is proposed to strike out "\$195,000,000" and to insert in lieu thereof "\$145,000,000."

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I shall not take the time of the Senate to debate the issue. It has been debated at length. The amendment is offered to give the Senators an opportunity to vote on the lower figure. Because of the parliamentary situation Senators voted either for \$195 million or \$225 million. Senators who wish to support the lower figure, which has been recommended by the administration and endorsed by both the National Grange and the Farm Bureau will now have an opportunity to vote on the amendment calling for the lower figure.

I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

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

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from South Dakota will state it.

Mr. MUNDT. I believe the yeas and nays were previously ordered on the Williams amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That amendment has been voted on.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I renew my request for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASEL], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER], are absent on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from Vermont

[Mr. FLANDERS] would vote "nay" and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] would each vote "yea."

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] are necessarily absent. If present and voting the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] would each vote "nay" while the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] would vote "yea."

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] are absent by leave of the Senate. If present and voting, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] would vote "nay."

The Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], is absent by leave of the Senate, having been appointed a delegate to attend the International Labor Organization Conference at Geneva, Switzerland.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], and the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is absent by leave of the Senate on official committee business.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent by leave of the Senate, having been appointed a delegate to attend the International Labor Organization Conference at Geneva, Switzerland.

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] would each vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 22, nays 51, as follows:

YEAS—22

Anderson	Douglas	Potter
Beall	Duff	Purtell
Bennett	Ferguson	Saltonstall
Bricker	Frear	Smith, Maine
Bridges	Kennedy	Watkins
Bush	Kuchel	Williams
Butler, Md.	Fastore	
Byrd	Payne	

NAYS—51

Aiken	Hendrickson	Mansfield
Butler, Nebr.	Hennings	Maybank
Carlson	Hickenlooper	McCarthy
Clements	Hoey	McClellan
Cooper	Holland	Monroney
Cordon	Humphrey	Mundt
Daniel	Jackson	Neely
Dworschak	Jenner	Robertson
Eastland	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Ellender	Johnson, Tex.	Smathers
Fulbright	Johnston, S. C.	Smith, N. J.
George	Kefauver	Smith, N. C.
Gillette	Kilgore	Sparkman
Gore	Knowland	Stennis
Green	Langer	Thye
Griswold	Long	Wiley
Hayden	Malone	Young

NOT VOTING—23

Barrett	Hunt	Morse
Capehart	Ives	Murray
Case	Kerr	Schoeppe
Chavez	Lehman	Symington
Dirksen	Magnuson	Taft
Flanders	Martin	Tobey
Goldwater	McCarran	Weicker
Hill	Millikin	

So the amendment of Mr. WILLIAMS was rejected.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which lies at the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 25, in line 22, it is proposed to strike out "\$7 million" and to insert "\$12 million".

On page 26, in line 13, it is proposed to strike out "\$6,286,329" and to insert "\$11,248,000."

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, this amendment is offered in an effort to restore the original budget figures on upstream flood control.

There are 11 projects, most of which have been authorized since 1940 and 1944, to provide for agricultural flood-prevention work. These 11 projects are largely a part of main-stem flood prevention control, and are a phase of a new type of flood control and flood prevention. We might say this upstream flood control is the "farmers' method" of flood prevention.

All of us have heard that it would be fine if we could build dams on top of the hills, instead of building them in the rich river valleys. Fundamentally, that is exactly what upstream flood-control projects do. In the 11 projects that have been authorized during more than 10 years, the Soil Conservation Service not only is providing for comprehensive and complete soil conservation by means of farm terracing, contour plowing, and grassing the runoffs, but it also is providing control in the upstream reaches of the creeks and streams, so that one of the main land resources of the Nation, namely, the valley lands of the rivers, creeks, and streams, will be preserved.

Upstream plugs are built to control the runoffs in the upper reaches of the rivers and creeks and thus prevent the water from ever reaching the main stems of the rivers.

The 11 authorized projects have been provided for that purpose. As a result, not only is the Government able to avoid purchasing hundreds of thousands of acres of fertile bottom land, but Uncle Sam gets a free ride in the case of the water-retention reservoirs.

The Federal Government does not have to invest large sums of money in the purchase of land for the water retention reservoirs, because the farmers give the Government easement rights on them. The Government constructs small earthen dams, with a discharge culvert placed vertically, which empties the water from most of the dams within 24 hours.

Because only a small amount of water is left in the pool, for stock water purposes, the farmer naturally grasses most of the land that is covered in time of flood. So most of the funds used for

upstream control are devoted to the construction of works, not to the purchase of land.

Careful studies of this program have been made. From the time when it began until 1944, the maximum time of construction was supposed to be from 15 to 20 years from start to finish. But under the reduced appropriations that have been made for this program and for other programs during the years, the range of time will not be from 15 to 20 years, but will stretch up to 65 or 70 years, at the present rate of appropriations.

Because \$1 will have the value of \$2, in the case of upstream control versus main-stem construction, and because the work can be done by small operators using bulldozers and other small equipment, this program offers the maximum amount of flood control for the minimum expenditure of dollars.

By proceeding with this comprehensive program of upstream-flood control, we are buying millions of acres of soil conservation of the most comprehensive and perfect type. The money used for this program will not go into the purchase of limestone or the purchase of fertilizer. It will go into work on the land; and this program gears into a comprehensive river flood control system, so that the water is held where it falls. Thus we take advantage of the sinking in of the water, rather than to try to rush the water through the land and off to the sea. Instead, the moisture is permitted to soak into the land on which it falls.

Mr. President, if we are able to develop this program and if we can complete a few of the projects, which will serve as guinea pigs, I believe they will show that we are now spending much more on rushing the water to the sea than we should be spending, and are receiving far less in the way of return on the expenditures, than in the case of trying to hold the water where it falls.

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

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to my distinguished friend from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. I want to be sure I understand the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma. As I understand his amendment, it deals with projects authorized under the Flood Control Act of 1936.

Mr. MONRONEY. That is correct.

Mr. CARLSON. It does not have reference to projects which were in the bill and were, I contend, authorized under Public Law 46.

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator is correct, and I personally would vote to support the amendment in which the Senator from Kansas is interested, to provide \$5 million for new pilot starts on a number of streams in 21 States.

I think we are spending far too little for the comprehensive flood-control program, soil conservation methods. But my amendment applies to the 11 authorized projects. We have the projects listed.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in my remarks at this point two tables, the first of which

deals with watersheds, the second with flood-prevention appropriations, Department of Agriculture.

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

Watershed	Estimated total Federal cost as of June 30, 1952	Cumulative Federal obligations through fiscal year 1953	Percent of total Federal cost obligated through fiscal year 1953	Proposed years to complete	Years to complete at present rate of appropriations ¹
Buffalo Creek, N. Y.	\$5,278,837	\$1,282,716	24	18	29
Colorado (Middle), Tex.	5,466,790	1,113,407	20	20	34
Coosa, Ga.	2,491,230	685,912	23	20	25
Little Sioux, Iowa	8,838,200	5,172,858	57	15	12
Little Tallahatchie, Miss.	7,739,340	2,336,006	31	20	23
Los Angeles, Calif.	19,490,795	5,887,709	32	10	23
Potomac, Pa.-W. Va.-Md.-Va.	1,619,160	621,304	38	24	18
Santa Ynez, Calif.	2,156,870	1,514,882	70	10	10
Trinity, Tex.	64,943,540	7,150,458	11	15	65
Washita, Okla.	22,823,290	6,158,696	27	15	26
Yazoo, Miss.	34,382,330	3,241,348	9	20	74
Totals.	175,230,382	35,951,895			

¹ Based on average of appropriations fiscal years 1947 through 1953.

Flood prevention appropriations, Department of Agriculture

Watershed	Fiscal year 1952	Fiscal year 1953	Original estimates, 1954	Revised estimates, House and Senate committee, 1954	Amount cut from original estimates, 1954	Percent cut
Buffalo Creek, N. Y.	\$158,372	\$188,111	\$565,000	\$248,000	\$317,000	66
Colorado (Middle), Tex.	163,900	188,284	639,000	294,000	345,000	54
Coosa, Ga.	32,177	135,413	167,000	167,000		
Little Sioux, Iowa	510,784	760,240	750,000	750,000		
Little Tallahatchie, Miss.	385,678	518,300	734,000	596,500	137,500	19
Los Angeles, Calif.	294,902	395,447	953,000	578,583	374,417	39
Potomac, Pa.-W. Va.-Md.-Va.	34,840	39,338	56,000	56,000		
Santa Ynez, Calif.	157,904	173,267	170,000	170,000		
Trinity, Tex.	590,352	914,968	3,926,000	1,314,000	2,612,000	66
Washita, Okla.	533,574	866,035	2,089,000	1,197,246	891,754	43
Yazoo, Miss.	438,303	739,713	1,199,000	915,000	284,000	24
Total.	3,300,786	4,922,116	11,248,000	1,6,286,329	4,961,671	

¹ Total of \$7 million includes \$500,000 for preliminary investigations and surveys, and \$178,671 for general basin investigations.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, since we are interested in soil conservation, since this appropriation will help to give comprehensive soil conservation to every acre in the whole watershed of the 11 projects, and also since the projects have been approved since 1940, I believe that we could well spare \$5 million in order that these projects may be completed faster, and we may realize the advantage of upstream flood control. In other words, cultivatable land is added by upstream flood control. The little creek valleys which are overflowed once, twice, and three times a year, are not now cultivatable; and those areas form much of our very best land. All of these little creekbeds are subject to cultivation, and subject to having controlled discharge of water, so that the streams will never overflow. Instead of wiping out hundreds of thousands of fertile acres of bottom land by main-stem-dam methods, hundreds of thousands of fertile acres of bottom land which could not otherwise be used are brought under cultivation.

Mr. President, I know of the Army engineers' program proposing only large dams for flood control, but I do not believe it possible to put every foot into the same size shoe. Neither do I think it possible to oversimplify the flood-control problem by building only massive main-stem dams. I think this upstream flood control is a program that is well prescribed to fit certain watersheds. The Government has spent millions of dol-

lars on every type of agricultural research, and now it is asked to spend a few million dollars on flood-control research, in a practical way, which will give us a dollars-and-cents return in soil conservation for every dollar we spend; and there will be full benefits of flood control completely in addition to that.

This farmer's method of flood control, as we might call it, has been given only about 1 cent out of every dollar that is being spent. Yet, if one goes about and talks to the farmers, every one of them will say, "Can we not hold the water where it falls? Can we not save some of our bottom land? Why can we not make this soil-conservation, flood-prevention program work?"

I say to you, Mr. President, we could well increase the meager amount of \$7 million, which is allowed in the pending bill, to the budget figure of \$12 million, which was recommended after careful study by the Department of Agriculture, the Bureau of Soil Conservation, and the Budget.

Certainly we do not want to short-change the farm program on flood control—that is the farmers' method of flood control—while we are appropriating \$404 million, as we did last year in the Army civil-functions bill, for the main-stem type of dams. These huge dams ultimately will silt up. There should be protection for these huge main-stem dams through the upstream works against siltation, and the holding back of the silt that erodes from the

farmlands, holding it back on the hills, in the upstream area, through terracing, contour plowing, and check-dams.

It will far more than pay off, in the protection of our main-stem dams. So, Mr. President, I hope that the Senate will consider restoring the budget figure of \$11,248,000 which was recommended for this vital program for the 11 projects that have been authorized since 1940 and 1944.

If this is not done, the program will be cut almost \$5 million, as the cut in the budget estimate is \$4,961,671. That is a terrific cut on this very important development of upstream flood control. I think the time has come when the Senate should go on record as to whether we believe in what we preach about flood control through soil conservation. The amendment restores only \$5 million of the funds that have been cut out, and puts the appropriation back at the original budget figure.

Mr. President, I hope the amendment will be agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I shall speak very briefly in opposition to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma. These watershed programs are good programs, but the total cost of all programs that have been requested, and that have been planned, amounts to something over \$300 billion. For the 11 particular watershed programs that have been authorized, there was recommended last year \$7,750,000. What the Senator from Oklahoma is asking for is \$12 million, or an increase of \$4,250,000.

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

Mr. YOUNG. I will yield in a moment. We have already eliminated \$5 million for 49 other watershed projects that have great merit. It would be most unfair to all those projects if we were to increase these particular funds to \$12 million under flood prevention and cut the other item out completely. I now yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. What did the distinguished Senator say the cost of the projects would be?

Mr. YOUNG. The estimated cost of all watershed programs envisioned by the Department of Agriculture is in excess of \$300 billion.

Mr. MONRONEY. I believe the distinguished Senator is quoting Army engineers' figures. The cost of the 11 projects we are working on now is \$175 million. That was the estimated cost as of June 30, 1952. We have spent only \$35 million of the \$175 million estimated for the projects. Obviously, if we are to do a complete job of going back into every creek, as suggested by the Army engineers, to complete this entire nationwide program, embodying this new idea in flood control, we will probably arrive at a \$300 billion figure. But certainly the development proposed in my amendment affects only \$175 million of construction.

Mr. YOUNG. That is correct. Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. CORDON. The Senator from Oregon was present during the hearing on the agricultural bill—not this year—when the representative of the Department of Agriculture made the statement, in answer to a question, that the total cost of all the agricultural watershed or upstream tributary programs in the United States was estimated at \$300 billion. That was the statement made by the Department of Agriculture, and those figures were based upon original estimates which were made a number of years prior to that time.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. HENNINGS. I had the pleasure and privilege of serving on the Missouri Basin Survey Commission with the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, and during the course of our labors and studies lasting more than a year, we learned a great deal about the complexity and intricacy, and, as the Senator from Oregon has pointed out, a great deal about the expense of a program which may ultimately be achieved in order to reach something like a solution of our water-control problems, including conservation, flood control, and reclamation, as well as the subsidiary parts of the programs. I am wondering why only 11 projects are included in the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma. I am asking, for enlightenment, whether the chairman of the subcommittee knows of others which some of us might consider equally important in the terms of watersheds, and to which we gave great consideration in the preparation of the report, with which the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee is so familiar. I wondered why the committee took this action.

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

Mr. HENNINGS. I am asking for information.

Mr. MONRONEY. I had discussed the question of submitting one amendment to include all these projects, and a proposal of \$5 million for the unauthorized projects which were placed in the bill by the House. I supported those also.

The distinguished Senator from Kansas stated he did not wish to press his amendment, but he expressed sympathy for this project, too, because it covers a wide area. We want more upstream flood control, not less, and the quicker we can proceed with these projects, which are being starved to death, the quicker we can then expand to the other areas, with which the distinguished Senator is so familiar, areas in the Missouri Valley and other places. But if we are to continue to starve all these programs, there is no use in our starting any new ones. It is in complete sympathy and in complete agreement with the sponsors of the House provision that I am submitting my amendment. Unfortunately, the two are under different authorizations, and in different sections of the bill.

Mr. YOUNG. I may say to the Senator that I believe all of these are good projects. I think, however, we ought to

go easy on them, particularly at this time, when we are not making starts on many new programs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY].

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

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Goldwater	McCarran
Anderson	Gore	McCarthy
Barrett	Green	McClellan
Beall	Griswold	Monroney
Bennett	Hayden	Mundt
Bricker	Hendrickson	Neely
Bridges	Hennings	Pastore
Bush	Hickenlooper	Payne
Butler, Md.	Hoey	Potter
Butler, Nebr.	Holland	Purtell
Byrd	Humphrey	Robertson
Carlson	Jackson	Russell
Clements	Jenner	Saltonstall
Cooper	Johnson, Colo.	Smathers
Cordon	Johnson, Tex.	Smith, Maine
Daniel	Johnston, S. C.	Smith, N. J.
Douglas	Kefauver	Smith, N. C.
Duff	Kennedy	Sparkman
Dworshak	Kilgore	Stennis
Eastland	Knowland	Thye
Ellender	Kuchel	Watkins
Ferguson	Langer	Wiley
Fraser	Long	Williams
Fulbright	Malone	Young
George	Mansfield	
Gillette	Maybank	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY].

Mr. AIKEN. I am strongly in favor of upriver flood control development programs. I think altogether too much emphasis has been placed on the construction of great dams across wide river valleys, dams which sometimes destroy more land than they protect as the Senator from Oklahoma has said.

However, I am skeptical of an amendment which adds \$5 million to the bill. All of us hope there may be an honorable armistice or truce signed in Korea, followed eventually by peace, but we should realize that as soon as an armistice is signed, public opinion will be asserting itself very vigorously. If an armistice is signed, and there develops a hope of peace which may last for some time, we may expect a recession in business as a result of industrial conversion. The public will then put pressure on Congress and the administration, and successfully, for a renewal of a public works program. There will be a very insistent public demand for renewal of some programs which have been held in abeyance during the past few years, and very properly so, I believe.

One of the means we shall have with which to soften a recession while conversion is taking place from war production to civilian production will be the development of upriver valleys and the application of flood control methods. At that time we shall not be talking in terms of \$5 million. When that point is reached, I believe some ciphers will be added to the figure.

Much as I should like to support the Senator from Oklahoma, I shall not vote for his amendment. As has been said, there is a question as to the authority for an appropriation for all these projects.

I observe that the Senator from Oklahoma is on his feet.

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

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. The projects affected by my amendment have been authorized by an act of Congress. There is no question about the authorization of the projects, which the House added, but which were eliminated from the bill by the Senate committee. The Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] was the sponsor of these projects, but some question was raised as to their authorization.

Mr. AIKEN. I did not understand that the Senator had deleted these projects from his amendment.

Mr. MONRONEY. At the request of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], my amendment, as offered, now affects 11 projects which have been authorized since 1940 and 1944, and on which work has been dragging along at a painfully slow pace. It will take 75 years to complete some of the projects.

The new pilot projects, which the Senator from Kansas proposed, and which were included by the House, were stricken from the bill by the Senate committee, which raised a question as to their authorization, but those projects are not affected in any way by my amendment.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Oklahoma has improved the situation materially. However, it seems to me that we might do well to pass over the amendment at this time. There will be a conference with the House, and I assure the Senator from Oklahoma that I shall give full consideration to his proposal in the conference. But I believe that very shortly it will be necessary for Congress to consider the matter on a much broader scale than that proposed by the Senator from Oklahoma, which affects only 11 upstream river developments.

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

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. I appreciate what the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has said. He has been a great supporter of upstream flood control.

One of the purposes of trying to develop the 11 pilot or guinea-pig operations would be to gain experience, so that if the time comes for additional construction, we will not be wasting money on false starts or because of lack of technical information. Therefore, as I have said in proposing the amendment, the research value alone in moving these projects further along will pay off big dividends if we can speed up these 11 pilot projects at this time.

Mr. AIKEN. Even though I shall vote against the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma, I shall, in conference give thoughtful consideration to his proposal. I believe I am required by law to be a member of the conference committee, and there I shall give even more

thoughtful consideration to a broader program, on which I feel we must be working in order to be able to take advantage of any recession which may develop as a result of the hoped-for truce.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I have received a letter from Mr. Chester Wilson, Conservation Commissioner of Minnesota. In his letter Mr. Wilson states:

I have just received a message from Washington stating that the Senate committee has deleted an item of \$5 million in the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill (approved by the House Appropriations Committee) for carrying out 50 small watershed projects under the supervision of the United States Soil Conservation Service.

If I were to read the entire letter, Senators would learn that the Commissioner of Conservation in Minnesota is very much disturbed about this deletion. He says further in his letter:

This news is very disturbing to this department, and I am sure that it will be received with much concern by the members of the State Soil Conservation Committee, soil conservation district supervisors, and by conservationists generally around the State.

May I ask if that is the item that is in question?

Mr. YOUNG. No. The item about which the Senator from Oklahoma is talking refers to 11 authorized projects under the flood prevention program. The reason the Senate committee on Appropriations struck out the \$5 million under watershed protection was that there was a serious question as to proper authorization. It is a question which can best be ironed out in conference with the House.

Mr. THYE. In other words, it was stricken out for no other purpose than to have a question for discussion when the Senate and House conferees meet?

Mr. YOUNG. That is correct.

Mr. THYE. The matter is one which worries many honest, sincere conservationists. If the Senate committee did not have a mind to appropriate some of this amount, what will happen in conference? That is the question and the fear expressed by Mr. Wilson. The situation may be quite poorly understood, because if the Senate does nothing, it will appear that we are not conservation minded. To me, that is a disturbing factor, because it seems that we are considering the problem in the wrong ways. If the Senate strikes out this amount for the purpose of having a question to discuss, persons who are unfamiliar with the situation will read the appropriation bill, when we have finished with it on the Senate floor, and think that we did not have any intention of trying to improve the run-off or conservation program.

I would much rather have had the \$5 million increase agreed to; then there would have been something to discuss in conference. The item would not have been stricken entirely from the bill. If it is stricken out entirely, the action will be misunderstood.

Mr. YOUNG. I think many who sent letters like the one just read would bet-

ter understand the problem if they studied the law itself. The question is one of appropriate authorization. If a vote were to be taken on the Senate floor, the proposal would be lost entirely, and there would be no possibility of later bringing it up in conference. As matters now stand, there is a possibility of considering the question in conference. If we were to assume that the particular projects were properly authorized there would still be a question whether they were to be temporary or experimental in character.

There is more than \$5 million involved. The total cost of these projects is \$29 million, and not \$5 million, which is the figure in the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments offered by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], which are being considered en bloc.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I renew my request for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the demand for the yeas and nays sufficiently seconded?

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I shall not take 15 minutes to make my brief statement, but I wish to make a slight contribution to this discussion.

The first committee meeting I ever attended after I came to the Senate was a 1944 meeting of the Commerce Committee, which reported the 1944 Flood Control Act. I have been interested in this particular approach to flood prevention from that time until today.

I am one of those who believed then, and still believe, that certain of these projects should be carried forward to completion in order that we might have some experience upon which to determine whether this is the sound approach. However, one of the questions which bothers me is this: One of the original approvals was that of the Santa Ynez River Basin in California. That is just over the mountains from Santa Barbara. I made inquiry in the hearings this year as to what was being done with reference to the Santa Ynez River Basin, and I was told that very satisfactory progress was being made with it.

Since we approved that project, or that type of flood prevention, the Bureau of Reclamation has built a dam across the Santa Ynez River. They are still praying that they will get enough water to fill the reservoir behind it. Since that time ownership in that area—the upper Santa Ynez Basin—to the extent of more than 40,000 acres, has gone to one man. I have made inquiry in the area, and I cannot find where a dollar was ever spent in the area. From the answers to my questions this year there is grave doubt in my mind as to whether the Department of Agriculture is yet aware that a dam was built across the Santa Ynez River within 20 or 30 miles of the place where it flows into the Pacific Ocean.

If that is a sample of what has been done, I think we should be a little careful when we add any more money than the amount in the bill at this time, which is some \$1½ million or so more

than was appropriated last year. The appropriation of last year was \$5,700,000. The bill this year carries an appropriation of \$7 million. Assuming that there is no more knowledge than there appeared to be in the hands of the Department of Agriculture, I doubt if we could expect intelligent expenditure of any such additional funds.

In view of the fact that the overall anticipated estimated expenditure is the highest of any single type of project I have known in the internal history of the United States—it now runs somewhere between \$400 billion and \$500 billion—I think we should go a little carefully at this time and suggest to the Department of Agriculture that it should know precisely what it is doing, or at least keep track of the monstrous reclamation dams which are being built across some of the streams, and which, so far as the upper areas are concerned, make any type of upstream flood prevention utterly useless, and any type of flood prevention below wholly unnecessary.

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

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator does not discount the value of preventing siltation by upstream flood-control treatment for the benefit of dams which may be far downstream, does he?

Mr. CORDON. There is nothing like that involved in this project.

Mr. MONRONEY. I am not at all familiar with the project to which the Senator refers, but I am familiar with the Washita project, which is to control the entire river watershed, and at the same time prevent the siltation of the Denison Lake on Red River, which will probably add 20 or 30 years to the useful life of that project.

Mr. CORDON. I do not for a moment depreciate the values which are involved. I invite the attention of the Senate to one instance which came to my attention. It was sufficient to hang a red lantern on this proposal, so far as I am concerned, until we know that the Department knows more about just how and where it expects to spend the money. I should like to see some of the projects tested, so that we can gain valuable experience, but I do not like to see money spent on a proposal such as this. I would rather spend the money in the Senator's part of the country on a project which could be finished.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments offered by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], which are being considered en bloc. The yeas and nays have been asked for.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments offered by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY]. [Putting the question.] The "noes" seem to have it.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I ask for a division.

On a division the amendments were rejected.

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

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Utah will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 24, after line 8, it is proposed to insert the following:

SPECIAL ACTS

For the acquisition of land to facilitate the control of soil erosion and flood damage originating within the exterior boundaries of the Cache National Forest, Utah, in accordance with the provisions of the act of May 11, 1938 (Public Law 505), as amended, \$10,000.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, this amendment deals with such a small sum that I feel like apologizing for bringing it before the Senate. It relates to a program inaugurated back in 1938, when the Congress authorized the appropriation of a small sum from the receipts from the national forest, to be used for the purchase of private lands which were checkerboarded within the national forest. The national forest to which I am now referring is the Cache National Forest, in north-central Utah. This forest is upon ground upon which water is deposited through snows and rains, to supply the cities of Brigham City, Utah, Ogden, and other communities.

The communities themselves have been cooperating with the Government since 1938. They have been putting in money of their own and helping to buy these lands, improve them, and take care of them so that they will become a very fine part of the national forest. We have gone along year after year. The Government has been putting up \$10,000 out of receipts from the national forest until this year, when the item was dropped.

The people of the local communities now have their part of the money ready. They are willing to go along, and they want to continue this very fine program. There are still other lands to be bought.

I should invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that under the law as it now exists, 25 percent of the income from the national forests goes to the communities in which the national forests are located. The \$10,000 item here is from forest receipts, but 25 percent of that would belong to the counties. They are willing that that amount be appropriated, because it all goes into the Treasury. They are willing to have that amount appropriated as well, which, in effect, would mean an actual appropriation of \$7,500 from the receipts of the national forest which would reach the Public Treasury and remain there for other purposes.

It seems to me we should encourage cooperation such as we are getting from these cities and communities. We have been talking in terms of a great many millions of dollars. This is a cooperative agreement that was started a number of years ago and has been carried on until this year. Communities and counties are cooperating with the Government in a very splendid fashion. I see no reason why the item should not be accepted by the committee.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, it is only a small project, and I have discussed it with several members of the Committee on Appropriations. I think it will be agreeable to take the amendment to conference, to see what can be worked out.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HENDRICKSON in the chair). The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] is willing to take the amendment to conference. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD immediately following the action of the Senate a statement which I have prepared justifying the amendment.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WATKINS

PURCHASE OF LANDS WITHIN THE CACHE NATIONAL FOREST, UTAH, TO PREVENT SOIL EROSION AND FLOOD DAMAGE

By an act approved May 11, 1938 (52 Stat. 347), and amended by the act of May 26, 1944 (58 Stat. 227), Congress has authorized the Secretary of Agriculture to purchase lands within the boundaries of the Cache National Forest in the State of Utah to assure that such lands will be managed, with nearby national forest lands, so as to minimize soil erosion and damage from floods. This act also authorizes appropriation by the Congress of the receipts from the Cache National Forest in Utah to pay for the lands acquired under the act. Proposed purchases must be approved by the National Forest Reservation Commission as established by section 4 of the Weeks law of March 1, 1911. This Commission is comprised of two Members of the Senate, Senators BRIDGES and STENNIS, two Members of the House of Representatives, Mr. COLMER, of Mississippi, and Mr. D'EWART, of Montana, the Secretary of War (or the Chief of Engineers as his alternate), and the Secretaries of Interior and Agriculture.

A primary purpose of this law is to facilitate protection and improvement of watersheds within the Cache National Forest on which many communities depend for domestic water and on which a substantial farm area depends for irrigation water. Purchase of critical watershed lands permits reduction or termination of grazing use, assures utilization of timber under good forestry practices, and permits the restoration of an adequate vegetative cover through reseeding, terracing, and similar measures, if such are necessary, in conjunction with like activities on other national-forest lands in the vicinity.

The west slopes of the Wasatch Mountains and the watersheds of the Ogden and Weber Rivers, all in northern Utah, descend steeply to the relatively level lands which adjoin the Great Salt Lake on its east side. Water from the streams that rise in this mountain area supports the cities and towns at the foot of the mountains and the irrigation agriculture which utilizes the fertile flat lands. Ogden, Willard, Brigham, and other towns depend on these short and swift streams for their water supplies. These streams are also the sole source of irrigation water for farms. In relation to need, water resources in this area are limited and careful conservation and use is essential.

A good part of these watersheds is within the Cache National Forest. Interspersed with the national forest lands are substantial acreages of privately-owned range and timberland of high watershed importance. The area of privately-owned lands, which are not subject to national forest administration, is proportionately greater in those parts of the national forest established in more recent years, as the Wellsville Mountain area which was added to the forest in 1937.

Some of these privately-owned lands have been abused through over-grazing, over-cutting of timber, and destructive fires. As a consequence, on such lands, the vegetative cover often has been destroyed or seriously impaired, soil has been gullied or eroded away, and the water absorptive capacity of the topsoil has been reduced. Private owners often are under economic pressure to obtain maximum returns from their lands and make it difficult to decrease or terminate grazing or other use in the interest of watershed betterment. In many instances the use and value of these lands for watershed purposes, which is of overriding importance to the public, is of little direct concern to the owners. Also, private owners often are unable to install and maintain the restoration measures which are needed to stabilize the more seriously depleted land and to reduce downstream damages.

Deterioration of the steep, erodible mountain watersheds in this area has in the past resulted in serious flash floods affecting the valuable lowlands. The dangers of this situation were demonstrated in 1936 when a flood and resultant mud flow, directly attributable to watershed impairment, descended upon the town of Willard and nearby areas. It destroyed or damaged many homes, caused two deaths, destroyed the local power plant, damaged irrigation and municipal water systems, orchards, and crops, and otherwise caused a material loss of property. Costs of removing the mud and rock flows from the highways, irrigation systems and other facilities, and repairing the damage were, of course, large. Similar floods of varying degrees have affected other areas along the base of this mountain range.

The need for action to avoid repetition of such floods led to formation of two local non-profit organizations, the Weber County Watershed Protective Corporation and the Wellsville Mountain Area Project Corporation, to aid in rehabilitation and protection of these critical watershed areas. These organizations, financed by local contributions, have cooperated closely with the Forest Service in promoting protection and better use of watershed areas in the national forests. A considerable acreage of land has been acquired and donated for national forest purposes and other land has been purchased and conveyed to the United States at cost.

Since enactment of the act of May 11, 1938, above referred to, Congress has appropriated funds thereunder each year, beginning with fiscal year 1940, except for the years 1943 to 1946, inclusive. Since 1947 and through the current fiscal year (1953), Congress has each year appropriated \$10,000 from the receipts of the Cache National Forest for purchase of lands in accordance with the act. This money has been used to acquire lands for which public ownership was deemed necessary to accomplish the purposes of the act and which the owners were willing to sell at a reasonable price. The parts of these appropriations not used to buy essential lands were returned to the Treasury for distribution in the same way as other national forest receipts.

The counties wherein the Cache National Forest is located would ordinarily have received 25 percent of the funds so appropriated, in accordance with legislation providing for contributions to local governments on account of national forests. Hence, in addition to the work of the local non-profit organizations described above, the local governments are in effect contributing 25 percent of the cost of land purchased.

The appropriation bill for the Department of Agriculture for fiscal year 1954, as approved by the House of Representatives and as recommended by the Appropriations Committee of the Senate, does not include an appropriation under this act.

There have been purchased or approved for purchase under this act since 1940 about 19,000 acres of land. About 11,500 acres have

been acquired since 1947, when appropriations were again made available after the war. There remains as much or more privately owned land within these watersheds in similar condition. Critical areas are a relatively small portion of the watersheds, but they have been and can again be the cause of destructive floods and a continuing source of damaging sediments in irrigation reservoirs and canals.

In 1947 the people of Weber County, Utah, organized the Weber County Watershed Protective Corp. This corporation solicits and receives contributions from municipal and private sources with which to acquire lands in Weber County for inclusion in the Cache National Forest. In some instances the lands are directly included; in other instances land exchanges are negotiated; in other cases the corporation's funds are used to encourage and assist private owners in conservation and watershed protection work. Funds are subscribed by Weber County, by water companies, and by service clubs. Each year Weber County communities put on drives for public contributions.

It simply is not right for the Federal Government to walk out on its commitment to these people. The assignment of \$10,000 of Cache National Forest funds should by all means be continued during the fiscal year 1954.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, a few minutes ago the Senate decided not to increase the funds for soil conservation; in other words, not to support the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. I think it is well for the Senate to keep in mind, as it votes on the agricultural appropriation bill, particularly with reference to the items dealing with vital services, the following dispatch which has been taken off the ticker in the cloakroom. It is from the United Press, and reads:

CHICAGO.—A wild selling wave hit major grain markets today and sent wheat prices tumbling today to some of the lowest levels in 3 years.

At Minneapolis, wheat for delivery in September and December fell the full 10-cent limit for a single day's trading, and cash wheat fell as much as 16½ cents a bushel.

At Chicago, July wheat dropped 9½ cents a bushel, and sold for \$1.89 to \$1.88½ cents a bushel.

Wheat for immediate delivery, known as cash wheat, sold more than 12 cents lower on the Chicago market.

At Kansas City, the selling wave sent July wheat tumbling 9 cents a bushel.

At Chicago, other grains followed the downward trend, July and September corn hitting new lows for the season.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I should also like to call attention to another bulletin, also from Chicago. It reads:

Wheat was 2½ to 2¾ cents lower than the previous finish, July \$1.95½; corn was 1½ to 1¾ cents lower, July \$1.51½; and oats were ½ to ¾ cent lower, July 71½ cents. Soybeans were down ¾ to 1¼ cents, July \$2.85¼, and lard was unchanged to 3 cents a hundred pounds higher, July \$9.25.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair respectfully calls the Senator's attention to the fact that he will have to offer an amendment before he is entitled to hold the floor.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] may be permitted to finish his statement.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Vermont. I wish to call attention to one other dispatch, which reads:

CHICAGO (Associated Press).—Wheat futures dropped sharply today on heavy selling influenced by the fact that the new crop is being harvested in the Southwest and there is a lack of space to store it.

The dispatches indicate that the measures we are dealing with, particularly as they affect vital services to American agriculture, are of the utmost importance.

I am very happy to make note of the fact that the Senators who have lent so much of their time and energy to the work of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry are familiar with these facts, and are directing their efforts toward taking care of the situation.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. It seems to me that the farmers are about to receive a great deal of bad news in 1 day. As the Senator from Minnesota has stated, we have failed to increase the funds for the soil-conservation payments. I should like to point out that the amendment which I offered, in my own behalf and on behalf of several other Senators, including the Senator from Minnesota, would have provided for a reduction of \$25 million in the amount available to the farmers this year. I shall await with interest the explanation to be made to the farmers by the Farm Bureau Federation leaders, who have told Congress that they would be able to pay for the soil conservation practices, at the same time the farmers get the news that the cash market for wheat has dropped 16 cents in 1 day. I wonder whether they will receive the news very enthusiastically.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. I wish to make the record perfectly clear that the amendment I was referring to, the so-called Russell amendment, even if it had been adopted, as the Senator has pointed out, would have left the amount of money for the soil-conservation payments under the so-called ACP program below what was originally recommended. What we are able to do was merely to sustain the figure of \$195 million, which is approximately \$55 million below the amount recommended by the outgoing administration.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, was that the amount recommended by the present administration?

Mr. RUSSELL. The present administration made a much smaller recommendation. I believe the amount was about \$140 million.

Mr. MAYBANK. I thank the Senator. I wanted to have that statement in the record.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be offered, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I call up my amendment, which is lying on the desk.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

THE CHIEF CLERK. On page 38, line 17, after the word "program", it is proposed to insert the following: "Provided, That the additional amounts for the rural electrification program may be distributed in any State or Territory, in addition to the sums which such State may otherwise receive, except that not more than 20 percent of such additional amounts may be distributed to any one State."

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I make the point of order that the amendment is legislation on an appropriation bill.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I move that the rule be suspended. I have been authorized to make the motion by the Committee on Appropriations.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is in order. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota will state it.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, what happened to the point of order?

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed by the Parliamentarian that notice has been given. Therefore the motion to suspend the rule is in order.

The Chair would remind the Senator from North Dakota that he may speak 15 minutes on the motion if he desires to do so.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, the amendment is offered in accordance with the request of the Department of Agriculture, contained in the justifications sent to the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations.

In substance, I should like to say that, of the amount appropriated for REA under the present law, 50 percent is set aside, based on the needs of the individual States; and the other 50 percent is divided among the several States, provided that not more than 10 percent may be used in any one State.

The amendment would change the 10-percent provision to 20 percent. It is believed by REA that such a provision is needed. Of course, all the projects would, as heretofore, still have to be approved by the REA.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] pointed to the drastic break in the grain markets of today. The reason the markets are in such a demoralized condition is because of the \$3 billion worth of commodities which have been accumulated under the Truman administration, for which there is no market or use.

So far as the vote on the Russell amendment is concerned, I point out that the Russell amendment, which was rejected by the Senate, proposed to furnish more fertilizer, so farmers could improve their soil and thereby grow more wheat, to be put in storage, and to force the market down even further.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I cannot let that erroneous statement pass

without challenging it. If the Senator from Delaware knew anything about the conservation program, he would know that it is impossible to purchase 1 pound of fertilizer to increase the production of wheat.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator may be technically correct. On the other hand, the amendment furnishes lime and other fertilizers for the purpose of building up farms in order that they may produce more crops. If farms produce more crops, it means that more wheat and other crops will be grown. That is the argument used for the additional appropriations. It was a long-range program of making greater the productive capacity of the farms. I think the Senator from Georgia will agree that the huge surpluses that have been accumulated during the last few years are today, in effect, acting as a drag on the market.

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course, but that has nothing to do with the Senator's statement that the funds are to go to buy fertilizer for the increased production of wheat. The Senator from Delaware cannot point to a single case of that sort.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The money is to go to improve the productivity of the farms, in order that more cotton, wheat, corn, or other crops may be grown and that statement cannot be denied. Otherwise, what is the lime and fertilizer for?

Mr. RUSSELL. But the Senator from Delaware made the categorical statement that the money went to purchase fertilizer, so that more wheat would be produced. I challenge that statement, because it is not correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS. No; I say the purpose of the amendment is to improve the productivity of the farms, so that more wheat, more corn, and more other crops, which are in great surplus supply today, will be produced.

Mr. RUSSELL. The farms are more productive than they have been; but the surpluses are due to the failure of the administration to apply the controls that are authorized by law to be applied, in the case of the crops to be marketed from each farm.

If the Senator from Delaware wishes to pursue a policy of depleting the soil, so that it cannot produce, that is another matter. But he should not hide such a purpose behind a statement that the funds are used for the purchase of fertilizer, so that more wheat will be produced, because that is not correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS. These funds are used to increase the productive capacity of the farms.

I agree with the Senator from Georgia that a large part of the trouble today is due to the failure of the past administration to put into effect the acreage controls which automatically follow a rigid 90-percent support program.

Mr. RUSSELL. I agree, and that is the only correct statement the Senator from Delaware made in connection with this matter.

The other point the Senator from Delaware urges is, in effect, a crop-reduction program to be based upon depleting the soil of the Nation. I am not in favor of a program which would deplete the soil of the Nation, with the result that adequate production would be impossible.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is not true. I believe that the statement of the Senator from Georgia was answered very well by both the president of the American Farm Bureau Federation and by the legislative representative of the National Grange, when both of them pointed out very emphatically that they did not believe the funds requested by the committee amendment were needed to carry on a sound program to preserve the farms.

The continued accumulation of billions of dollars worth of agricultural commodities under the high support program can only lead to ultimate disaster. I have repeatedly warned that this would happen under the shortsighted policy of the past administration. The leaders of our great farm organizations likewise have recognized this danger and for that reason have opposed the 90-percent fixed support. After today's vote I shall incorporate in the RECORD a letter from the Director of the Budget showing the direct cost of this program.

Of course, the cost to the consumer and the long-range damage to our farmers is incalculable.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Delaware has correctly stated that the heads of the American Farm Bureau Federation urged, as they have for 3 or 4 or 5 years, that the appropriation be reduced. We have now heard from the leadership of the American Farm Bureau Federation, and the Senate has voted to follow the views of that leadership. This matter will now be appealed to the membership of the American Farm Bureau Federation, and we shall await their decision at the polls in 1954.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Of course, we had a decision in 1952, in which they repudiated the past administration.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes, but they did not repudiate the past administration on this program. In 1947 we had a clear-cut issue on this program, when there was in power in Congress the party that is in power today. That party cut the heart out of this farm program. In my judgment, that had more to do with the results of the 1948 election than did any other single item.

Having heard from the leaders of the American Farm Bureau Federation and having followed their views, as I have said, Senators now can tell the membership of that federation that the views of its leadership have been followed on this issue; and then we shall see how such Senators fare in the elections in the agricultural States.

Of course, our friends from the highly industrialized areas had no difficulty regarding this matter, for the population of their States is industrial, and very little farming is done in those areas.

However, sometimes I think that from the standpoint of the overall welfare of the party, it is a little wise to give some consideration to the effect such a policy will have on the members of the party who happen to live in agricultural areas.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Many Members of Congress from the South and the Midwest often think the East is not an agricultural area. However, with all due respect to the Senator from Georgia, and to agriculture in Georgia, I point out that the county in which I live ranks fifth in

the United States, and outranks any other county east of the Mississippi and south of the Mason-Dixon Line in production. They have reached this goal without any Government subsidy. In fact, the high-support program penalizes them.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, if the Senator from Delaware will yield to me—

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. THYE. Let me inquire in what respect Delaware ranks fifth.

Mr. WILLIAMS. In the output of farm commodities in dollar volume—a goal reached without Government supports.

Mr. THYE. I would agree with the Senator from Delaware, in respect to the production of broilers; but those who engage in that production must go to the great Grain Belt of the Midwest to get the grain they need. Price supports affect most definitely the grain-producing areas, and thus are of vital importance to those who produce broilers, because the decision on the whole question of price supports determines whether those who produce broilers will be able to obtain at bargain prices the feed they have to obtain from the breadbasket of the Nation.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I commend the Senator from Minnesota for the statement he has made and for his attitude on farm problems. He views them on a nationwide basis.

I point out to him that, no doubt, as a result of the news which has just been received, the producers of broilers will be singing paens of praise over the news that the wheat market in Minneapolis has broken 16½ cents a bushel. No doubt that is good news for those who produce broilers, but it is not good news for the farmers who produce wheat.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from North Dakota to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI.

The affirmative votes of two-thirds of the Members present are required, if the motion is to be agreed to.

Senators who are favoring the motion will please rise and be counted.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Goldwater	McCarran
Anderson	Gore	McCarthy
Barrett	Green	McClellan
Beall	Griswold	Monroney
Bennett	Hayden	Mundt
Bricker	Hendrickson	Neely
Bridges	Hennings	Pastore
Bush	Hickenlooper	Payne
Butler, Md.	Hoey	Potter
Butler, Nebr.	Holland	Purtell
Byrd	Humphrey	Robertson
Carlson	Jackson	Russell
Clements	Jenner	Saltonstall
Cooper	Johnson, Colo.	Smathers
Cordon	Johnson, Tex.	Smith, Maine
Daniel	Johnston, S. C.	Smith, N. J.
Douglas	Kefauver	Smith, N. C.
Duff	Kennedy	Sparkman
Dworshak	Kilgore	Stennis
Eastland	Knowland	Thye
Ellender	Kuchel	Watkins
Ferguson	Langer	Wiley
Frear	Long	Williams
Fulbright	Malone	Young
George	Mansfield	
Gillette	Maybank	

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present. The question is on the motion of the Senator from North Dakota to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI.

MR. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I merely submit that it seems to me this is clearly legislation on an appropriation bill. It has been so ruled by the Chair.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has so ruled.

MR. KNOWLAND. Under the rules, the distinguished Senator who is acting as chairman of the subcommittee is, of course, privileged to move to suspend the rules. But it seems to me that when a basic change is being made in legislation it should be referred to the proper legislative committee; and unless the situation is of such overwhelming urgency that it cannot be taken care of except in some other way, it seems to me that that is the more orderly way to proceed. I have generally in the 8 years I have been in the Senate supported the rural electrification program. I think it is a good program. I think it entirely possible that if this proposal were referred to the proper legislative committee, and reported favorably, I would support it. But I question very much the advisability of trying to write it into the appropriation bill at this time. For that reason I shall not support the motion to include in the bill the language proposed by the Senator from North Dakota.

MR. YOUNG. Mr. President, I should like to explain the amendment a bit further. This has no particular application to my own State. I doubt whether we need it at all. It is being asked for by many who are interested in REA and by the Department of Agriculture. Let me read a part of the justification presented to the Senate Appropriations Committee:

In some States, under the allotment formula, the maximum amount that can be loaned is likely to be less than the amount required to meet loan needs. In recent years contingent loan authorizations, subject to the same limitations as the basic authorization, were provided in the necessary amount to increase the limitations in States where urgently needed for increasing capacity of lines and facilities. Since the additional amounts were subject to the allotment formula, it has been necessary for the Congress to provide additional borrowing authorization in excess of the amounts required for actual lending. In order to avoid this situation in 1954, it is proposed that the contingency funds be made available directly as needed in the various States, except that not more than 20 percent of such additional amounts may be loaned, in any one State. On this basis, a contingent authorization of \$60 million, in addition to the basic authorization of \$95 million is required to meet loan needs for fiscal year 1954.

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

MR. YOUNG. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

MR. THYE. I should like to ask the Senator from North Dakota a question. One reason for the change in the language is that some of the older associations have found their lines to be inadequate to carry the load now placed on them, and they would like to bor-

row additional money to reconstruct the lines in order that the lines may be adequate for that purpose. Is not that the reason?

MR. YOUNG. That is correct; and there is more need in the older States than in my own State.

MR. THYE. There are some associations in Minnesota whose members, at the time they constructed their units, thought they had ample capacity to meet all future load requirements. They now find the loads stepped up by from 15 to 100 percent, and, as to some of the lines, by more than 100 percent. The units are not so constructed that they can carry the load, and it will be necessary to reconstruct, as well, the transforming stations.

They are therefore faced with a serious situation as to whether they can borrow sufficient money to enable them to reconstruct their lines so that they can carry the present-day load.

I think it is a good amendment, though, like the Senator from California, I think it is legislation on an appropriation bill. But in this particular case, because I doubt whether we would have sufficient time to enact the necessary legislation, I believe we would be warranted in waiving the question, so as to permit the language to be written into the bill.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from North Dakota to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI. On this question a two-thirds vote is necessary in order that the motion may be agreed to. The Chair requests a division.

The Senate divided.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion having failed to receive two-thirds of the votes of Members of the Senate present and voting, the motion is not agreed to.

MR. HUMPHREY subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have placed in the RECORD at the point where loan funds and administrative funds for REA were considered a statement which I have prepared in connection with that subject.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUMPHREY IN SUPPORT OF ADEQUATE LOAN FUNDS AND ADMINISTRATIVE FUNDS FOR REA

Few Government programs have proven of sounder value to the entire Nation than that of the Rural Electrification Administration.

The amazing progress in electrifying rural America over a comparatively short span of years has not only contributed greatly to better rural living, it has also helped revolutionize farm production and opened vast new markets for American industry.

I'm afraid there is some misunderstanding, however, as a result of the pride we take in the fact that electricity is now available to about 90 percent of our farms, compared to around 9 percent when REA was created.

Just because we have made such great progress doesn't by any means indicate the job is finished. Much remains to be done. We not only must complete the area coverage so electricity is available to all farmers, we must make sure our existing electric cooperatives can keep up with the increasing demands for power. That means we must

have adequate financing for "heavying up" existing REA co-op lines wherever necessary, to make sure they can accommodate the heavier loads required by the increasing use of electricity in our farm production.

The REA program is an excellent example of the Government helping farm people to help themselves. Contrary to what some people think, the Government doesn't own or control these rural electric cooperatives, they belong to the farmers themselves. All the Government has done has been to make the necessary credit available, so the people could band together and provide themselves with electric service.

REA itself operates no rural electric or telephone facilities, and the program involves no grants or subsidies. REA serves principally as a banker. Its main functions are to lend money, and to give technical advice and counsel where needed in the construction and operation of the borrowers' facilities.

PAYING OWN WAY

REA borrowers repay the loans with interest, from their operating revenues. The record of REA borrowers justifies full confidence of the Congress in this program. They are repaying their loans, and interest, ahead of schedule.

I'm proud of Minnesota's record in this regard. All of Minnesota's REA co-ops are paying their own way. As of last year, they had paid about \$22½ million in principal and interest on their REA loans, including nearly \$3 million paid on principal ahead of schedule.

The entire program has been a good investment, on the Government's part.

If we cut off the source of credit for the co-ops, however, we are not only preventing improvements in service but also endangering the investment we already have in these electric systems.

REA now has a backlog of some \$140 million in unfilled loan applications. There has been good evidence that our Nation's electric cooperatives will seek additional loans of some \$200 million during the next 18 months, bringing a total estimated credit need up to \$340 million.

The Administration's budget estimates only called for \$95 million in loan funds. It should appear obvious that if such a drastic slash in available credit was made, many existing cooperatives will have to be deprived of necessary credit and further expansion and improvement of rural electrical service will be seriously crippled.

About one-third of the new loan requests are contemplated to "heavy up" existing lines, to enable them to carry the increased loans required to meet the demands of farmers for increasing amounts of electric power, reflecting the greater use of electrical equipment in performing farm production and farm household tasks. What's going to happen when the demand exceeds what existing facilities can provide, if credit is shut off for increasing the capacity of present lines?

SOUND INVESTMENT

The House of Representatives wisely recognized that Secretary Benson's recommendation was unsound. They have provided for loan authorization amounting to \$135 million, the amount originally requested in the Truman budget.

In my opinion, it would be good business to go even further and make available an amount closer to the estimated needs for REA loans during the coming fiscal year, as indicated by the rural electric co-ops themselves. This isn't any giveaway—it is a sound business investment. Cutting loan funds isn't economy, for nothing is saved. Whatever amount the Congress provides will be repaid with interest. I urge this committee to make sure adequate loan funds are available so as to avoid any crippling of REA services, but in any event not to go below the amount the House has determined is the bare minimum.

In regard to administrative funds for REA, the House has provided only \$7,775,000—the amount Secretary Benson estimated he could get by with. I appreciate the economy-objective of Members of the other House, and it is understandable that they should tell the Secretary of Agriculture to go ahead and try getting along with less as long as he thinks he can.

I must warn, however, that others have had more experience through the years with the REA program than the new Secretary of Agriculture. They are deeply concerned that such a reduction in administrative expenses would necessarily mean a curtailment of services to the rural electric cooperatives, and lack of adequate safeguards over the big investment we now have in REA loans. I must point out that more is involved than just administration of the new loan funds provided; continued servicing and supervision over all the existing loans is also involved in this budget item. I respect the judgment of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association that REA needs \$10 million to adequately administer the program without cutbacks in essential operations. I urge this committee to reexamine the administrative fund estimates and increase them to a safe level.

EXPAND TELEPHONE PROGRAM

I am also seriously concerned with the new rural telephone program upon which we are just making a start. The Administration has only asked for \$50 million, and that is all the House has provided.

That should at least be doubled, if we are going to go ahead with extending rural telephone service in this country. Farmers need telephones, need them even more than people living closer together in the cities. They need such facilities for handling their business, and for protecting the lives of their loved ones. We aren't going to get telephone service extended over rural America by little dribs and dabs. We aren't going to get the job done unless we are willing to make adequate loan funds available so that rural people don't have to be turned down. REA has reported that 483 telephone loan applications totaling \$95,626,661 were pending as of March 27, 1953. It appears obvious that REA needs at least \$100 million in loan authorization for the telephone program, just to catch up with the requests now on hand. It will need more to do the full job in the year ahead.

I want to warn this committee what postponing rural telephone service will mean in some areas. It won't just mean a delay in getting telephones—it may mean some farmers won't ever get such service. If the rural telephone program of REA is "put on the shelf" until private telephone companies have skimmed the cream of the rural areas by starting service only to the most thickly populated districts—the most profitable ones to serve—it will become economically unfeasible in the future to work out sound projects for the sparsely settled remote districts.

Telephone loan funds are available to private companies just as they are to telephone cooperatives, as long as they offer a sound plan of extending rural service. Let's not delay this sound program any longer. Again, it is not a matter of economy for all loans are repayable with interest.

Lip service to the objectives of rural electrification and rural telephone programs will not mean very much if the programs are squeezed out of existence via appropriations. Both political parties have gone on record in support of REA's contribution to rural progress, and pledged continuing support. I urge this committee to see that adequate funds are made available to continue the great work that has already been accomplished.

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 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. STENNIS. Mr. President, I desire to invite the attention of the Senate to an item or two in the bill, to which I shall not offer an amendment, but which I think deserve further consideration by the Appropriations Committee. I refer particularly to the item for agricultural research.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would ask the Senator from Mississippi whether he proposes an amendment at this point.

Mr. STENNIS. No, Mr. President, it was not my purpose to offer an amendment at this time. I understood that the bill had been read the third time, and I was speaking to the bill itself.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Texas wish time to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the Senator from Mississippi such time as he may desire.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from Texas. I beg the Chair's pardon. I did not know the time had to be yielded.

Mr. President, the current appropriation for agricultural research in the fiscal year 1953, is \$56,482,000. The amount in the revised budget submitted after President Eisenhower came into office was \$58,879,000. The House appropriated \$57,604,000, and the amount carried in the bill as reported to the Senate is \$59,004,000, an increase of \$1,400,000 over the House appropriation. It is, however, less than the amount recommended in the budget which was submitted to the Congress during the first part of the year.

I do not have a detailed breakdown of the agricultural research program, but I think one is urgently needed and that we should have it at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. President, I have testimony here from Dr. Shaw, who is ill today and has been for some days. The testimony to which I refer was taken before the House committee. He sets forth the need for funds. He is the head of the Agricultural Research Organization, and he is of the opinion that the funds for the agricultural research program should be doubled, and that there should be an immediate fund of from \$10 million to \$15 million in addition to the appropriation proposed.

I have before me a breakdown according to the general subject matter, which appears on page 259 of the House hearings, from which I shall read a few items:

THE PLACES IN RESEARCH WHERE INCREASED ACTIVITY MAY BE NEEDED MORE THAN ELSEWHERE

It is difficult to single out particular areas of research that are more in need of strengthening than others. We make a concerted effort to maintain a balanced program within whatever funds are available to us. Actually most agricultural research will have to be strengthened if the Nation's needs for agricultural products and services are to be sat-

isfied in the years ahead. In my opinion, the increases in the fiscal year 1954 budget for research provide for expanding the No. 1 priority items. In developing the budget within the funds allowed, I selected these items on the basis of their urgency. If additional areas of research could be expanded I would place emphasis on the following items:

1. Diseases and insects affecting both plants and animals. Wheat smut in the Northwest and vesicular exanthema disease of hogs are examples of the problems.

2. Plant, animal, and human nutrition. Basic physiological studies of nutrient uses and requirements are needed.

3. Soils and irrigation. Water will set the ceiling on crop yields. We need to develop methods of soil and watershed management to increase the efficiency of water use in both humid and arid regions.

4. Farm mechanization. Labor-saving devices for farm operations are of critical importance to farmers.

5. Food and feed preservation. We can bring greater stability to agriculture if we can develop methods of converting perishables into acceptable products that may be stored.

6. New and improved uses of agricultural products. Agricultural markets are getting away from us because we are not developing and improving our products as fast as competitive products are being developed and improved.

7. Marketing. Additional studies are needed to cope with current problems arising as the result of declining foreign markets, accumulating or impending surpluses, and falling prices for agricultural products.

8. Survey of soil and forest resources. An accurate knowledge of our resources is required for efficient management.

Mr. President, I wish to refer to the report of the Advisory Committee which operates under the Agricultural Research Act. In the report there are submitted programs which will require an additional \$31 million. The committee was established under the Agricultural Research Act of 1946. I have a report on the figures recommended for research in 1954 by the State experiment stations and research bureaus, which total \$7,512,000.

These facts, Mr. President, are indicative of the carefully surveyed needs which are now urgent and demanding and with reference to which a high authority, an expert research scientist has given his opinion and his conclusions.

It is a matter in which President Eisenhower is vitally interested. He mentioned the subject several times in his campaign speeches, and has emphasized and reemphasized it. As late as last week, at Beltsville, Md., where there is located one of the major experiment stations, he was quoted in the press as saying:

Let any man who is opposed to agricultural research appropriations come out to Beltsville.

I commend him for his statements. I do not bring the question up for any other reason than to point to the need and to the fact that we have not responded according to the need and according to the general recommendations of the President of the United States.

Mr. President, if there were available this afternoon a breakdown which I thought would be sufficient to place before the Senate, with definite explanations of how the money is to be spent, I would offer an amendment providing

for at least \$6 million or \$8 million of additional funds to carry on the program. I believe such a proposal would have the approval of the subcommittee, and I am confident if the figures were broken down adequately, that it would receive the approval of the Senate.

I wish to serve notice, Mr. President, that as soon as such a breakdown is available, I intend to offer a program, along with any other Senator who will join me, the first time there is a reasonable opportunity after the committees have had an opportunity to go over the matter and make a recommendation to this body.

I especially invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that the funds are inadequate. The amount we are spending for agricultural research at this time has not been increased since 1940.

The program is really going backward, as a general proposition, because of its inability to move forward with the funds which have been appropriated. So, Mr. President, at the first opportunity the program will be presented, and I hope the very fine subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, of which the Senator from North Dakota is so ably serving as chairman, will go into the subject further and will join in bringing the matter to the attention of the Senate, even through a supplemental appropriation bill, if that can be done. But let us get the research program going before it lags any further.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. The members of the committee feel exactly as does the Senator from Mississippi. The committee has received more than 100 telegrams from farm organizations and others urging that we raise the agricultural research appropriation approximately \$17 million more than has been appropriated.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator very much. I think a breakdown will be submitted shortly.

RURAL TELEPHONE SERVICE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield to the junior Senator from Texas 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The junior Senator from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may address a few questions to the distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] concerning the Rural Electrification Administration appropriation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator may proceed.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, with respect to the appropriation for the rural telephone program, of course, we know the act prescribes the terms under which the administrator can approve applications for telephone service. I note that in the House report it is stated that it is the consensus of the committee that REA should advance Federal funds for telephone service in rural areas when private enterprise cannot or will not provide adequate service. That has given considerable concern to some of my constituents who have

written me, feeling that the language in the House report might be interpreted to mean that the Administrator is being directed to withhold his approval of a telephone loan until he determines that there is no private enterprise willing or able to provide such service.

I am glad to say that the Senator's committee has not used such language in its report; but is it the intention of the Senate committee that the REA Administrator shall comply with any such interpretation as that which I have suggested?

Mr. YOUNG. I would say to the distinguished Senator from Texas that the language in the Senate committee's report was designed to counteract and clarify certain language contained in the House report. I think the majority of the members of the committee feel it may be necessary in certain instances for the REA Administrator to contact private concerns in the telephone business, as well as mutuals and independents. In cases where such concerns have filed plans for serving a particular area they should be given consideration by the Administrator. By that it is not meant that the program of bringing telephones to the farmers of the United States should be unduly delayed by unreasonably prolonged negotiations. Existing companies have had nearly 3 years after the necessary legislation was enacted in which to provide service. In fact, they had many years even before the Telephone Act was passed to provide such service.

It seems to me that the REA Administrator should proceed to make loans to cooperatives who seek to provide service if the existing companies do not wish to do so.

Mr. DANIEL. There is just such an instance in Texas. The Hill County Telephone Co., Inc., located at Fredericksburg, serving nine counties, and several of the small exchanges in cities such as Ingram and Comfort, Tex., have given options to sell their exchanges. They are willing to sell to cooperatives. They have had 3 years in which to apply for loans themselves. As I understand, it is the interpretation of the Senator's committee that they have no such preference rights as would require the Administrator to say that they would have to apply for a loan before permitting the application to go through and be approved.

Mr. YOUNG. I think that is correct. I wish to read from the report of the Senate Committee on Appropriations:

The committee is advised that approximately 60 percent of the farms of the country remain without telephone service of any kind and that a large proportion of those presently served suffer from inadequate service. The committee urges REA to move as fast as consistent with good business methods with its loan and construction program in order to eliminate delays which have occurred in the past.

Mr. DANIEL. I call attention also to the last sentence in the last paragraph of that part of the committee's report which refers to rural telephones, which would seem to mean that the committee does not believe the Administrator should give such preference rights to local companies which have not exer-

cised their right to apply for loans for rural telephone service. That sentence, on page 14, is as follows:

It is recognized that in many instances the program cannot move forward except by the farmers in a community doing the job for themselves by forming their own organization and, where necessary, acquiring the existing exchange in their local trade centers as the nucleus for economic and efficient service.

From that statement in the report, it would appear to me that the Senator's committee clearly recognized that in some instances it would be necessary for farmers in sparsely settled areas to acquire certain local exchanges within the area, in order to have a feasible program. Is that not correct?

Mr. YOUNG. That is exactly correct. In most areas, I believe that REA cooperatives could operate to the best advantage by working with existing companies, particularly with respect to switchers and telephone exchanges. But if existing companies were permitted or encouraged to furnish only partial service to a limited number of farmers, then the remaining farmers in the area, in most cases, would not have an opportunity to receive good telephone service without overall cooperative coverage.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair respectfully reminds the Senator from Texas that his time has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, does my colleague desire additional time?

Mr. DANIEL. May I have 2 minutes?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield 2 minutes to the junior Senator from Texas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The junior Senator from Texas is recognized for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. DANIEL. Then, so far as the view of the Senator's committee is concerned, is there any reason for further delay on applications when the Administrator has already determined that there is an area in which local exchanges have granted options, and are willing to sell, in order that a rural telephone cooperative may be set up? Is there any reason for further delay in order to ascertain whether private exchanges desire to apply for loans themselves?

Mr. YOUNG. I should not think there was any reason for further delay. If the existing companies wanted to furnish the service, certainly by now they would have filed their plans with the REA administrator. In the absence of such plans, I think the administrator should proceed to approve applications.

Mr. DANIEL. As I understand, there is a movement on foot to have the REA administrator require members of telephone cooperatives to pay as much as \$100 each as equity payments on the purchase of stock in a cooperative, before he will approve a loan. Has that matter come before the Senator's committee? Only \$50 payments have been required in the instance I mentioned a moment ago. I wondered if there was any discussion before the Senator's committee of the plan to increase payments.

Mr. YOUNG. There was no discussion of that kind, so far as I can recall.

Mr. DANIEL. I thank the Senator.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The bill (H. R. 5227) was passed.

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

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. YOUNG, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. McCARTHY, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. HAYDEN, and Mr. McCARRAN conferees on the part of the Senate.

OVERALL RESULTS OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION OPERATIONS SINCE 1933

MR. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, on January 12, 1953, I requested from the Director of the Budget the file of information as to the overall results of the Commodity Credit Corporation operations since its inception in 1933. At this point I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a letter received from the Director of the Budget under date of March 3, 1953, outlining the total expenditures under that program, and the losses.

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

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D. C., March 3, 1953.
Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: This is in further reply to your letter dated January 12, 1953, requesting information regarding losses of the Commodity Credit Corporation and the manner in which the Corporation receives its funds.

The Commodity Credit Corporation is capitalized for \$100 million in capital stock owned by the United States and as of December 31, 1952, there was a deficit of \$179,959,760.89. A brief statement of the losses and appropriations, note cancellations, and repayments to the Treasury follows:

Net operating loss exclusive of wartime consumer subsidy	\$1,128,999,783.32
Wartime consumer subsidy	2,102,119,071.46
Total operating losses	3,231,118,845.78

Less:	
Net restoration of capital from U. S. Treasury	2,494,919,661.78
Recovery from Secretary of Treasury, Public Laws 389 and 393, 80th Congress	56,239,432.11
Reserve for postwar price support and of agriculture	500,000,000.00
Total recoveries	3,051,159,093.89
Net deficit Dec. 31, 1952	179,959,760.89

The net operating loss of \$1,128,999,783, excluding the wartime consumer subsidy, reflects a net realized program loss of \$737,319,500, a net amount of \$158,813,865 in reserves for losses, and a net amount of \$232,864,418 for administrative expenses, interest, etc.

The following item-by-item reply to your specific questions will show the manner in which the corporation has been reimbursed

by the United States Treasury for such losses, as well as other funds which have been paid to the corporation pursuant to specific legislation:

1. The paid in capitalization of the corporation is \$100 million held by the United States.

2. As of December 31, 1952, the corporation's books showed a deficit of \$179,959,760.89.

3. Appropriations have been made to the corporation as follows:

(a) For restoration of capital impairment pursuant to the act of March 8, 1938:

Appraisal of—	Appropriation act	Amount
Mar. 31, 1938	June 25, 1938 (52 Stat. 1114, 1148).	\$64,285,404.73
Mar. 31, 1939	Aug. 9, 1939 (53 Stat. 1301, 1325).	119,599,918.05
Mar. 31, 1941	July 3, 1941 (55 Stat. 451, 563).	1,637,445.51
Mar. 31, 1943-44	Apr. 12, 1945 (59 Stat. 77, 90).	256,764,881.04
June 30, 1951	July 5, 1952 (66 Stat. 335, 354).	109,301,154.00

Total appropriations for restoration of capital impairment 581,678,803.33

(b) Pursuant to the act of February 18, 1946 (Public Law 301, 79th Cong.), \$500 million was paid to the Corporation as a reserve for postwar price support of agriculture. Price-support losses during fiscal years 1947, 1948, and 1949 were charged against this reserve, thereby reducing the amounts required for restoration of capital impairment during those years.

4. Payments of surplus were made to the United States Treasury pursuant to the act of March 8, 1938, as follows:

Appraisal of—	Date of payment	Amount
Mar. 31, 1940	June 1940	\$43,756,731.01
Mar. 31, 1942	June and September 1952	27,515,513.68
June 30, 1947	April 1948	17,693,492.14
June 30, 1948	June 1949	48,943,010.36

Total payments of surplus to U. S. Treasury 138,208,747.19

5. Notes of the Corporation have been canceled by the United States Treasury as follows:

(a) For restoration of capital impairment pursuant to the act of March 8, 1938:

Appraisal of—	Appropriation act	Amount
June 30, 1945	July 20, 1946 (60 Stat. 556, 593).	\$921,456,561.00
June 30, 1946	May 26, 1947 (61 Stat. 106).	641,832,080.64
June 30, 1949	Sept. 6, 1950 (64 Stat. 595, 677).	66,698,457.00
June 30, 1950	Aug. 31, 1951 (65 Stat. 225, 245).	421,462,507.00

Total notes canceled by U. S. Treasury for restoration of capital impairment 2,051,449,605.64

(b) Pursuant to Public Laws 389 and 393, 80th Cong., the Secretary of the Treasury was authorized to cancel notes of the Corporation in an amount not to exceed \$57,500,000 for costs of commodities furnished by the Corporation for foreign relief and assistance. During fiscal years 1948 and 1949, a total of \$56,239,432.11 of the Corporation's notes were cancelled by the United States Treasury, thereby reducing the amounts required for restoration of capital impairment during those years.

Summary of recoveries of losses through June 30, 1951	
Appropriations:	
Capital impairment	\$581,678,803.33
Reserve for postwar price support	500,000,000.00
Total appropriations	1,081,678,803.33
Deduct: Payments to Treasury	138,208,747.19

Summary of recoveries of losses through June 30, 1951—Continued

Note cancellations:

Capital impairment	\$2,051,449,605.64
Foreign aid	56,239,432.11

Total note cancellations	2,107,689,037.75
--------------------------	------------------

Total recoveries of losses from U. S. Treasury through June 30, 1951	3,051,159,093.89
--	------------------

6. Section 32 funds are made available to the Department for the removal from the market of commodities in surplus supply. These funds do not accrue to the Corporation except to the extent that they are in payment for commodities purchased by section 32 from the Corporation. These purchases by section 32 are reflected as sales by the Corporation, and the funds go into the general funds of the Corporation together with funds derived from sales to all other private or governmental entities. The amount of sales to section 32 cannot be readily summarized as all sales to domestic purchasers are reported to Washington as a consolidated item. This information is obtainable from the field offices and can be secured if necessary, but this would involve a considerable expenditure of time and money.

7. Other funds which have accrued to the Corporation are as follows:

(a) Pursuant to the International Wheat Agreement Act of 1949, the United States has agreed to supply wheat or wheat products to participating nations at a specified price. The Corporation is utilized for this activity and is authorized to use its general borrowing authority to pay current obligations and to be repaid therefor from appropriations made specifically to cover the costs of the agreement. Following is a list of reimbursements to the Corporation and manner of reimbursement:

Program year	Appropriation act	Amount
1950	Public Law 135, 82d Cong., Aug. 31, 1951 (appropriation to the Secretary).	\$78,808,000
1951	Public Law 451, 82d Cong., July 5, 1952 (note cancellation).	182,162,250
Total reimbursements for International Wheat Agreement.		258,970,250

(b) Pursuant to Public Law 271, 80th Congress, approved July 30, 1947, and subsequent Department of Agriculture appropriation acts, funds of the Corporation have been transferred to the appropriation "Eradication of foot-and-mouth and other contagious diseases of animals and poultry." Following is a list of the reimbursements made to the Corporation and the manner of reimbursement:

Appropriation act: Amendment
Public Law 785, 81st Cong.
June 25, 1948 (appropriation to the Secretary) \$25,400,000
Public Law 343, 81st Cong.
Oct. 10, 1949 (appropriation to the Secretary) 34,000,000
Public Law 135, 82d Cong.
Aug. 31, 1951 (note cancellation) 32,700,000
Public Law 451, 82d Cong.
July 5, 1952 (note cancellation) 11,240,532

Total reimbursements for transfers to eradication of foot-and-mouth disease 103,340,532

The reimbursements shown under this item are not included in the realized losses of the Corporation, as the intent of the respective legislation was that the Corporation would be reimbursed for any unrecovered costs under these activities.

(c) Section 391 (c) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, required the Corporation to lend to the Secretary of Agriculture during each fiscal year, such sums, not to exceed \$50 million, to make advances for the purchase of conservation materials from January 1 to June 30 of each year. Repayment to the Corporation is usually made during the succeeding fiscal year from funds appropriated to the Secretary for the conservation program. These loans and repayments are handled on the books of the Corporation through its usual loan accounts.

In addition to the foregoing, the Corporation has authority to borrow up to \$6,750,000,000 from the Treasury and/or from private lending agencies. At December 31, 1952, \$2,800,778,475 of this borrowing authority was committed, leaving \$3,949,221,525 yet available.

The figures contained in this reply to your letter have been furnished by the Department of Agriculture.

Sincerely yours,

Jos. M. Dodge,
Director.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, immediately following that, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a second letter, dated March 16, 1953, from the Director of the Budget, in which he outlines the expenditures for these programs under section 32. I ask unanimous consent that both these letters appear in the RECORD immediately following the vote on the agricultural appropriation bill. These letters show an overall cost of more than \$5 billion.

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

EXECUTIVE OFFICE
OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D. C., March 16, 1953.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: This has reference to your letter of March 5, 1953, regarding the funds available for section 32 programs and the expenditures of such funds. The answers to your questions are as follows:

1. How much money has been made available to the Department of Agriculture during the past 20 years (broken down by years) under section 32?

The surplus removal program, commonly known as section 32, was not authorized until August 24, 1935. For the fiscal years 1936 through 1953, however, a total of \$2,573,671,819 has been made available by (1) the permanent appropriation of an amount equal to 30 percent of customs receipts, and (2) various supplemental appropriations. In years prior to 1948, various portions of the annual appropriations remained unobligated at the end of the fiscal year for which they were originally available, and several of these unobligated balances, amounting to \$117,617,178, have been reappropriated.

An analysis of sources of funds, obligations, and disposition of balances for fiscal years 1936-54 is attached as schedule I.

2. How much of these funds has been spent by the Department of Agriculture either through the Commodity Credit Corporation or by direct purchases during this same interval?

For the fiscal years 1936 through 1952, a total of \$2,057,618,939 was obligated, and total expenditures would be approximately the same amount. Of this total, \$610,693,914 represents purchases of surplus commodities for direct distribution, \$104,627,120 for diversion of surplus commodities to new uses, \$260,131,250 for encouraging exports of

surplus commodities, \$285,972,494 for the financing of various stamp plans, \$136,694,622 for the school-lunch and milk programs, \$57,224,648 for administrative expenses, \$41,239,560 for allotments and transfers to cooperating agencies, and \$561,035,331 for transfers to other uses authorized by legislative action. In addition to the foregoing, obligations for the fiscal year 1953 through January 31, 1953, have amounted to \$44,437,655, and expenditures for the same period were \$46,265,965.

An analysis showing obligations by projects, allotments, and transfers, unobligated balances, and total funds available for fiscal years 1936-54 is attached as schedule II.

In regard to your question concerning assurance that section 32 funds are being spent in accordance with the law, before any section 32 programs are authorized, the proposal is thoroughly considered by the Department, the legality of the program is reviewed by the Office of the Solicitor, and a formal docket is prepared to authorize the program. Funds are then obligated under the standard obligation procedures, and the vouchers which authorize the actual expenditures of funds are, of course, audited by the General Accounting Office.

I regret that the information furnished in response to your previous letter did not meet your needs.

Sincerely yours,
Jos. M. Dodge, Director.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

TRANSFER OF PRICE-SUPPORT WHEAT TO PAKISTAN

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 2112, calendar No. 407, which is the Pakistan wheat bill. It is not intended to proceed with the bill tonight, but to make it the unfinished business for consideration tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from California.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2112) to provide for the transfer of price-support wheat to Pakistan, which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with amendments.

ORDER FOR RECESS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business this afternoon, it recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

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

REDUCTION OF INDIVIDUAL INCOME TAXES

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland obtained the floor.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. MALONE. Two of the top campaign issues last year were a return to constitutional government and a reduction of taxes.

Today I am introducing a bill to provide for individual income-tax reduction for the calendar year 1953 by moving back 6 months the termination date of the individual income-tax increases imposed under the Revenue Act of 1951. The individual emergency-income tax would then expire on June 30, 1953, on the same date the excess-profits tax is scheduled to expire.

On April 2, 1953, I introduced a bill to repeal all war-emergency excise taxes on transportation, telephone and telegraph, and entertainment, and the excise tax on luggage, handbags, and miscellaneous articles.

The Revenue Act of 1951 provided an emergency increase in individual income-liability of about 11 percent of the then existing tax. Under present law, this increase will terminate on December 31, 1953. The bill which I am about to introduce moves the termination date back to June 30, 1953. One-half of the reduction under the present law for 1954 is made effective for the entire calendar year 1953.

The bill would reduce the withholding tax rate from 20 percent to 18 percent as of July 1, 1953. Thus for those subject to withholding, the full reduction schedule for January 1, 1954, would become effective July 1, 1953.

Because of spiraling inflation and excessive taxation and free trade, the principle of free enterprise, upon which this country is built, is being destroyed. The high cost of living and excessive tax burdens are inflicting great hardships on many people. Individuals in the lower income groups carry the greatest share of the tax burden, and they are the ones who need immediate relief. It is only fair and just that individual citizens be given a tax reduction on June 30, 1953, to coincide with the scheduled termination of the excess profits tax on the same date. The excess profits tax will expire on June 30, 1953. I am opposed to the extension of this so-called emergency tax for the same reason that I am for the simultaneous repeal of the emergency excise and individual income taxes.

So long as we are planning to give more than \$5 billion to foreign countries which have themselves reduced income taxes, I certainly believe that the American people should be given some consideration in this matter and should have relief from the excessive taxes which they now pay.

No one objects to paying high taxes when they are necessary for the welfare and defense of our country but when billions of the taxpayers' money are sent to foreign nations to build up their production potential in competition with the American taxpayers, then it is only fair the people of our country be given some tax relief.

The individual income tax at present rates is stifling initiative and preventing business expansion. Even in the lowest individual income-tax bracket, almost one-fourth of any additional earnings must be paid to the Government in the form of taxes and the increases continue until in the highest brackets, 92 cents of every dollar must be turned over to the Treasury. In the case of corporations, existing Federal income taxes may take as much as 82 percent of additional

dollars earned. This discouragement of individual and business incentive will lessen the normal increases in productivity and the willingness to take business risks. If continued, this policy of excessive taxes would result in lower income, lower revenues and eventually lower standards of living.

It is well known that individuals and business organizations are unable, under the present arrangement of taxes, to build up a reserve to tide them over anticipated poor business periods, or to aid in the proper expansion of business.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a bill which I introduced on April 2, 1953, to repeal certain emergency excise taxes.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1566) to terminate the war rates of certain excise taxes, to repeal certain excise taxes, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MALONE on April 2, 1953, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) effective with respect to the period after June 30, 1953, the following sections and subchapters of the Internal Revenue Code are hereby repealed:

(1) section 1650 (war tax rates of certain miscellaneous taxes);

(2) section 1651 (retailers' excise tax on luggage, etc.);

(3) section 3406 (a) (10) (manufacturers' excise tax on electric light bulbs and tubes);

(4) subchapter B of chapter 30 (taxes on telegraph, telephone, radio, and cable facilities); and

(5) subchapter C of chapter 30 (taxes on transportation of persons).

(b) The "rate reduction date" defined in section 1659 of the Internal Revenue Code shall be July 1, 1953.

SEC. 2. (a) Section 2400 of the Internal Revenue Code (tax on jewelry, etc.) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "The tax imposed by this section shall not apply to articles sold at retail for less than \$50."

(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) of this section shall apply only to articles sold on or after July 1, 1953.

SEC. 3. (a) Section 3406 (a) (4) of the Internal Revenue Code (manufacturers' excise tax on photographic apparatus) is hereby amended by striking out "20 percent" and inserting in lieu thereof "10 percent."

(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) of this section shall apply only to articles sold on or after July 1, 1953.

SEC. 4. Effective with respect to amounts paid after June 30, 1953, for the use of any safe-deposit box, chapter 12 of the Internal Revenue Code (tax on safe-deposit boxes) is hereby repealed.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to reduce the individual income tax. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD, as part of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2140) to reduce the individual income tax, introduced by Mr. MALONE, was received, read twice with its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Individual Income Tax Reduction Act of 1953."

Sec. 2. Reduction in individual surtax rates.

(a) Rates of surtax for individual not head of household.—

(1) Paragraph (1) of section 12 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to rates of surtax for individual not heads of households) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(1) Calendar year 1953: In the case of a taxable year beginning on January 1, 1953, and ending on December 31, 1953, there shall be levied, collected, and paid for such taxable year upon the surtax net income of every individual (other than a head of a household to whom subsection (c) applies) the surtax shown in the following table:

"If the surtax net income is:	The surtax shall be:
Not over \$2,000-----	18.1% of the surtax net income.
Over \$2,000 but not over \$4,000.	\$362, plus 19.2% of excess over \$2,000.
Over \$4,000 but not over \$6,000.	\$746 plus 23% of excess over \$4,000.
Over \$6,000 but not over \$8,000.	\$1,288, plus 29% of excess over \$6,000.
Over \$8,000 but not over \$10,000.	\$1,848, plus 33% of excess over \$8,000.
Over \$10,000 but not over \$12,000.	\$2,508, plus 37% of excess over \$10,000.
Over \$12,000 but not over \$14,000.	\$3,248, plus 42% of excess over \$12,000.
Over \$14,000 but not over \$16,000.	\$4,088, plus 47% of excess over \$14,000.
Over \$16,000 but not over \$18,000.	\$5,028, plus 50% of excess over \$16,000.
Over \$18,000 but not over \$20,000.	\$6,028, plus 53% of excess over \$18,000.
Over \$20,000 but not over \$22,000.	\$7,088, plus 56% of excess over \$20,000.
Over \$22,000 but not over \$26,000.	\$8,208, plus 60% of excess over \$22,000.
Over \$26,000 but not over \$32,000.	\$10,608, plus 61% of excess over \$26,000.
Over \$32,000 but not over \$38,000.	\$14,268, plus 64% of excess over \$32,000.
Over \$38,000 but not over \$44,000.	\$18,108, plus 67% of excess over \$38,000.
Over \$44,000 but not over \$50,000.	\$22,128, plus 71% of excess over \$44,000.
Over \$50,000 but not over \$60,000.	\$26,388, plus 73% of excess over \$50,000.
Over \$60,000 but not over \$70,000.	\$33,688, plus 76% of excess over \$60,000.
Over \$70,000 but not over \$80,000.	\$41,288, plus 79% of excess over \$70,000.
Over \$80,000 but not over \$90,000.	\$49,188, plus 81.5% of excess over \$80,000.
Over \$90,000 but not over \$100,000.	\$57,338, plus 84.5% of excess over \$90,000.
Over \$100,000 but not over \$150,000.	\$65,738, plus 86.5% of excess over \$100,000.
Over \$150,000 but not over \$200,000.	\$109,038, plus 87.5% of excess over \$150,000.
Over \$200,000-----	\$152,738, plus 88.5% of excess over \$200,000."

(2) Paragraph (2) of such section 12 (b) is hereby amended (A) by striking out the heading and inserting in lieu thereof "Other taxable years beginning before July 1, 1953—", and (B) by striking out "January 1, 1954" and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1953 (other than the calendar year 1953 to which paragraph (1) applies)".

(3) Paragraph (3) of such section 12 (b) is hereby amended by striking out "DECEMBER 31, 1953" and "December 31, 1953" and inserting in lieu thereof, respectively, "JUNE 30, 1953" and "June 30, 1953".

(b) Rates of surtax for head of household.—

(1) Section 12 (c) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to rates of surtax for heads of households) is hereby amended by renumbering paragraphs (1), (2), (3), (4), and (5) thereof as paragraphs (2), (3), (4), (5), and (6), respectively, and inserting before paragraph (2) (as so renumbered) the following:

"(1) Calendar year 1953: In the case of a taxable year beginning on January 1, 1953, and ending on December 31, 1953, there shall be levied, collected, and paid for such taxable year upon the surtax net income of every individual who is the head of a household the surtax shown in the following table:

"If the surtax net income is:	The surtax shall be:
Not over \$2,000-----	18.1% of the surtax net income.
Over \$2,000 but not over \$4,000.	\$362 plus 19.2% of excess over \$2,000.
Over \$4,000 but not over \$6,000.	\$746 plus 23% of excess over \$4,000.
Over \$6,000 but not over \$8,000.	\$1,288 plus 29% of excess over \$6,000.
Over \$8,000 but not over \$10,000.	\$1,848 plus 33% of excess over \$8,000.
Over \$10,000 but not over \$12,000.	\$2,508 plus 37% of excess over \$10,000.
Over \$12,000 but not over \$14,000.	\$3,248 plus 42% of excess over \$12,000.
Over \$14,000 but not over \$16,000.	\$4,088 plus 47% of excess over \$14,000.
Over \$16,000 but not over \$18,000.	\$5,028 plus 50% of excess over \$16,000.
Over \$18,000 but not over \$20,000.	\$6,028 plus 53% of excess over \$18,000.
Over \$20,000 but not over \$22,000.	\$7,088 plus 56% of excess over \$20,000.
Over \$22,000 but not over \$26,000.	\$8,208 plus 60% of excess over \$22,000.
Over \$26,000 but not over \$32,000.	\$10,608 plus 61% of excess over \$26,000.
Over \$32,000 but not over \$38,000.	\$14,268 plus 64% of excess over \$32,000.
Over \$38,000 but not over \$44,000.	\$18,108 plus 67% of excess over \$38,000.
Over \$44,000 but not over \$50,000.	\$22,128 plus 71% of excess over \$44,000.
Over \$50,000 but not over \$60,000.	\$26,388 plus 73% of excess over \$50,000.
Over \$60,000 but not over \$70,000.	\$33,688 plus 76% of excess over \$60,000.
Over \$70,000 but not over \$80,000.	\$41,288 plus 79% of excess over \$70,000.
Over \$80,000 but not over \$90,000.	\$49,188 plus 81.5% of excess over \$80,000.
Over \$90,000 but not over \$100,000.	\$57,338 plus 84.5% of excess over \$90,000.
Over \$100,000 but not over \$150,000.	\$65,738 plus 86.5% of excess over \$100,000.
Over \$150,000 but not over \$200,000.	\$109,038 plus 87.5% of excess over \$150,000.
Over \$200,000-----	\$152,738 plus 88.5% of excess over \$200,000."

(2) Paragraph (2) (as renumbered) of such section 12 (c) is hereby amended (A) by striking out the heading and inserting in lieu thereof "Other taxable years beginning before July 1, 1953—", and (B) by striking out "January 1, 1954" and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1953 (other than the calendar year 1953 to which paragraph (1) applies)."

(3) Paragraph (3) (as renumbered) of such section 12 (c) is hereby amended by striking out "DECEMBER 31, 1953" and "December 31, 1953" and inserting in lieu thereof, respectively, "JUNE 30, 1953" and "June 30, 1953."

(c) Limitation on tax.—

(1) Paragraph (1) of section 12 (f) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to limitation on tax of individuals) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(1) Calendar year 1953: In the case of a taxable year beginning on January 1, 1953, and ending on December 31, 1953, the combined normal tax and surtax shall in no event exceed 87.5 percent of the net income for the taxable year."

(2) Paragraph (2) of such section 12 (f) is hereby amended (A) by striking out the heading and inserting in lieu thereof "Other taxable years beginning before July 1, 1953," and (B) by striking out "January 1, 1954" and inserting in lieu thereof "July

1, 1953 (other than the calendar year 1953 to which paragraph (1) applies)."

(3) Paragraph (3) of such section 12 (f) is hereby amended by striking out "DECEMBER 31, 1953" and "December 31, 1953" and inserting in lieu thereof, respectively, "JUNE 30, 1953" and "June 30, 1953."

(d) Proration for fiscal year taxpayers: Subsection (j) of section 108 of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to fiscal year tax-payers) is hereby amended—

(1) by striking out so much thereof as precedes paragraph (1) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(j) Certain taxable years of individuals beginning before July 1, 1953: In the case of a taxable year of a taxpayer, other than a corporation, beginning before July 1, 1953, and ending after June 30, 1953 (other than one beginning on January 1, 1953, and ending on December 31, 1953), the tax imposed by sections 11 and 12, section 400, or section 421 (a)

(2), shall be an amount equal to the sum of—":

(2) by striking out "January 1, 1953" and "January 1, 1954" in paragraph (1) and inserting in lieu thereof, respectively, "July 1, 1952" and "July 1, 1953"; and

(3) by striking out "January 1, 1954" and "December 31, 1953" in paragraph (2) and inserting in lieu thereof, respectively, "July 1, 1953" and "June 30, 1953."

(e) Effective date: Except as provided in section 5, the amendments made by this section shall apply only with respect to taxable years ending after June 30, 1953.

SEC. 3. Individuals with adjusted gross income of less than \$5,000.

(a) Tax for calendar year 1953: Section 400 of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to optional tax on individuals with adjusted gross income of less than \$5,000) is hereby amended by striking out table I and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"TABLE I.—Taxable year beginning Jan. 1, 1953, and ending Dec. 31, 1953

If adjusted gross income is—		And the number of exemptions is—				And the number of exemptions is—													
		1 2 3 4 or more				1 2 3 4 or more				1 2 3 4 or more				1 2 3 4 or more					
At least	But less than	The tax shall be—				At least	But less than	The tax shall be—				At least	But less than	The tax shall be—					
		1	2	3	4 or more			1	2	3	4 or more			1	2	3	4 or more		
\$0	\$675	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,325	\$2,350	\$317	\$317	\$191	\$191	\$64	\$64	\$04	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
675	700	4	0	0	0	2,350	2,375	322	322	195	195	69	69	0	0	0	0	0	0
700	725	9	0	0	0	2,375	2,400	327	327	200	200	74	74	0	0	0	0	0	0
725	750	13	0	0	0	2,400	2,425	332	332	205	205	78	78	0	0	0	0	0	0
750	775	18	0	0	0	2,425	2,450	336	336	210	210	83	83	0	0	0	0	0	0
775	800	23	0	0	0	2,450	2,475	341	341	214	214	88	88	0	0	0	0	0	0
800	825	28	0	0	0	2,475	2,500	345	345	219	219	93	93	0	0	0	0	0	0
825	850	32	0	0	0	2,500	2,525	350	350	224	224	97	97	0	0	0	0	0	0
850	875	37	0	0	0	2,525	2,550	355	355	228	228	102	102	0	0	0	0	0	0
875	900	42	0	0	0	2,550	2,575	360	360	233	233	107	107	0	0	0	0	0	0
900	925	47	0	0	0	2,575	2,600	365	365	238	238	112	112	0	0	0	0	0	0
925	950	51	0	0	0	2,600	2,625	370	370	243	243	116	116	0	0	0	0	0	0
950	975	56	0	0	0	2,625	2,650	374	374	248	248	121	121	0	0	0	0	0	0
975	1,000	61	0	0	0	2,650	2,675	379	379	252	252	126	126	0	0	0	0	0	0
1,000	1,025	66	0	0	0	2,675	2,700	384	384	257	257	131	131	0	0	0	0	0	0
1,025	1,050	70	0	0	0	2,700	2,725	389	389	262	262	135	135	0	0	0	0	0	0
1,050	1,075	75	0	0	0	2,725	2,750	393	393	267	267	140	140	0	0	0	0	0	0
1,075	1,100	80	0	0	0	2,750	2,775	398	398	271	271	145	145	0	0	0	0	0	0
1,100	1,125	85	0	0	0	2,775	2,800	403	403	276	276	150	150	0	0	0	0	0	0
1,125	1,150	89	0	0	0	2,800	2,825	407	407	281	281	154	154	0	0	0	0	0	0
1,150	1,175	94	0	0	0	2,825	2,850	412	412	286	286	159	159	0	0	0	0	0	0
1,175	1,200	99	0	0	0	2,850	2,875	417	417	290	290	164	164	0	0	0	0	0	0
1,200	1,225	104	0	0	0	2,875	2,900	422	422	295	295	169	169	0	0	0	0	0	0
1,225	1,250	108	0	0	0	2,900	2,925	427	427	300	300	173	173	0	0	0	0	0	0
1,250	1,275	113	0	0	0	2,925	2,950	432	432	305	305	178	178	0	0	0	0	0	0
1,275	1,300	118	0	0	0	2,950	2,975	437	437	309	309	182	182	0	0	0	0	0	0
1,300	1,325	123	0	0	0	2,975	3,000	443	442	314	314	188	188	0	0	0	0	0	0
1,325	1,350	127	1	0	0	3,000	3,050	451	449	321	321	195	195	0	0	0	0	0	0
1,350	1,375	132	6	0	0	3,050	3,100	461	459	331	331	204	204	0	0	0	0	0	0
1,375	1,400	137	10	0	0	3,100	3,150	472	469	340	340	214	214	0	0	0	0	0	0
1,400	1,425	142	15	0	0	3,150	3,200	482	479	350	350	220	220	0	0	0	0	0	0
1,425	1,450	146	20	0	0	3,200	3,250	492	489	359	359	223	223	0	0	0	0	0	0
1,450	1,475	151	25	0	0	3,250	3,300	503	499	369	369	227	227	0	0	0	0	0	0
1,475	1,500	156	29	0	0	3,300	3,350	513	509	378	378	232	232	0	0	0	0	0	0
1,500	1,525	161	34	0	0	3,350	3,400	524	519	388	388	236	236	0	0	0	0	0	0
1,525	1,550	165	39	0	0	3,400	3,450	534	529	397	397	241	241	0	0	0	0	0	0
1,550	1,575	170	44	0	0	3,450	3,500	545	539	407	407	247	247	0	0	0	0	0	0
1,575	1,600	175	48	0	0	3,500	3,550	555	549	416	416	250	250	0	0	0	0	0	0
1,600	1,625	180	53	0	0	3,550	3,600	566	559	426	426	254	254	0	0	0	0	0	0
1,625	1,650	184	58	0	0	3,600	3,650	576	569	437	437	258	258	0	0	0	0	0	0
1,650	1,675	189	63	0	0	3,650	3,700	587	579	447	447	262	262	0	0	0	0	0	0
1,675	1,700	194	67	0	0	3,700	3,750	597	589	458	458	266	266	0	0	0	0	0	0
1,700	1,725	199	72	0	0	3,750	3,800	608	599	468	468	271	271	0	0	0	0	0	0
1,725	1,750	203	77	0	0	3,800	3,850	618	609	479	479	275	275	0	0	0	0	0	0
1,750	1,775	208	81	0	0	3,850	3,900	629	619	489	489	280	280	0	0	0	0	0	0
1,775	1,800	213	86	0	0	3,900	3,950	639	629	499	499	286	286	0	0	0	0	0	0
1,800	1,825	218	91	0	0	3,950	4,000	650	639	510	510	290	290	0	0	0	0	0	0
1,825	1,850	222	96	0	0	4,000	4,050	660	649	520	520	294	294	0	0	0	0	0	0
1,850	1,875	227	100	0	0	4,050	4,100	671	659	531	531	298	298	0	0	0	0	0	0
1,875	1,900	232	105	0	0	4,100	4,150	681	669	541	541	302	302	0	0	0	0	0	0
1,900	1,925	237	110	0	0	4,150	4,200	692	679	552	552	306	306	0	0	0	0	0	0
1,925	1,950	241	115	0	0	4,200	4,250	702	689	562	562	310	310	0	0	0	0	0	0
1,950	1,975	246	119	0	0	4,250	4,300	713	699	573	573	314	314	0	0	0	0	0	0
1,975	2,000	251	124	0	0	4,300	4,350	723	709	583	583	318	318	0	0	0	0	0	0
2,000	2,025	256	129	2	0	4,350	4,400	734	719	594	594	322	322	0	0	0	0	0	0
2,025	2,050	260	134	7	0	4,400	4,450	744	729	604	604	326	326	0	0	0	0	0	0
2,050	2,075	265	138	12	0	4,450	4,500	755	739	615	615	330	330	0	0	0	0	0	0
2,075	2,100	270	143	17	0	4,500	4,550	765	749	625	625	334	334	0	0	0	0	0	0
2,100	2,125	275	148	21	0	4,550	4,600	77											

(b) Technical amendments.—

(1) The heading of table II in such section 400 is hereby amended to read as follows:

"Table II

"Taxable Years Beginning After October 31, 1951, and Before July 1, 1953 (Other Than the Calendar Year 1953 to Which Table I Applies)"

(2) The heading of table III in such section 400 is hereby amended to read as follows:

"Table III

"Taxable Years Beginning After June 30, 1953"

(c) Effective date: Except as provided in section 5, the amendments made by this section shall apply only with respect to taxable years ending after June 30, 1953.

SEC. 4. Collection of income tax at source.

Section 1622 of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to income tax collected at source) is hereby amended—

(1) by striking out "January 1, 1954" wherever it occurs in subsection (a) and subsection (c) (1) (A) and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1953"; and

(2) by striking out "December 31, 1953" wherever it occurs in subsection (c) (1) (B) and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1953."

SEC. 5. Computation of tax in case of certain joint returns.

If a joint return of a husband and wife is filed under the provisions of section 51 (b) (3) of the Internal Revenue Code in a case where the husband and wife have different taxable years because of the death of either spouse, and the taxable year of the surviving spouse covered by such joint return began before July 1, 1953, and ended after June 30, 1953, the amendments made by this act shall apply in respect of such joint return as if the taxable years of both spouses covered by the joint return ended on the date of the closing of the surviving spouse's taxable year.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I am opposed to the continuation of the war-emergency taxes. I am not only opposed to the extension of the war-emergency so-called excess-profits tax, but I also favor, as provided in the proposed legislation which I have just introduced, setting back the expiration date of the emergency individual income taxes to coincide with the expiration date of the excess-profits tax.

J. DON ALEXANDER—VETO MESSAGE
(S. DOC. NO. 51)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HENDRICKSON in the chair) laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying bill referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed:

To the United States Senate:

I return herewith, without my approval, the enrolled bill (S. 484) conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of Colorado to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of J. Don Alexander against the United States.

The bill confers jurisdiction on the United States District Court for the District of Colorado to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claim of J. Don Alexander, of Colorado Springs, Colo., against the United States for recovery of income tax paid by him for the year 1929, which covered the capital net gain for the sale of 9,000 shares of stock in the

Alexander Industries, Inc., which stock was later held by the United States circuit court of appeals to be the property of Alexander Industries, Inc., and not of J. Don Alexander (69 F. 2d 610 (1934)). Section 2 of the bill provides that such suit may be instituted within 1 year after date of enactment of the act; that proceedings for the determination of the claim and review thereof and payment of any judgment thereon, shall be as in other cases under title 28, United States Code, section 1346 (a) (1); that nothing contained in the act shall be construed as an inference of liability on the part of the United States.

The Congress, in changing this bill from its original form to that of a jurisdictional bill, apparently believed that its action would provide a greater degree of protection to the interests of the United States. A review of the facts and of the decision of the circuit court of appeals convinces me that this action of the Congress has had quite the opposite effect from what was intended.

The opinion of the court in the case of *Alexander v. Theleman* referred to in the bill discusses in some detail (1) the relationship of Mr. Alexander to the corporation, in which he owned a considerable portion of stock, and (2) the question of the ownership of the 9,000 shares, the sale of which Mr. Alexander had assumed, in paying his income tax in 1930, gave rise to a capital net gain to him. Although the opinion raises some doubt whether equitable considerations are presented so as to justify a refund of the principal amount of the tax payment of \$16,720.41, the bill, in conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of Colorado, provides for the payment of any judgment recovered in accordance with the provisions of law applicable to tax cases of which the court has jurisdiction. Accordingly, the bill might permit Mr. Alexander to recover, not only the amount paid by him, but also interest at the rate of 6 percent per annum for the period from 1930 to date of payment. Thus, in effect, Mr. Alexander might recover over \$23,000 in interest alone.

The requirement that the United States pay interest on a refund is entirely proper where the Government has retained a taxpayer's money, notwithstanding the fact that by means of a timely refund claim the officials of the Treasury were put on notice and had an opportunity to examine the merits of the claim. Such circumstances do not exist in this case. No reason appears why the Government should pay in interest a sum far in excess of the original amount claimed by Mr. Alexander.

If the Congress should decide again to review Mr. Alexander's original claim and should resolve the equities in this case in favor of the claimant, I would be willing to give the case further consideration.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.
THE WHITE HOUSE, June 15, 1953.

CRITICAL SITUATION OF LEAD AND ZINC MINERS

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield to me?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I shall be very happy to yield to the Senator from Utah, but I must catch a train. I will not yield for a 15-minute speech. How much time will the Senator require?

Mr. WATKINS. I do not think I shall require more than 3 minutes.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I am glad to yield.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, most of the lead and zinc mines in the State of Utah and elsewhere in the United States are now virtually shut down. During the past year 22 of Utah's 30 lead and zinc mines have ceased operations. By March 30, 1953, approximately 1,600 people in my State had lost their jobs as a consequence of the curtailment of lead and zinc mining operations.

The falling off of lead and zinc mining operations in the State of Utah and elsewhere in the United States is largely due to ruinous competition in the American market by lead and zinc producers from foreign producing areas.

Legislation has been proposed which would impose a sliding scale stabilization tax on importations of lead and zinc. I strongly favor this move. Obviously some form of protective action is necessary in order to restore the lead and zinc mining industry to a competitive status with foreign imports. It might be of some help to use the escape clause in our present tariff legislation. Up to the present time the executive department of the United States has failed to use the escape clauses in the reciprocal trade treaties to protect the American industries which are endangered.

I recently received petitions from various mining communities in the State of Utah bearing the signatures of several thousand citizens in stricken lead and zinc mining areas. On May 25, some of these communities observed "Preserve Your Community Day" for the purpose of organizing themselves and bringing to greater public attention the critical situation with which they are faced. They have appealed to the Congress of the United States for help, and in my view the Congress must take some immediate action to help relieve this desperate situation.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD immediately following my remarks the communications which I have received from the mayors of Eureka, Utah; Park City, Utah; Heber City, Utah; and Lark, Utah. I ask unanimous consent also that there be inserted in the body of the RECORD after my remarks a letter from the Tooele Mill and Smeltermen's Union, Local No. 55, of Tooele, Utah, together with a statement which appeared in various weekly newspapers throughout Utah during the week of June 1, 1953.

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

LARK, UTAH, June 11, 1953.
Senator ARTHUR V. WATKINS,
Washington, D. C.

The community of Lark, Utah, depends entirely upon the lead-zinc mining industry. Three hundred and seventy-two signatures from the community of Lark ask you to support H. R. 5496 to help preserve the lead-zinc

mining industry. Copy of petition with list of signatures will follow.

J. A. COFFEY,
Chairman, Lions Club Committee.

EUREKA CITY CORP.,
Eureka, Utah, June 1, 1953.

HON. ARTHUR V. WATKINS,
Senator From Utah,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WATKINS: Our Tintic mining district, one of the oldest and most productive districts of the West, has felt the full impact of the recent decrease in the price of lead and zinc. Mining activity has been reduced and we face the prospect of a complete shutdown of our major producers, which would mean a complete demoralization of our town which is entirely dependent on the continuing operation of the mines which support it.

As mayor of Eureka City, Utah, I proclaimed May 25, 1953, as "Preserve Our Community Day" and called upon all our citizens to join in petitioning you to give full support to the sliding scale stabilization lead-zinc import tax provisions of H. R. 4294.

This petition, signed by only a few of the many vitally affected, is transmitted to you with the plea that you do all in your power to help this American community to preserve its way of life and its essential role as a contributor of vital materials needed in time of national peril.

Respectfully submitted.

MAYNARD CRONIN.

PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORP.,
Park City, Utah, May 27, 1953.

The Honorable ARTHUR V. WATKINS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: You will be interested to know that May 25, 1953, was proclaimed as Preserve Your Community Day in Park City, Summit County, Utah. On this day all citizens were urged to sign a petition which supported the principle of House Resolution 4294 with respect to protections of the domestic lead and zinc industry through a sliding scale stabilization tax.

This noteworthy project was endorsed by the Park City Council and practically all civic organizations and citizens. The B. P. O. E. Lodge 734, Park City Kiwanis Club, Park City Lions Club, V. F. W. Post 3391, American Legion Frank E. Petersen Post 14, and Local Union 4264 Steelworkers of America were all active in obtaining signatures.

The feelings of the citizenry of Park City can be attested to by the fact that practically every adult in our city was happy to place his or her signature to this petition.

Sincerely yours,

EARLE W. RESEIGH,
Mayor.

HEBER CITY MUNICIPAL GOVERNMENT,
Heber City, Utah, May 27, 1953.

The Honorable ARTHUR V. WATKINS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: You will be interested to know that May 25, 1953, was proclaimed as Preserve Your Community Day in Heber City, Wasatch County, Utah. On this day all citizens were urged to sign a petition which supported the principle of House Resolution 4294 with respect to protections of the domestic lead and zinc industry through a sliding scale stabilization tax.

This noteworthy project was endorsed by the Heber City Council and practically all civic organizations and citizens. The Wasatch County Chamber of Commerce, Heber City Lions Club, V. F. W. Local 8885, American Legion Lockhart Post 23, Heber Valley Riding Club, and Local Union 4264 Steelworkers of America were all active in obtaining signatures.

The feelings of the citizenry of Heber can be attested to by the fact that practically every adult in our city was happy to place his or her signature to this petition.

Sincerely yours,
R. N. JACOLETTI, Mayor.

UTAH HARD HIT BY FOREIGN BLOWS AT LEAD-ZINC PRICES

Utah's lead-zinc industry has been crippled by foreign governments and producers of strategic metals dumping their low priced products on the American market.

According to Paul H. Hunt, who recently testified in Phoenix for the Utah Mining Association before the House Committee on Small Business, of 30 Utah lead-zinc operators in 1952, only 8 are still active, 6 on a curtailed basis. By March 30, 1953, approximately 1,600 men had lost their jobs.

Mr. Hunt quoted S. H. Williston, chairman of the Strategic Minerals Committee, American Mining Congress, who summarized the situation by saying, "When we want and urgently need metals from abroad, we do not get them and when we do not need them, they come into the American market to depress prices and close down domestic plants."

Foreign metal dumping in the past 10 months forced the price of lead down from 19½ to 12 cents a pound, and zinc from 19½ to 11 cents. Mr. Hunt pointed out that most American mines cannot operate successfully at these prices.

DOMESTIC SHORTAGE

In tracing recent fluctuation of the lead-zinc market, Mr. Hunt recalled that in 1951 Government ceiling prices on zinc rose from 17½ to 19½ cents, while foreign producers were getting 31½ cents on the western European market. This made it impossible to obtain zinc for American requirements and when use of zinc was curtailed, men in manufacturing industries lost their jobs.

In 1952, Mr. Hunt said, European demand for zinc fell off and the United States became a dumping ground. Prices dropped to 11 cents while imports in July rose to 60,000 tons. The year's total was 565,162 tons, an increase of 150 percent over 1951.

"Despite a smaller spread between foreign and domestic lead prices, the lead picture closely paralleled zinc. When supply caught up with demand, foreign sources unloaded and imports jumped from 257,900 tons in 1951 to 615,481 in 1952," Mr. Hunt said.

"Hope for the future of the industry in Utah and the entire country lies in H. R. 4294," Mr. Hunt said. He pointed out that this bill, recently introduced in Congress, through provisions that provide for a sliding scale of import taxes on lead and zinc, can strengthen and stabilize the industry to a point that will permit reopening of currently shutdown mines.

RESOLUTION OF TOOKEE MILL AND SMELTER-MEN'S UNION, LOCAL NO. 55, TOOKEE, UTAH

Whereas we, the membership of Local 55, International Union of Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers, representing 350 employees of the International Smelting & Refining Co. at Tooele, Utah, who have just returned to work May 1, 1953, from a 4-month shutdown of concentrator and smelter caused from custom ore shortages resulting from existing low lead and zinc metal prices, feel very insecure as to future employment under existing metal price conditions; and

Whereas such interruption of employment as recently experienced causes serious economic loss to each of us and to this community as a whole: Be it

Resolved by the membership of this local union, That we as a group ask that assistance be given the lead-zinc industry in the manner proposed in H. R. 5496, sponsored by Representative RICHARD SIMPSON, now being considered by the House Ways and

Means Committee under the chairmanship of Representative DANIEL A. REED.

HY JORDAN, President.
J. ROSS ROWBERRY,
Secretary.

THE GREAT SOCIALIST REVOLUTION

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, some weeks ago I delivered a speech in the Senate on the problem of policy-influencing personnel in Government, in which it was my purpose to emphasize the following premise:

While the majority of Federal employees are not only loyal and reliable but void of any desire or intent to bring about the great Socialist revolution * * * there does exist a significant minority of Federal employees who during the past two administrations have striven purposely and resolutely to effectuate such a transformation. Because of the strategic positions the members of this minority occupy and because of their skill and experience, gained by many years of practice, in subverting Federal authority to their own ends, it can be fairly said that as long as they constitute a force in the Government no legislation, no matter how wisely drafted to further Republican programs, can be expected to maintain its character or to attain its goals.

This minority is to be found, chiefly, in those departments and agencies of the Government whose actions and policies affect, directly or indirectly, the economic and social institutions of the Nation. The members of this group include, in particular, professional employees, such as lawyers, economists, information specialists, writers, personnel experts, public-relations people, and political- and social-science analysts. What percentage of professional or policy-influencing employees in the Government are members of the forces of that great Socialist revolution * * * it is impossible to say. But experience and observation suggest that the percentage is sufficiently large to warrant the immediate and thoughtful attention of the new Republican administration.

Some members of [these] Socialist forces * * * still hold top positions in the Government as presidential appointees, and since they may be expected to be replaced as a result of the change in administration, they are not a primary concern. Most of them, however, occupy positions below the top and out of the public eye, ranging from confidential assistants, division heads, and section chiefs to minor and obscure subordinates. These should be of utmost concern to the new Republican administration. It is upon them, unless replaced or neutralized, that the Republican appointees, who are necessarily less expert and experienced in Government, will have to depend to a great extent for information, advice, and assistance in the performance of the innumerable duties of their offices. Government today is a system of wheels within wheels, wherein the small and obscure wheels grind out in great part the vast bulk of the decisions and policies for which the major and known wheels are ultimately responsible. Hence, if the policies and decisions of the new Republican administration are not to be frustrated, it will be necessary to remove from the Government whom ever among the small and obscure wheels may duly and fairly be shown to be Socialists in ideology and purpose, and replace them with personnel who are free of any anticapitalist, procollectivist bias.

Mr. President, having thus attempted to accentuate the seriousness of the personnel problem which confronts the new Republican administration, I should now

like to discuss the manner in which such Government employees, whom I choose to describe as crypto-Socialists or collectivists, are continuing to influence policy under the new administration, are continuing to spread New Deal propaganda, and are consolidating and further entrenching themselves to work toward a return of the New Deal to power.

As an illustration, the Department of Labor, employing more than 6,000 persons, warrants immediate attention. The top echelon of the Department, in addition to the Secretary and Under Secretary, consists of four Assistant Secretaries, a number of assistants to the Secretary, numerous bureau chiefs, assistant bureau chiefs, confidential advisers, special assistants, information specialists, and the like. I need not point out that under the previous administration special care was exercised to insure that these positions were occupied by only the most militant and ideologically correct New Deal collectivists. It would be extremely difficult to find anywhere a group more thoroughly loyal to the New Deal or more completely devoted to the supposition that business and businessmen are bad and must necessarily be controlled and regimented by the Government, that private enterprise is selfish and corrupt, and that public ownership is essentially good and should increasingly supplant privately owned industries and institutions.

It is most disheartening to find that in spite of the emphatic repudiation of these ideas in the election of last November there has been virtually no change in the situation at the Department of Labor. The same individuals remain in the same jobs and carry on the same campaigns against the American free-enterprise system. The New Deal bureau chiefs, the New Deal special assistants, the New Deal information specialists and the New Deal lawyers and economists have been unaffected by the change of administration.

Just to give an example of the continual antiemployer propaganda which emanates from the Department of Labor, I call your attention to a speech which was made at the Maryland Federation of Labor convention a few weeks ago by a regional director of the Labor Department's Wage and Hour Division. The full significance of this speech, I feel, has been completely overlooked.

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

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I am very happy to yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, is the Senator from Maryland persuaded that none of those people can be converted to take the opposite point of view now?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I am completely so persuaded.

This official, a holdover from the previous administration, deplored the widespread violations by business enterprises of the minimum-wage, overtime-pay, and child-labor features of the wage-and-hour law. He charged that more than 50 percent of businesses inspected by the Wage and Hour Division are

found in violation of the law, and said, "If we find these conditions when business is good, what is to be expected when the business cycle turns downward." In other words, this Labor Department spokesman was implying that businessmen are greedy and unscrupulous in good times as well as bad.

The fact is that these statistics on violations are completely false and misleading and are intended to put business and employers in the worst possible light. When a Wage-Hour investigator goes into a business establishment he carries a voluminous stack of regulations of the Wage and Hour Division, and if he finds merely a technical violation of any of these highly complicated regulations affecting only one of possibly a thousand employees of the establishment, the entire establishment is recorded as in violation of the wage-and-hour law. In this way the Department of Labor accumulates and publicizes statistics about employer violations which, to the layman or uninitiated, are seemingly impressive. However, this type of antiemployer propaganda has been developed and extensively disseminated by the Department of Labor for many years under the New Deal-Fair Deal administrations, and this deliberate practice proceeds without the slightest interruption, since the same cryptosocialist group remains in the key positions in the Department.

Another demonstration of the anomalous results of continuing these New Dealers in positions of influence in the Department of Labor comes to light in connection with Taft-Hartley Act amendments currently being considered by the Congress. Ever since the enactment of the Taft-Hartley Act in 1947, the New Deal group in the Department of Labor has been bitterly and violently opposed to this act. They have made it clear time and again that they want total repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act and restoration of the Wagner Act. In 1949 they drafted a bill to accomplish this and used every known pressure and stratagem to obtain passage through the Congress. After this effort failed, they devoted themselves to writing inflammatory anti-Taft-Hartley speeches and articles, and in this way the Department of Labor became the central lobbying agency for repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act. The man who is now the Acting Solicitor of the Department of Labor even had the effrontery to launch an attack on the Taft-Hartley law before an international body, the International Labor Organization, in Geneva, Switzerland, in 1951. It is indeed an amazing spectacle to see an official, who is sworn to support and enforce the laws of the United States, brazenly denouncing a duly enacted law of the land for all the world to see and hear.

In the election campaign of 1952, the platform of the Republican Party called for support of the Taft-Hartley Act, with some modest amendments which would not affect the basic principles of the act. We now find the same New Deal group that has been bitterly fighting for Taft-Hartley repeal is advising the new administration as to what amendments

should be made to the act. The press reports indicate that the proposals which this group is advocating as an administration position would amount to virtual repeal of all features of the act except those that were carried over from the Wagner Act.

Another shocking example of the perpetuation of New Dealers in influential positions in the Department of Labor surrounds the reduction in force now taking place in the Department as a result of the reduced appropriation which has been passed by the House. In executing the reductions in force, the hardcore New Dealers, most of whom are in the upper bureaucratic levels, have remained untouched and the cuts have been made almost exclusively among the lower grade employees. As an illustration, let me direct your attention to the proposed reorganization of the Solicitor's Office in the Department of Labor—a reorganization which has evolved from a budget reduction of \$414,000 or approximately 23.7 percent.

Heretofore, the Solicitor's Office, the legal arm of the Department of Labor, has functioned with a Washington staff of 111 attorneys comprising 27 supervisory personnel and 84 in the nonsupervisory categories. With the completion of the pending reorganization, the Washington office will have a total payroll of 66 attorneys. On the surface, this would seem to be an effective reorganization with a reduction in force totaling 45 people.

But, let us look a little deeper. The new staff of 66 persons will be composed of 23 in the supervisory group and 43 in the nonsupervisory group. Reflect upon that point for a moment—23 supervisors and 43 workers—1 chief for less than every 2 Indians. In other words, a reduction of approximately 15 percent in supervisors, and nearly 50 percent in working attorneys.

Officials of the Department of Labor would undoubtedly claim that a desirable and practical reorganization will thus be achieved in the interest of the objectives of the Republican platform and policies, that the sanctity of civil service status has been preserved, and that there is legal justification for the disparity in numbers of supervisory and nonsupervisory personnel. They would, I am certain, neglect to allude to the deliberate and adroit manipulation of the unlimited or indefinite categories of civil service personnel for the specific intention of retaining people who are fully sympathetic to the New Deal and the socialistic tendencies which have prevailed during the past two administrations, most successfully in the Department of Labor. Parenthetically, let me state that many of those attorneys being retained are active members of the Americans for Democratic Action and are, or have been active in the National Lawyers Guild, organizations which are noted for New Deal-Fair Deal socialistic philosophies.

However, evidence that a pattern to continue these cryptosocialists in significant policy-influencing capacities has been established, is indisputable. The present reorganization of the Solicitor's Office was drafted with the obvious pur-

pose of protecting the collectivist bureaucrats who are unalterably wedded to the following thesis, which I mentioned in my earlier speech:

In the field of labor, which next to foreign affairs is the most sensitive and fertile field for Socialist infiltration, collectivist attitudes * * * manifest themselves primarily in a prounion, antimanagement bias. This prounion bias for labor does not spring, it must be stressed, from any real concern for wage earners or for the great free American labor movement as such. Labor unions are regarded by the crypto-Socialist not as integral and wholesome factors in the national economy nor as legitimate voluntary organizations seeking the social and economic welfare of their members within the framework of the American system of private capitalism, but rather as instruments for attaining a Socialist state.

As long as these cryptosocialists are retained in such sensitive assignments, as in the Labor Department Solicitor's office, the legislative proposals of the new Republican administration and the Congress cannot meet with favorable and unbiased consideration. What hope is there for any effective cooperation or receptive liaison from the Department, as long as conditions such as these are prolonged.

The efforts of the New Dealers in the Labor Department to perpetuate New Deal control of policy influencing positions under the Republican administration extend not only to the Department of Labor but also to the other vital labor agency of the Government, the National Labor Relations Board. Ever since the NLRB was established in 1935, the staffs of the Board and its Office of General Counsel have been encumbered with persons of extreme left-wing attitudes. Naturally enough, the decisions of the NLRB have reflected a marked antemployer bias. More than any other agency of Government, the NLRB has been criticized for the partisan character of its rulings and decisions. In view of these facts it has been the opinion of many experts in the field of labor-management relations that a remedy for the problems arising under the Taft-Hartley Act cannot be achieved without a drastic change in the personnel responsible for administering this law.

In line with this, a number of bills have been introduced in this session of the Congress to reorganize the NLRB and its staff with the objective of creating a genuinely public-minded and impartial agency. This proposed legislation would eliminate the present office of General Counsel and would substitute therefor an Administrator and a new staff. It is my understanding that this proposal has high priority on the list of the changes in the Taft-Hartley Act which the administration is now considering. The Department of Labor has, however, adamantly opposed any changes in the organization of the Board or its office of General Counsel unless provision is made for a transfer of the present staff without any loss of status to the reorganized agency. In other words the Department of Labor wants all of the New Deal cryptosocialists of the Labor Board kept right where they are so that they can continue to preserve the par-

tisan direction of Board decisions. What more concrete proof is required that the primary objective of the New Dealers is to protect their own.

Certainly this is a "dead giveaway." The Department of Labor, in considering desirable changes in the Taft-Hartley law, has a legitimate interest in the substantive provisions of the law, but the question of retaining the present personnel of the Board goes beyond the substance of the law and gets into the area of the ideological attitudes of the individuals concerned. The motivation for the Department's insistence upon retention of the present staff can only be a desire to maintain New Deal control of the Board. This is scarcely in harmony with the desires of the new administration to bring into government people who will carry out the philosophy of the new administration and assist in reversing the socialistic trend of government for the past 20 years.

Again, I voice a vigorous word of caution to the new administration. It is becoming increasingly more difficult to accomplish any change in Government as long as these cryptosocialists are permitted to remain in sensitive policy-determining positions. The time for positive corrective action is now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. What is the pleasure of the Senate?

RECESS

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. In accordance with the order previously entered, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 29 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, the recess being under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Tuesday, June 16, 1953, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 15 (legislative day of June 8), 1953:

OFFICE OF DEFENSE MOBILIZATION

Arthur S. Flemming, of Ohio, to be Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

Subject to qualifications provided by law, the following for permanent appointment to the grades indicated in the Coast and Geodetic Survey:

To be commissioned commander

Charles A. Schoene Fair J. Bryant
William N. Martin Charles W. Clark
Harold J. Seaborg

To be commissioned lieutenant commander

William E. Randall

To be commissioned lieutenant

Dewey G. Rushford
Gordon D. Scott

To be commissioned lieutenant (junior grade)

Julian W. Flint William D. Barbee
David F. Romero Robert A. Parker
Arthur R. Benton, Jr. Herbert R. Lippold
Eugene A. Taylor Roger F. Lanier

To be commissioned ensign

George W. Thompson
Floyd J. Tucker, Jr.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 15 (legislative day of June 8), 1953:

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Ralph H. Demmler, of Pennsylvania, to be a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission, for the term expiring June 5, 1957.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Amos J. Peaslee, of New Jersey, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Australia.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JUNE 15, 1953

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Reverend Joseph V. Sullivan, S. T. D., assistant superintendent of Catholic schools, diocese of Kansas City, Mo., offered the following prayer:

We pray Thee, O God of might, wisdom, and justice, through whom authority is rightly administered, laws are enacted, and judgment decreed, assist with Thy holy spirit of counsel and fortitude the President of the United States, that his administration may be conducted in righteousness, and be eminently useful to Thy people over whom he presides; by encouraging due respect for virtue and religion; by a faithful execution of the laws in justice and mercy; and by restraining vice and immorality. Let the light of Thy divine wisdom direct the deliberations of Congress, and shine forth in all the proceedings and laws framed for our rule and government, so that they may tend to the preservation of peace, the promotion of national happiness, the increase of industry, sobriety, and useful knowledge; and may perpetuate to us the blessing of equal liberty. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, June 11, 1953, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill and joint resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1273. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to incorporate the American University," approved February 24, 1893, so as to clarify the relations between the board of trustees of the American University and the board of education of the Methodist Church, and for other purposes; and

S. J. Res. 6. Joint resolution to provide for a continuance of civil government for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. CARLSON and Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition