It is what enabled southern California to build a manmade harbor at San Pedro and develop it into one of the Nation's major ports. It is what made it possible for the community to seek out its water supply 250 miles away and bring it in across mountains and deserts so that a great metropolitan area could live and flourish. It is what boomed the west coast's relatively undeveloped aircraft industry into a dynamic arsenal which produced 44 percent of America's warplanes between 1942 and 1945.

It's the spirit that gets things done.

The spirit of southern California generates the vision, drive, and leadership which are indispensable to the future air cadet.

The City of Shreveport

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 7, 1954

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I was certainly delighted to learn from the editors of Look magazine that my home city of Shreveport, La., had been named as one of the 11 all-American cities entitled to an award for this honor. This contest, which was sponsored by the National Municipal League and Look magazine as cosponsors, reviewed the status of 115 other cities throughout the United States. One of the reasons why the city of Shreveport was selected for this award was due to the survey of the Negro community which was conducted in Shreveport by 1,000 white and Negro volunteers. This survey originated by the Shreveport Council of Social Agencies and before the comprehensive project was finished, almost every civic group had cooperated and participated to lend assistance.

The survey dealt with all phases of life among the city's Negro population. This selection of the city of Shreveport was such a coveted honor that undoubtedly it will have the effect of spurring other southern cities to make progress in the direction of removing unlivable quarters from their midst and working out more acceptable programs to take care of the colored population living in their midst.

Mr. Speaker, I am very proud of the recognition which has been given my home city of Shreveport. It is a city of 140,000 people, resting along the banks of a great stream, and is the queen city of the Red River Valley. Its streets are wide and paved and its buildings and people are modern. It is most appropriate that Look magazine and the National Municipal League would give this place of honor to the city of Shreveport.

Another Weapon for the Government's Anticrime Arsenal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 7, 1954

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 7404 is a bill which would give the Federal Government a right of appeal in criminal prosecutions after the court has knocked out evidence on which the Government relies.

This is a part of the crime legislation program in which the section of criminal law of the American Bar Association is deeply interested.

It is a very dangerous mistake for us to go on ignoring the challenges of big-time crime and criminal activity, which affect every community in our land.

This bill only has 18 words but it packs a wallop against the criminals. What it does is to plug an important loophole through which guilty defendants are now escaping. In some types of criminal prosecutions, such as narcotics and stolen property cases, the Government must depend almost entirely on evidence seized at the time of the arrest to win a conviction. If the defense succeeds in obtaining a pretrial order to suppress such evidence, there is no point in going ahead with the trial for all practical purposes. The case is lost before it even begins. At present, the Government has no appeal from this.

H. R. 7404 would permit such appeals. It would thus help save many prosecutions which are now lost by the Government on technicalities without ever reaching a trial on the merits.

The last phrase, "when the defendant has not been put in jeopardy" is necessary to avoid a constitutional difficulty—for the Government cannot appeal from an acquittal, once the trial has commenced.

A copy of the bill is attached:

A bill to amend section 3731 of title 18 of the United States Code relating to appeals by the United States

Be it enacted, etc., That section 3731 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended by inserting after the fifth paragraph of such section (relating to appeal by the United States from the district courts to a court of appeals) the following new paragraph:

"From a decision sustaining a motion to suppress evidence, when the defendant has not been put in jeopardy."

SENATE

MONDAY, JANUARY 11, 1954

(Legislative day of Thursday, January 7, 1954)

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

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

O God, our Father, from whom all holy desires and all good counsels do proceed, rise mercifully with the morning upon our darkened hearts. In this tragic and tangled world, so willful and divided, we are conscious of our woeful inadequacy to sit in the seats of judgment, to balance the scales of justice, and to respond with equity to the myriad calls of human need. Wilt Thou crown the deliberations of this Chamber with Thy wisdom and with spacious thinking. Lighten the eyes of these Thy servants, who here speak for the Nation, with Thy sympathy for all mankind. As they here face questions which confound fallible human appraisals, quicken in them, we beseech Thee, every noble impulse, and sanctify for Thy glory and for human good their best endeavors. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. KNOWLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, January 7, 1954, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, informed the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 215, 83d Congress, after the adjournment of the Congress, the Speaker appointed Mr. REED, of New York; Mr. SIMPSON, of Pennsylvania; Mr. VORYS, of Ohio; Mr. COOPER, of Tennessee; and Mr. RICHARDS, of South Carolina, as members on the part of the House, on the Commission on Foreign Economic Policy.

The message also informed the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of section 2, Public Law 249, 83d Congress, and the order of the House of August 3, 1953, the Speaker had appointed, after the adjournment of Congress, Mr. LATHAM, of New York; Mr. WIDNALL, of New Jersey; Mr. CELLER, of New York; and Mr. DONOVAN, of New York, to serve with him as members on the part of the House, on the United States Commission for the Bicentennial of Columbia University in the city of New York.

The message further informed the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 198, 83d Congress, and the order of the House of August 3, 1953, the Speaker had appointed, after the adjournment of the Congress, Mr. FORAND, of Rhode Island; Mr. HESELTON, of Massachusetts; Mr. COTTON, of New Hampshire; Mr. SADLAK, of Conecticut; Mr. CARRIGG, of Pennsylvania; Mr. O'BRIEN, of New York; and Mr. HYDE, of Maryland, as members on the part of the House, of the Joint Committee To Participate in the Celebration of the 200th Anniversary of the Congress of 1754, held at Albany, N. Y.

The message also informed the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 263, 83d Congress, and the order of the House of August 3, 1953, the Speaker appointed Mr. POFF and Mr. ROBESON of Virginia as members of the Jamestown-Williamsburg-Yorktown Celebration Commission.

The message further informed the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of section 2, Public Law 109, 83d Congress, and the order of the House of August 3, 1953, the Speaker appointed, after the adjournment of Congress, Mr. MASON, of Illinois; Mr. DOLLIVER, of Iowa; Mr. OSTERTAG, of New York; Mr. DINGELL, of Michigan; and Mr. HAYS, of Arkansas, as members of the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations.

The message also informed the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 220, 83d Congress, and the order of the House of August 3, 1953, the Speaker appointed, after the adjournment of the Congress, Mr. TOWE, of New Jersey; Mr. HARDIE SCOTT, of Pennsylvania, as advisory members of the Commission on Judicial and Congressional Salaries.

The message further informed the Senate that, pursuant to the authority of section 712 (a) of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, the Speaker announced that Mr. WOLCOTT, chairman of the House Committee on Banking and Currency, had appointed Mr. SPENCE, of Kentucky, a member of that committee, as a member of the Joint Committee on Defense Production, vice Mr. PATMAN, of Texas, resigned.

AGRICULTURAL PROGRAM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 292)

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask that the message from the President relating to agriculture be laid before the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the message from the President of the United States, which was read by the legislative clerk and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(For President's message, see House proceedings for today.)

LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 291)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read by the Chief Clerk and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(For President's message, see House proceedings for today.)

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, it is my proposal that there now be a morning hour, under the customary limitations as to debate. Thereafter, I shall ask for a quorum call, before having a call of the calendar for the consideration of bills to which there is no objection.

Following the call of the calendar, it will be my purpose, as announced last week, to call up Calendar 731, S. 987, a bill to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the tercentennial celebration of the founding of the city of Northampton, Mass.; Calendar 730, H. R. 1917, a bill to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces to commemorate the sesquicentennial of the Louisiana Purchase; Calendar 719, S. 2474, a bill to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces to commemorate the tercentennial of the founding of the city of New York; and then Calendar 831, S. 2643, a bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

When action has been completed on Senate bill 2643, whatever time that may take, I shall propose to have taken up Calendar 442, S. 2150, a bill providing for the creation of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corp.

Following the completion of action on the St. Lawrence seaway bill, it is proposed to take up Calendar 408, Senate Joint Resolution 1, which is the so-called Bricker amendment.

Thus the Senate may be advised for some period in advance as to the proposed legislative program.

As was attempted to be done in the last session of Congress, I shall constantly keep the minority leader informed in advance of the program the majority has in mind, and I shall also make announcements to the Senate as a whole, so that Senators may make their plans by reason of having advance knowledge of the measures it is intended to consider.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. KNOWLAND. I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the transaction of routine business as in the morning hour, under the usual limitations.

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

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

REPORT OF FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE CORPORATION

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, for the fiscal year 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT OF REGIONAL RESEARCH LABORATORIES

A letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the activities of, funds used by, and donations to, the regional research laboratories for the year 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON RESEARCH WORK PERFORMED UNDER CONTRACTS OR COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS

A letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of research work being performed under contracts or cooperative agreements, for the fiscal year 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON AGRICULTURAL EXPERIMENT STATIONS

A letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the receipts, expenditures, and work of agricultural experiment stations in the States, Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT OF FEDERAL EXTENSION SERVICE

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Federal Extension Service, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

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

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

REPORT OF NATIONAL FOREST RESERVATION COMMISSION

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, President, National Forest Reservation Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON PROFESSIONAL AND SCIENTIFIC POSITIONS ESTABLISHED IN DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report covering the professional and scientific positions established in the Department of Defense, for the year 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

AUTHORIZATION FOR CERTAIN PROPERTY TRANSACTIONS IN COCOLI, C. Z.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Air, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize certain property transactions in Cocoli, C. Z., and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON AGREEMENTS ENTERED INTO BY NAVY DEPARTMENT

A letter from the Director, Naval Petroleum Reserves, Department of the Navy, reporting, pursuant to law, that no agreements involving naval petroleum reserves had been entered into during the calendar year 1953; to the Committee on Armed Services.

GRANT OR RETROCESSION TO A STATE OF JURISDICTION OVER CERTAIN LAND

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the grant or retrocession to a State of concurrent jurisdiction over certain land (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

STATEMENT OF JUDGMENTS RENDERED BY COURT OF CLAIMS

A letter from the clerk, United States Court of Claims, transmitting, pursuant to law, a statement of all judgments rendered by the Court of Claims for the year ended October 2, 1953 (with an accompanying statement); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

PERMANENCY OF AUTHORIZATION OF CERTAIN TRANSACTIONS BY DISBURSING OFFICERS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed

legislation to amend the act of December 23, 1944, to make permanent the authorization for certain transactions by disbursing officers of the United States (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PROPOSED AWARD OF CONCESSION PERMIT, ROCKY MOUNTAIN NATIONAL PARK, COLO.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a proposed award of the concession permit in Rocky Mountain National Park, Colo. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

RECOMMENDATION FOR FREEDOM OF MENOMINEE TRIBE OF WISCONSIN FROM FEDERAL SUPERVISION APPLICABLE TO INDIANS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 108, recommendations for legislation necessary to free the Menominee Tribe of Wisconsin, among others, from Federal supervision and control and from all disabilities and limitations specially applicable to Indians (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT OF COUNCIL ON LAW ENFORCEMENT IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A letter from the chairman, Council on Law Enforcement in the District of Columbia, reporting on the activities of that council, and requesting that it be permitted to delay submitting its report until February 1, 1954; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

LAWS ENACTED BY GUAM LEGISLATURE

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of laws enacted by the Second Guam Legislature (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

TRANSFER OF RIGHT, TITLE, AND INTEREST IN A CERTAIN INVENTION

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to transfer to Vernon F. Parry, the right, title, and interest of the United States in foreign countries in and to a certain invention (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITION AND MEMORIAL

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

A resolution adopted by the delegates to the 61st annual convention of the United States Savings and Loan League, Chicago, Ill., relating to the general policy of the national administration; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A resolution adopted by the Seneca Nation Clan Mothers and Sons and Daughters of the Cold Springs and Newtown Long Houses of Allegheny and Cattaraugus Reservations, N. Y., protesting against the adoption by Congress of House Concurrent Resolution 108, expressing the sense of Congress that certain tribes of Indians should be freed from Federal supervision (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

DURUM WHEAT—RESOLUTION OF NORTH DAKOTA FARM BUREAU

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the North Dakota Farm Bureau, relating to the planting of additional acres of durum wheat.

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

DURUM WHEAT

Our own industry, particular to North Dakota, in which we supply the macaroni industry with durum wheat, is in serious trouble due to a combination of rust and drought.

This trouble arises from an inability to supply the demand and this can result in a halt in the growth of macaroni consumption by the United States public. Efforts by the industry to use substitutes have failed.

Therefore we ask for prompt legislation by Congress to permit any farmer (with a previous durum history in 1951, 1952, or 1953) who plants 40 percent of his 1954 allotted wheat acres to durum, to be permitted to seed to durum additional acres to bring his total wheat and durum acres up to his total farm wheat base acreage.

This formula will apply to the 1954 crop year only and does not apply to red durum.

PRICE SUPPORTS—RESOLUTION OF NORTH DAKOTA FARM BUREAU

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the North Dakota Farm Bureau, relating to price supports for agricultural commodities.

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

PRICE SUPPORTS

Since our 1953 platform was approved in November 1952, there have been no efforts made to introduce the factor of quality into the support program, to make realistic reductions in production of basics, or to take any other realistic steps to put the support program in a sounder position.

Therefore we urge Congress to enact extension of the amendment to the Agricultural Act of 1949, providing for a minimum support of 90 percent of parity on the basic commodities.

We ask that this extension be for a period suitable in length to enable proper reduction of national wheat acreages, and of other basic acreages where surpluses exist.

We will accept marketing quotas and acreage restrictions to accomplish this goal of matching production with demand.

With shrinkage of the present wheat surplus we ask Congress and the industry to work toward our common goal of full 100 percent of parity income in the market place.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. YOUNG, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

S. 1990. A bill to strengthen the investigation and enforcement provisions of the Commodity Exchange Act; with an amendment (Rept. No. 839); and

S. 2313. A bill to amend the Commodity Exchange Act in order to include wool among the commodities regulated by such act; with amendments (Rept. No. 840).

By Mr. AIKEN, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, without amendment:

S. 1577. A bill to authorize the exchange of land in Eagle County, Colo., and for other purposes (Rept. No. 841).

By Mr. AIKEN, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, with an amendment:

S. 2404. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to require reasonable bonds from packers (Rept. No. 842); and

S. 2583. A bill to indemnify against loss all persons whose swine were destroyed in July 1952 as a result of having been infected with or exposed to the contagious disease, vesicular exanthema (Rept. No. 843).

By Mr. AIKEN, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, with amendments:

S. 1381. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 (Rept. No. 844); and

S. 1399. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to sell certain improvements on national forest land in Arizona to the Salt River Valley Water Users Association, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 845).

KOREAN WAR ATROCITIES—REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS (REPT. NO. 848)

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, from the Committee on Government Operations, I submit, pursuant to Senate Resolution 40, 1st session, 83d Congress, a report relating to the Korean war atrocities.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUTLER in the chair). The report will be received and printed.

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. MCCARRAN:

S. 2644. A bill for the relief of Maria Louise Andreis;

S. 2645. A bill for the relief of Marion S. Quirk; and

S. 2646. A bill for the relief of Victoriana Areitio Berincua; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2647. A bill to create an independent Civil Aeronautics Authority and an independent Air Safety Board, to promote the development and safety and to provide for the regulation of civil aeronautics, and to promote world leadership by the United States in aviation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

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

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

S. 2648. A bill for the relief of Johanna Pessler and her child; and

S. 2649. A bill for the relief of Chaya Frangles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2650. A bill to amend the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. SMITH of New Jersey when he introduced the last above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BEALL:

S. 2651. A bill to prescribe and regulate the procedure for adoption in the District of Columbia; and

S. 2652. A bill to amend the act of April 22, 1944, which regulates the placement of children in family homes in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CASE (by request):

S. 2653. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to create a board for the condemnation of insanitary buildings in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved May 1, 1906, as amended, and for other purposes;

S. 2654. A bill to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to sell certain property owned by the District of Columbia located in Montgomery County, Md., and for other purposes;

S. 2655. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1947 as amended;

S. 2656. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for compulsory school attendance, for the taking of a school census in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved February 4, 1925;

S. 2657. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of the healing art to protect the public health in the District of Columbia";

S. 2658. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide an immediate revision and equalization of real-estate values in the District of Columbia; also to provide an assessment of real estate in said District in the year 1896 and every third year thereafter, and for other purposes," approved August 14, 1894, as amended;

S. 2659. A bill to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to sell certain property in Prince Georges County, Md., acquired as a site for the National Training School for Girls;

S. 2660. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of optometry in the District of Columbia"; and

S. 2661. A bill to regulate the sale of shell eggs in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. LANGER (for himself, Mr. HENDRICKSON, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. HENNINGS, and Mr. FLANDERS):

S. 2662. A bill to provide for the enforcement of support orders in certain State and Federal courts, and to make it a crime to move or travel in interstate and foreign commerce to avoid compliance with such orders; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 2663. A bill to provide that ex-Presidents of the United States shall be members of the National Security Council; to the Committee on Armed Services.

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

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 2664. A bill to provide rates of compensation for overtime, night, and holiday work for certain Federal officers and employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 2665. A bill to amend the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, and the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

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

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 2666. A bill for the relief of Anastasia Alexiadou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLEMENTS:

S. 2667. A bill for the relief of Mary George Solomon;

S. 2668. A bill for the relief of John Lewis Pyles, Jr.; and

S. 2669. A bill for the relief of Andree M. Doyle; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WATKINS (for himself and Mr. BENNETT):

S. 2670. A bill to provide for the termination of Federal supervision over the property of certain tribes, bands, and colonies of Indians in the State of Utah and the individual members thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HUNT:

S. J. Res. 113. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, to assure the equal application thereof to individuals of both sexes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CIVIL AERONAUTICS ACT OF 1954

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill which constitutes a complete redraft of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938. I have introduced bills of this nature in several Congresses, ever since 1944, when I introduced a bill of this kind as S. 1790 of the 78th Congress. Other bills of this nature which I have introduced include S. 1 of the 79th Congress, S. 1 of the 80th Congress, and S. 1 of the 81st Congress.

It is my hope that the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee may see fit to make this bill the basis of broad and comprehensive hearings on this subject, to the end that the committee may rewrite the Civil Aeronautics Act as its wisdom dictates. To this end, I have addressed a letter to the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], which I shall, at the conclusion of these brief remarks, ask to have inserted in the RECORD.

I desire now to make it clear to my colleagues that by introducing this bill I am not disowning the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, which I had the honor to sponsor, and toward the enactment of which I gave a great deal of my time and effort over the space of 3 years. I think the Civil Aeronautics Act is a good act, and I believe it has accomplished a great deal of good for the United States and in particular for the aviation industry of this country. But that industry has grown tremendously even in the 16 years since enactment of the Civil Aeronautics Act. In connection with that growth there have been changes, and new problems have arisen, both within the industry, and in the administration of the act. Recognition of these changes is one of the purposes of the redrafted law which I propose.

I wish to say that while this redrafted law contains a number of provisions which I believe are very much worthwhile and very desirable, it will not be my purpose to insist on any single provision of the bill. I hope the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, in its deliberations on this subject, will agree with me respecting certain provisions which I have proposed; but I recognize that it is the function of the committee to make the decisions, and that the committee may well differ with my views. What I am mainly concerned with is getting a thorough and comprehensive review of the Civil Aeronautics Act, and the enactment by the Congress of such changes as may appear justified on the basis of the hearings which I hope the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee will hold. I know that committee, if it decides to hold hearings, will call in all the best minds of the country in this field, will get the views of all the interests concerned with aviation, including the regulatory and administrative agencies of the Government, and will give due and proper weight to the proposals and expressions of all those who come before it, sifting the wheat from the chaff so that in the end there will come from the committee to the Senate proposed legislation which will preserve the spirit and purpose of the Civil Aeronautics Act and perpetuate its benefits, while at the same time recognizing and effectively dealing with the situations and problems which require new or amended legislative provisions.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my letter to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] which I mentioned a moment ago, may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2647) to create an independent Civil Aeronautics Authority and an independent Air Safety Board, to promote the development and safety and to provide for the regulation of civil aeronautics, and to promote world leadership by the United States in aviation, introduced by Mr. McCARRAN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The letter presented by Mr. McCARRAN is as follows:

DECEMBER 21, 1953.

Hon. JOHN W. BRICKER,
Chairman, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: For many years, experience in administration of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 has demonstrated with increasing force the need of revising the act.

Basically, the Civil Aeronautics Act is sound, and I believe I am not unduly immodest in crediting that act with substantial accomplishments for our Nation in the field of civil aviation. But times do change; new problems arise; and while I would resist with the last of my strength any effort to alter the basic philosophy of the Civil Aeronautics Act, I have long recognized the necessity for changes to make administration of the act easier, and to meet new problems and new situations which have arisen since the act was made law.

It was with this objective in mind that I introduced, 10 years ago, a complete redraft of the Civil Aeronautics Act. That redraft has been revised several times, and I have kept the matter constantly before the Congress, sponsoring such a bill in each Congress since I first made the proposal. It was S. 1790 in the 78th Congress, S. 1 in the 79th Congress, S. 1 in the 80th Congress, and S. 1 in the 81st Congress. For various reasons, the bill has never had detailed consideration by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Because I have been engaged in redrafting this bill once again, I did not introduce it during the first session of the 83d Congress. I shall introduce it soon after the Congress reconvenes in January.

This question of necessary changes in the Civil Aeronautics Act is a matter with which we cannot continue forever to temporize. Revisions must be made to bring the act in

line with modern times and to meet present-day problems and issues. Such revisions can be made without departing from the basic philosophy of the act, and the net effect of making them can be good. This is a task which only Congress can undertake, though I can well envision the possibility that if Congress does not soon accept its responsibility in this regard, some effort may be made on the part of the executive branch of the Government to bring about changes in the act by executive or administrative action. Already there has been far too much of this sort of thing.

While I know that the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee is one of the busiest committees of the Senate, and has much extremely important legislation pending before it, I respectfully urge upon you the view that no legislation pending before the committee is of greater importance than this matter of modernizing the Civil Aeronautics Act.

When my proposed redraft of the Civil Aeronautics Act is again before you, in the coming session, I hope the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee may see fit to make consideration of this proposed legislation a major project.

In that connection, let me make it clear that I consider my own bill only as a starting point. Undoubtedly it can be improved by your committee as a result of its deliberations and such hearings as it may hold on the subject. I plead with the committee to set its teeth into this subject and do the kind of a job which is needed in the interest of American aviation.

Kindest personal regards.

Sincerely,

PAT MCCARRAN.

AMENDMENT OF LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS ACT, 1947

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947, the Taft-Hartley Act. This bill incorporates in legislation the recommendations of the President to amend the act. I have introduced this bill as chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, after consultation with the Secretary of Labor, in order that what might be called the administration bill may be immediately before our committee.

It should be noted that in the President's message he suggests that certain areas in national labor relations should be further studied to the end that additional legislation can be presented. I recognize also, of course, that there may be other areas of controversy that the members of the committee, or other Members of the Senate, will bring to our attention, and that other proposals in the way of amendments may be submitted. I can assure the Senate that any such suggestions will be given our careful consideration.

It is my purpose to request the committee to consider the President's recommendations immediately, and it is my hope that the bill which I am introducing today may be passed promptly and without waiting for the results of the studies in these other areas.

I have had prepared by the staff of the committee a brief summary of the bill incorporating the President's recommendations, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

SUMMARY OF THE BILL INCORPORATING THE PRESIDENT'S RECOMMENDATIONS FOR AMENDMENT TO THE TAFT-HARTLEY ACT

Agency: It enacts the common-law rule of agency and relieves unions of responsibility for acts of their members based on membership alone.

Secondary boycotts: It eases the ban on secondary boycotts by permitting the unions to bring pressure on secondary employers who are working on materials farmed out by a struck employer and on secondary employers who are jointly engaged in performing work on a construction project with the primary employer.

It requires the National Labor Relations Board to give priority in its investigations of unfair labor practice charges in cases involving secondary boycotts.

Free speech: It extends the guaranty of free speech to representation cases as well as unfair-labor-practices cases.

Stability of bargaining agreements: It strengthens the stability of collective-bargaining relationships by relieving the parties thereto of the obligation to bargain on the terms and conditions of employment during the life of a valid collective-bargaining agreement.

Casual, intermittent, or temporary employments: It permits employers and unions in industries in which employment is casual, intermittent or temporary, more particularly construction, maritime, and entertainment industries, to enter into prehire collective-bargaining agreements which require membership in the union within 7 rather than within 30 days.

Secret ballot: It gives to employees involved in a strike, a voice through a secret ballot, in determining whether they wish the strike to continue.

Economic strikers: It imposes a ban on the holding of representation elections requested by a rival union during the first 4 months of a strike called by the incumbent union and imposes a similar ban against the holding of such elections requested by the employer for the duration of the strike or during the first year of the strike, whichever is shorter.

Filing of union information: It simplifies and eliminates duplication in the requirement that unions file organizational information with the Department of Labor.

Non-Communist affidavits: It requires employers as well as unions to file non-Communist affidavits.

Injunctions: It eliminates mandatory injunctions in connection with secondary boycotts but retains the discretionary injunction with respect to all unfair-labor practices.

It provides for the intervention of the Federal Mediation Service through a panel of local citizens to bring about a voluntary settlement of the dispute in cases where a discretionary injunction has been obtained.

Federal and State jurisdiction: It authorizes the States and Territories to protect the health or safety of their inhabitants in emergencies resulting from labor disputes.

National emergencies: It amends the national-emergency provisions of the law to give the President discretion to require the Board of Inquiry to make recommendations for the settlement of the dispute which recommendations shall not be binding on the parties to the dispute.

Checkoff of dues: It permits the checkoff of union dues to run until revoked in writing by the employee.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I also ask unanimous consent that because of the importance of this proposed legislation, and its controversial nature, the full text of the bill, which is introduced as an administration measure, be incorporated in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2650) to amend the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, is hereby further amended as follows:

(a) Section 2 (13) of such act is amended to read as follows:

"(13) In determining whether any person is acting as an 'agent' of another person so as to make such other person responsible for his acts, the common law rules relating to agency shall be applicable: *Provided*, That no labor organization shall be held responsible for the acts of any individual member thereof solely on the ground of such membership."

(b) Section 8 (b) (4) (A) of such act is amended to read as follows:

"(A) forcing or requiring any employer or self-employed person to join any labor or employer organization or any employer or other person (herein called secondary employer) to cease using, selling, handling, transporting, or otherwise dealing in the products of any other producer, processor, or manufacturer, or to cease doing business with any other person (herein called primary employee)—

"(i) unless the employees of the primary employer are engaged in a strike which—

"(a) is ratified or approved by a representative of such employees whom the primary employer recognized when the strike began or is required to recognize under an outstanding order or certification under this act, and no petition for certification of another labor organization is pending;

"(b) is not unlawful under this act; and

"(c) does not violate the terms of any existing collective-bargaining agreement; and

"(ii) unless—

"(a) the secondary employer has contracted or agreed with the primary employer (i) to perform work which the employees of the primary employer who are engaged in such strike normally would perform, or (ii) for the account of the primary employer, to render services that such employees would normally perform; or

"(b) the secondary employer is in the construction industry and is jointly engaged at the site of the work with the primary employer, who is in such industry, in constructing, altering, painting, or repairing a building or other structure;".

(c) Section 8 (c) of such act is amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and adding the following language: "nor shall it be the basis for setting aside an election conducted under section 9."

(d) Section 8 (d) of such act is amended by striking out all of the language after the colon at the end of paragraph "(4)" of said section and in lieu thereof, inserting the following:

"The duties imposed upon employers, employees, and labor organizations by paragraphs (2), (3), and (4) shall become inapplicable upon an intervening certification of the Board under which the labor organization or individual, which is a party to the contract, has been superseded as or ceased to be the representative of the employees subject to the provisions of section 9 (a), and the duties so imposed shall not be construed as requiring either party to a contract for a fixed period to discuss or agree to any modification of the terms and conditions of employment, whether or not embodied in such contract, prior to the expiration of such period, unless the contract

contains reopening provisions for modification of such terms and conditions of employment prior to the expiration date of such period. Any employee who engages in a strike within the 60-day period specified in this subsection shall lose his status as an employee of the employer engaged in the particular labor dispute, for the purposes of sections 8, 9, and 10 of this act, as amended, but such loss of status for such employee shall terminate if and when he is reemployed by such employer."

(e) Section 8 of such act is amended by adding thereto the following new subsections:

"(e) It shall not be an unfair labor practice under subsections (a) and (b) of this section for an employer primarily engaged in the construction, maritime, or entertainment industries, or in any other industry or section of an industry in which the Board finds employment to be casual, intermittent, or temporary in nature and in which the average period of continuous employment therein with any single employer is less than 30 days, to make an agreement covering employees engaged (or who upon their employment will be engaged) in construction, maritime, or entertainment work or in such casual, intermittent, or temporary employment, with a labor organization (not established, maintained, or assisted by any action defined in section 8 (a) of this act as an unfair labor practice and which at the time the agreement was executed or within the preceding 12 months has received from the Board a notice that it has complied with the requirements imposed by section 9 (f), (g), and (h)), solely because (1) the majority status of such labor organization has not been established under the provisions of section 9 of this act prior to the making of such agreement, and (2) such agreement requires, as a condition of employment, membership in such organization after the seventh day following the beginning of such employment or the effective date of the agreement whichever is the later: *Provided*, That nothing herein shall set aside the final proviso to section 8 (a) (3) of this act: *Provided further*, That agreements made pursuant to this subsection shall in all other respects be subject to the provisions of section 9 of this act: *Provided further*, That agreements made pursuant to this subsection shall not constitute a bar to petitions filed pursuant to section 9 (c) or 9 (e).

"(f) Any labor organization (as defined in sec. 2 (5)) calling a strike or work stoppage shall notify the Board thereof upon the commencement of such strike or work stoppage. Upon receipt of such notification the Board shall direct the taking of a secret ballot among the employees in the collective bargaining units in which such strike or work stoppage occurs, on the question of whether they wish to continue the strike or work stoppage. Such balloting may be conducted by mail or by any means or at any place deemed appropriate by the Board. Unless a majority of the employees eligible to vote cast their ballots in favor of a continuance thereof, such strike or work stoppage shall cease to be a protected, concerted activity within the meaning of this act."

(f) Section 9 (a) is amended by inserting immediately after the comma following the word "purposes" where it first appears in said section the following language: "or labor organizations which are parties to agreements entered into pursuant to section 8 (a) of this act,"

(g) Section 9 (c) (3) is amended to read as follows:

"(3) No election shall be directed in any bargaining unit or any subdivision within which, in the preceding 12-month period a valid election shall have been held. Employees on strike who are not entitled to reinstatement shall not be eligible to vote: *Provided*, That in any lawful strike in which recognition was not an issue when the strike began, no petition for an election filed by an employer pursuant to section 9 (c) (1) (B) shall be entertained prior to the termination of such strike or the expiration of 1 year from the commencement of such strike, whichever occurs sooner, nor shall any petition for an election filed by a labor organization other than the labor organization which called the strike be entertained for a period of 4 months after the commencement of such strike. In any election where none of the choices on the ballot receives a majority, a runoff shall be conducted, the ballot providing for a selection between the two choices receiving the largest and second largest number of valid votes cast in the election."

(h) Section 9 (e) (1) of such act is amended by inserting following the words "section 8 (a) (3)" the words "or 8 (e)."

(i) Section 9 (f) (A) of such act is amended by striking out all of the subsection numbered (6).

(j) Section 9 (h) of such act is amended by redesignating said section as "(h) (1)" and adding a new subsection "(2)" thereto as follows:

"(2) No investigation shall be made by the Board of any question affecting commerce concerning the representation of employees, raised by an employer under subsection (c) of this section, and no complaint shall be issued pursuant to a charge made by an employer under subsection (b) of section 10, unless there is on file with the Board an affidavit executed contemporaneously or within the preceding 12-month period by such employer, its officers if it is a corporation, that he is not a member of the Communist Party or affiliated with such party, and that he does not believe in, and is not a member of or does not support any organization that believes in or teaches, the overthrow of the United States Government by force or by any illegal or unconstitutional methods. The provisions of section 1001 of title 18 of the United States Code shall be applicable in respect to such affidavits."

(k) Section 10 (b) is amended by inserting immediately before the period at the end thereof, the following: ": *Provided further*, That whenever it is charged that any person has engaged in an unfair labor practice within the meaning of paragraph (4) (A), (B), or (C) of section 8 (b), the preliminary investigation of such charge shall be made forthwith and given priority over all other cases except cases of like character in the office where it is filed or to which it is referred."

(l) Section 10 (j) of such act is amended by inserting immediately before the period at the end thereof, the following: ": *Provided*, That where such temporary relief or restraining order is granted by the court in any case involving a labor dispute between an employer and a labor organization which the employer recognized when such temporary relief or restraining order was granted or was required to recognize under an outstanding order or certification of the Board, the Director of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service is directed, if such labor dispute has not been settled, immediately to appoint a board composed of citizens of the locality in which the dispute exists, to meet with the parties to such dispute and seek a settlement thereof."

(m) Such act is amended by striking out all of section 10 (l).

(n) Section 14 of such act is amended by adding thereto a new subsection "(c)," as follows:

"(c) Nothing in this act shall be construed to nullify the power of any State or Territory to protect the health or safety of the people of such State or Territory during emergencies resulting from labor disputes."

(o) Section 209 (b) of title II of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, is amended by striking out the words "sixty-day period" and in lieu thereof inserting the words "forty-day period."

(p) Section 209 of title II of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, is amended by adding thereto the following new subsection "(c)":

"(c) Upon the certification of the results of such ballot, the President, unless the dispute has been settled, shall have authority to reconvene the board of inquiry which has previously reported with respect to the dispute and direct such board to make recommendations for the settlement of the dispute, but neither party to the dispute shall be under any duty to accept, in whole or in part, any recommendations for settlement made by such board of inquiry."

(q) Section 210 of title II of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, is amended by inserting after the word "Upon" where it first appears, the words "the twentieth day following."

(r) Section 301 (e) of title III of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, is amended to read as follows:

"(e) In determining whether any person is acting as an 'agent' of another person so as to make such other person responsible for his acts, the common-law rules relating to agency shall be applicable: *Provided*, That no labor organization shall be held responsible for the acts of individual members thereof solely on the ground of such membership."

(s) Section 302 (c) of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, is amended by striking out everything between "(4)" and "(5)" therein and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "with respect to money deducted from the wages of employees in payment of membership dues in a labor organization: *Provided*, That the employer has received from each employee on whose account such deductions are made a written assignment which shall be valid until revoked in writing; or"

(t) Strike out all of subsection (a) of section 303 of title III of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, and in lieu thereof insert the following:

"(a) It shall be unlawful for the purposes of this section only, in an industry affecting commerce, for any labor organization to engage in any activity or conduct defined as an unfair labor practice in section 8 (b) (4) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended. Nothing contained in this subsection shall be construed to make unlawful a refusal by any individual employee to enter upon the premises of any employer (other than his own employer), if the employees of such employer are engaged in a strike ratified or approved by a representative of such employees whom such employer is required to recognize under the National Labor Relations Act, as amended."

(u) Title IV of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, is hereby repealed; title V of such act is redesignated as title IV; and sections 501, 502, and 503 are redesignated as sections 401, 402, and 403, respectively.

(v) The amendments made by this act shall take effect 60 days after the date of its enactment.

JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, a short time ago a hearing on juvenile delinquency was held in the city of Denver by a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary. At that time the district attorney, Mr. Keating, appeared before the committee and gave some very excellent testimony which he later put into the form of a letter to the subcommittee, dealing with the matter of parental

delinquency. He referred to cases of fathers running away and not supporting their wives and children. In a great many cases the fathers went to other States, and it was impossible to bring them back in order that appropriate action might be taken in order to compel them to support their children.

On behalf of myself, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the latter of whom some 2 or 3 years ago introduced a bill along similar lines, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide for the enforcement of support orders in certain State and Federal courts, and to make it a crime to move or travel in interstate and foreign commerce to avoid compliance with such orders.

In view of the great importance of the bill, I ask that it be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2662) to provide for the enforcement of support orders in certain State and Federal courts, and to make it a crime to move or travel in interstate and foreign commerce to avoid compliance with such orders, introduced by Mr. LANGER (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Federal Family Support Act."

SEC. 2. (a) The Congress hereby declares that every individual has a natural, moral, and social obligation to support the members of his immediate family, which obligation transcends the status of debt.

(b) The Congress further declares that, while sound national policy requires that migration from State to State be unrestricted, experience has disclosed that in the exercise of the right of migration and travel many persons leave behind them broken homes, dependent and neglected children, and spouses; that, although the courts of the State in which the family resided may have properly ordered an individual to meet his natural, moral, and social obligations, once he has removed himself to another State he has a practical sanctuary against the rightful jurisdiction of the original State of residence.

(c) The Congress further declares that in other instances the departure preceded acquisition of jurisdiction over the person by the original State's courts with like result.

(d) It is the policy of Congress in enacting this act to correct the evils outlined above (1) by requiring that orders of State courts directing individuals to meet their natural, moral, and social obligations to child and spouse shall be enforced in Federal and State courts in areas to which such individuals have migrated from the original State; (2) by giving Federal courts in States of which such migrants have become citizens original jurisdiction, in suits brought by citizens of other States, to order such migrants to meet such obligations, to the end that children and spouses will not suffer want or be made the objects of charity and thus become an unnecessary burden to the general public and be themselves thereby humiliated; and (3) by providing criminal penalties for persons who move or travel in interstate or foreign commerce to avoid compliance with support orders.

SEC. 3. Part IV of title 28 of the United States Code is hereby amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new chapter:

"CHAPTER 173—ENFORCEMENT OF STATE COURT SUPPORT ORDERS

"Sec.
"2711. Definitions.
"2712. Registration of support orders.
"2713. Enforcement.
"2714. Notice to original court.

"§ 2711. Definitions

"As used in this chapter—

"The term 'support order' means an order of a State court having jurisdiction over an individual, directing such individual to make payments periodically to (or for the support of) his spouse, former spouse, or child (whether the issue of his body, legitimate or illegitimate, or adopted).

"The term 'obligor,' with respect to a support order, means an individual who is directed to make payments under the order.

"The term 'obligee' means any person to whom the proceeds of a support order is payable for himself, or the use or benefit of another, or such beneficiary or his guardian or guardian ad litem.

"The term 'original court,' with respect to a support order, means the court in which it was made.

"The term 'State' includes the Territories and the District of Columbia.

"The term 'registered,' with respect to a support order, means registered under section 2712.

"§ 2712. Registration

"Any obligee of a support order may register the order in any district court of the United States for a district, and in any court of a State having jurisdiction of like matters, in which an obligor of the order resides, or is found, and which is outside the State in which the support order was made. Registration shall be accomplished by filing with the clerk of such court a certified copy of the support order and of each order of the original court modifying the support order.

"§ 2713. Enforcement

"(a) Any court in which a support order is registered shall entertain contempt proceedings, in the same manner as if the order were an order of such court, against an obligor who fails to comply with the order within 30 days after being served notice that it has been registered.

"(b) No proceedings to enforce a support order shall be begun in any court under this section unless a copy of each order of the original court modifying the support order is registered under section 2712.

"(c) The cost of enforcement proceedings under this section shall be taxed against the party against whom the issues are resolved. The obligor shall be required to pay a reasonable attorney fee to the obligee if the court finds the proceedings were necessary to compel the obligor to comply with the support order.

"§ 2714. Notice to original court

"When, in any court, any support order is registered or any proceedings are taken under section 2713 to enforce a support order, written notice of such action under the seal of such court shall be sent to the original court."

SEC. 4. Section 1332 of title 28 of the United States Code is hereby amended by striking out subsection (b) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(b) Each district court located in a State shall have original jurisdiction, concurrent with State courts, of civil actions brought by a citizen of another State to order a citizen of the State in which the court is located to make payments periodically to (or for the support of) his spouse, or child (whether the issue of his body, legitimate or illegitimate, or adopted) if under the law of such State a State court is authorized to make such an order, as an incident to a divorce proceeding or otherwise. Nothing in this subsection shall authorize any district court to make a decree of divorce or separation, or to order an individual to make any payments to (or for the support of) a spouse who has without legal justification quit the home of such individual.

"(c) The words 'State' and 'States,' as used in this section, include the Territories and the District of Columbia."

SEC. 5. The jurisdiction of the courts upon which jurisdiction is conferred by sections 3 and 4 of this act shall not be affected by the amount of controversy, and such court shall have the power to enforce its orders by proceedings against either the person or property of the obligor, or both.

SEC. 6. The table of contents of part I of title 18 of the United States Code is hereby amended by inserting after

"1. General provisions..... 1"

the following:

"2. Abandonment or desertion of minor children..... 21"

SEC. 7. Part I of title 18 of the United States Code is hereby amended by inserting at the end of chapter 1 the following new chapter:

"CHAPTER 2—ABANDONMENT OF DEPENDENTS

"Sec.
"21. Definitions.
"22. Abandonment and desertion.
"23. Prima facie evidence.
"24. Testimony of wife.

"§ 21. Definitions.

"As used in this chapter—

"The term 'support order' means an order of a State court having jurisdiction over an individual, directing such individual to make payments periodically to (or for the support of) his spouse, former spouse, or child (whether the issue of his body, legitimate or illegitimate, or adopted).

"The term 'State' includes the Territories and the District of Columbia.

"§ 22. Abandonment and desertion.

"Any individual who, to avoid compliance with a support order, shall travel or move in interstate or foreign commerce, from the State in which such support order was issued or from any State in which proceedings have been instituted under chapter 173 of title 28 of the United States Code, shall be punished by a fine of not more than $2,500, or by imprisonment for not more than 3 years, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

"§ 23. Prima facie evidence.

"For the purposes of this chapter, failure of any individual to comply with the terms of a support order, after travel or movement in interstate or foreign commerce shall constitute prima facie evidence that such individual so traveled or moved with intent to avoid compliance with such support order, if personal service (including service by registered United States mail) of a certified copy of such support order has been had on such individual.

"§ 24. Testimony of wife.

"In all criminal proceedings under this chapter a wife may testify against her husband without his consent."

SEC. 8. Section 3237 of title 18 of the United States Code is hereby amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"Any offense under the provisions of chapter 2 of this title, is a continuing offense and may be inquired of and prosecuted, in any district from, through, or into which,

such offender so travels or moves, or in the district where the offender is found."

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency of the Committee on the Judiciary, I should like to say that the subcommittee has under consideration right at this time the problem to which the Senator from North Dakota has been referring.

Mr. LANGER. The distinguished Senator from New Jersey no doubt noted that I read his name as one of the cosponsors of the bill I have introduced.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. The members of my subcommittee are mindful of the facts which the Senator from North Dakota and his subcommittee developed in Denver.

MEMBERSHIP OF EX-PRESIDENTS ON NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, it has often seemed to me that after our public officials have either been defeated in election or have voluntarily retired from office, we in the United States have not taken full advantage of a great deal of the experience they have had, particularly in matters nonpartisan in nature. It seems to me we could well avail ourselves of the great experience of some of those who have served in public office, particularly in such fields.

Therefore, I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill to provide that ex-Presidents of the United States shall be members of the National Security Council. It seems to me that we as a nation could profit a great deal by their experience and advice, particularly in such matters as affect all the people of the United States and are not partisan in character.

The bill (S. 2663) to provide that ex-Presidents of the United States shall be members of the National Security Council, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

AMENDMENT OF CLASSIFICATION ACT OF 1949 AND FEDERAL EMPLOYEES PAY ACT OF 1945

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill amending the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, and the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, as amended, and for other purposes.

In my judgment the time is overdue when these acts should be amended in order that the so-called fringe benefits of Federal employees may be made more equitable and the pay structure more nearly consistent with practices in private industry. If this is done, I feel certain it will mean a more economical program for the taxpayer and at the same time improve working conditions and the morale of the employees.

Therefore, this bill will provide for a strong incentive award program, revise the supergrades in the Classification Act of 1949, and Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945. The whole structure of the bill, in my judgment, will help to bring about a more coordinated and an improved civil-service program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2665) to amend the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, and the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, as amended, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. CARLSON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS ON TREATIES AND EXECUTIVE AGREEMENTS

Mr. LANGER submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 54), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary 2,000 additional copies of the hearings relative to treaties and executive agreements held before a subcommittee of the above committee during the 83d Congress, 1st session.

SUSPENSION OF OPERATIONS OF NEW POWER POLICY AND MARKETING CRITERIA WITH REFERENCE TO MISSOURI RIVER BASIN

Mr. LANGER (for himself and Mr. HUNT) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 176), which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

Whereas on September 14, 1953, the Department of the Interior announced a new power policy and marketing criteria for the eastern and western divisions of the Missouri River Basin which became effective prior to the reconvening of Congress; and

Whereas the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly Legislation of the Committee on the Judiciary has commenced hearings on the new power policy and marketing criteria to determine its possible effects on competition within the electrical industry which hearings have not been completed: Be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the United States Senate that the Secretary of the Interior suspend further operation of the new power policy and marketing criteria for the Missouri Valley Basin for a period of 90 days following the adoption of this resolution in order to give the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly Legislation an opportunity to complete its investigation and study.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS RELATIVE TO ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

Mr. WILEY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 177), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Foreign Relations 500 additional copies of the hearings relative to the St. Lawrence seaway held during the 83d Congress, 1st session, by the said committee.

APPOINTMENT OF COMMITTEE BY UNITED NATIONS TO INVESTIGATE COMMUNIST ATROCITIES IN KOREA

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, I submit for appropriate reference a resolution expressing the grave concern of the Senate over the commission of Communist war atrocities against American and other United Nations personnel in Korea, and requesting that the United States delegation to the United Nations ask for the establishment of an impartial investigating commission, consisting of representative member nations, to inquire into and report the facts of all war crimes committed by the North Korean and Chinese Communist forces in or near Korea since June 24, 1950, and the means of subjecting the criminals responsible to just and lawful punishment.

Most of my colleagues, I am sure, have read or heard of the calculated acts or omissions to act on the part of the Red Chinese and North Korean Communist Armies against American and Allied prisoners of war. I can say to you, Mr. President, that some of these acts were so inhuman, so cruel, and so animal-like that common decency prevents me from reporting them in complete detail. However, I suggest that each of my colleagues read the testimony presented before our subcommittee last month by GI's, field commanders in Korea, and officials of the War Crimes Division, to learn first-hand of the true nature of this vicious Communist enemy.

As a proud Nation of God-loving civilized people, as a member Nation of the United Nations, and as a Nation dedicated to every principle of justice and respecting every inherent right of man, we cannot and must not allow these crimes to remain unpunished.

To do this would not only be an ineffaceable blot of disgrace on our national honor, but it would also be a sin against every mother, wife, sweetheart, and relative who has given a man in defense of our great Nation.

To do this would not only demonstrate a weakness in the eyes of all free nations, but would also give the Communists carte-blanche permission to continue the commission of these ruthless barbarisms in the future.

No, we cannot afford to sweep these horrible facts under the rug as though they did not happen. On the contrary, it is our duty—indeed, our responsibility, as a free Nation, and particularly as a member of the United Nations, to make certain that those responsible for these war crimes are sought out and that appropriate punishment is administered to them.

On October 28, 1950, General MacArthur, then Commander in Chief of the United Nations Command in Korea, set up a military commission to try accused war criminals. Therefore, in view of the number of provable cases of Communist war atrocities documented in the files, and since it has been established that these crimes were deliberately perpetrated by the Communist aggressor, it now becomes necessary to prosecute these war criminals as was done with the

Nazi and Japanese war criminals following World War II.

Accordingly, I am submitting the resolution expressing our deep concern over these barbaric Communist atrocities, and urging our delegation to the United Nations to ask for the establishment of an impartial investigating commission to inquire into and to report upon these atrocities and devise a means of prosecuting those found responsible.

We suffered more than 14,000 casualties in Korea; let us never for a moment forget this sad but true fact. If this Nation is to stand for real justice, we must stand for its every principle. Therefore, I hope this distinguished body will unanimously endorse the resolution at the earliest possible time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 178), submitted by Mr. POTTER, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Whereas the Communists in Korea have committed revolting atrocities against members of the armed services of the United States and members of other United Nations forces; and

Whereas the American people are gravely concerned that the commission of these atrocities should not go unpunished; and

Whereas it is the sense and desire of the Senate that speedy prosecution and conviction of the offenders under applicable law would not only mete out justice against the guilty, but would also be a warning to deter the commission of such offenses in the future: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate and its strong desire that the United States delegation to the United Nations urge the United Nations to establish an impartial investigating committee composed of representative member nations or representative members of the International Red Cross to inquire into and report upon atrocities committed in or near Korea since June 24, 1950, and the means of subjecting the criminals responsible to just and lawful punishment.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I am sure that Senators who were present in the Chamber and heard the statement made by the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER] were impressed with the importance of bringing to the attention of the American people the atrocities which heretofore have not been fully disclosed.

In the Saturday Evening Post of November 1953 there appeared an editorial entitled "Red Murder of 6,000 GI's Finally Angers Us."

In the days ahead it might be well for those in responsible position who are negotiating and hoping to make deals with the Reds, to read and reread this editorial, because it strikes a responsive chord in millions of American hearts and minds.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be placed in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, lest we forget.

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

RED MURDER OF 6,000 GI'S FINALLY ANGERS US

The United States has finally decided to get mad about the torture and murder of more than 6,000 American soldiers, not to mention unknown thousands of Koreans, by the Chinese and North Korean Communists. The American delegate to the United Nations has finally managed to bring this outrage to the official attention of the United Nations Assembly.

But the 6,000 American dead whose sacrifice has finally aroused official indignation are the same men whose murder was reported 2 years ago by Col. James M. Hanley, chief of the Eighth Army's section concerned with war crimes. Colonel Hanley estimated that about 6,100 American GI's had been killed by Chinese or North Koreans. The estimate in the recent release by the Department of Defense is substantially the same.

When Colonel Hanley made his statement, which might have been expected to arouse the indignation of civilized people throughout the world, the reaction was one of distress that the colonel should so far have forgotten himself as to fail to have the information cleared in Washington. Our allies in the United Nations were indignant that atrocity stories should be bruited about at a time when a cease-fire agreement with the Communists was in the making. General Ridgway, at that time supreme commander in Korea, commented on Colonel Hanley's statement in a gingerly fashion, forbearing to indicate that he was talking about the Chinese Communists. He did, however, state that it was possible that Colonel Hanley's estimate was correct.

Public indignation in this country seems to have been confined to a few Members of Congress like Representative W. STERLING COLE, of New York, who stated that the United Nations must deal with these outrages or "it might just as well not meet again." Doubtless the relatives of American soldiers reported as missing were indignant, but the official view was that nothing should be done to upset the cease-fire applecart by irritating the Communists. Somewhat more rational was the feeling that publication of the report might endanger the lives of United Nations soldiers still in the hands of the Reds.

All this was in late 1951. The truce negotiations continued for almost 2 years, during which, according to eminent military authority, we withheld our Sunday punch and accepted every humiliation heaped upon us by the Communists, all in the interest of peace. Eventually, we got the truce. What that amounts to remains to be seen. What we shall never know is what would have happened if our official representatives had shown as much spirit when Colonel Hanley's statement first appeared as we are showing, now that it is too late for moral indignation to have any effect on the truce terms.

It is just possible that this country might have developed moral indigation enough to slam the Communists out of the ring, regardless of what our U. N. associates thought about it. Maybe that would have been bad, but it would at least have been more satisfying than to continue dealing with murderers as if they were decent and responsible statesmen.

CONTINUATION OF AUTHORITY FOR TEMPORARY EMPLOYMENT OF TWO ADDITIONAL CLERICAL ASSISTANTS BY COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported the following original resolution (S. Res. 179), which was ordered to be placed on the Calendar:

Resolved, That the authority of the Committee on Foreign Relations, under Senate Resolution 146, 82d Congress, agreed to August 6, 1951, Senate Resolution 249, 82d Congress, agreed to January 15, 1952, and Senate Resolution 33, 83d Congress, agreed to January 31, 1953, authorizing the Committee on Foreign Relations to employ two additional clerical assistants, is hereby continued until January 31, 1955.

AMENDMENT OF RULE RELATING TO STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Mr. KNOWLAND (for himself and Mr. JOHNSON of Texas) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 180), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That during the remainder of the 83d Congress section (1) of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate (relating to standing committees) is amended—

(1) By striking out "11" in subsection (e) (relating to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service) and inserting in lieu thereof "13"; and

(2) By striking out "11" in subsection (a) (relating to the Committee on Public Works) and inserting in lieu thereof "13."

SEC. 2. Section 4 of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, as amended, is further amended by striking out "14" and inserting in lieu thereof "18," and by adding the following new paragraph:

"(b) In the event that during the remainder of the 83d Congress members of one party in the Senate are replaced by members of the other party, the 21 third committee assignments shall in such event be distributed in accordance with the following table:

Senate seats		Third committee assignments	
Majority	Minority	Majority	Minority
48	48	18	3
49	47	16	5
50	46	14	7
51	45	12	9"

INCREASED LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES BY COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. WATKINS submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 181), which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

Resolved, That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by subsection (k) of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, or by section 134 (a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized during the period beginning on February 1, 1954, and ending on January 31, 1955, to make such expenditures, and to employ upon a temporary basis such investigators, and such technical, clerical, and other assistance, as it deems advisable.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $87,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

INVESTIGATION OF PROBLEMS RELATING TO ECONOMIC STABILIZATION AND MOBILIZATION, BANKING POLICIES, ETC. (S. REPT. NO. 846)

Mr. CAPEHART, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 182) and

submitted a report thereon. The resolution was ordered to be placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Banking and Currency, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed during the period from February 1, 1954, to January 31, 1955, inclusive, to make a full and complete study and investigation of such problems as it may deem proper relating to (1) economic stabilization and mobilization; (2) domestic and international banking policies, including Federal Reserve matters and deposit insurance; (3) construction of housing and community facilities; (4) Federal loan policies; and (5) securities and exchange regulation.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized until January 31, 1955, inclusive, (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems advisable; and (3) with the consent of the head of the department of agency concerned, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to expend not to exceed $16,000 in addition to any other unobligated balance of funds made available pursuant to Senate Resolution 42, 83d Congress, 1st session, agreed to on January 30, 1953.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

STUDY OF OPERATIONS OF THE EXPORT-IMPORT BANK AND THE INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT (S. REPT. NO. 847)

Mr. CAPEHART, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 183) and submitted a report thereon. The resolution was ordered to be placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Banking and Currency, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a thorough study of the operations of the Export-Import Bank and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and their relationship to expansion of international trade.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized until January 31, 1955, inclusive, (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable within the limits of funds made available by this resolution; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems advisable; and (3) with the consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. Expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $83,000 in addition to any other unobligated balance of funds made available pursuant to Senate Resolution 25, 83d Congress, 1st session, agreed to on June 8, 1953, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

AMENDMENT OF AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1938, AS AMENDED—AMENDMENTS

Mr. KERR submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 2643) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

COINAGE OF 50-CENT PIECES TO COMMEMORATE THE SESQUICENTENNIAL OF LOUISIANA PURCHASE—AMENDMENTS

Mr. LONG submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 1917) to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces to commemorate the sesquicentennial of the Louisiana Purchase, which were ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON S. 2308, TO AUTHORIZE AND DIRECT THE INVESTIGATION BY THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF CERTAIN OFFENSES

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on behalf of a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Friday, January 15, 1954, at 10 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, on S. 2308, a bill to authorize and direct the investigation by the Attorney General of certain offenses, and for other purposes. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the proposed legislation may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of myself, chairman, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN].

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUTLER of Maryland in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

MUTUAL DEFENSE TREATY WITH KOREA—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

The PRESIDING OFFICER. As in executive session, the Chair lays before the Senate Executive A, 83d Congress, 2d session, a mutual defense treaty between the United States of America and the Republic of Korea, signed at Washington on October 1, 1953.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the injunction of secrecy be removed from the treaty, that the treaty, together with the President's message, be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and that the President's message be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from California? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The President's message is as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith the Mutual Defense Treaty between the United States of America and the Republic of Korea, signed at Washington on October 1, 1953.

I transmit also for the information of the Senate a document containing the joint statement by President Syngman Rhee of the Republic of Korea and by the Secretary of State on August 8, 1953, on the occasion of the initialing of the Mutual Defense Treaty in Seoul, and the text of an address by the Secretary of State on the occasion of the signing of the Mutual Defense Treaty on October 1, 1953.

There is further transmitted for the information of the Senate the report made to me by the Secretary of State regarding the aforesaid treaty.

The Mutual Defense Treaty signed by the United States and the Republic of Korea is designed to deter aggression by giving evidence of our common determination to meet the common danger. It thus reaffirms our belief that the security of an individual nation in the free world depends upon the security of its partners, and constitutes another link in the collective security of the free nations of the Pacific.

I recommend that the Senate give early favorable consideration to the treaty submitted herewith, and advise and consent to its ratification.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 11, 1954.*

(Enclosures: (1) Report of the Secretary of State; (2) mutual defense treaty with Korea; (3) joint statement by President Syngman Rhee and the Secretary of State; (4) address by the Secretary of State.)

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON CERTAIN NOMINATIONS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the following nominations were received today from the President of the United States:

Willard L. Beaulac, of Rhode Island, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Chile, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

Wiley T. Buchanan, Jr., of the District of Columbia, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Luxembourg, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

Selden Chapin, of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Panama, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

Hugh S. Cumming, Jr., of Virginia, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipo-

tentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Indonesia, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

Robert C. Hill, of New Hampshire, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Costa Rica, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

U. Alexis Johnson, of California, a Foreign Officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Czechoslovakia, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

H. Freeman Matthews, of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of the Netherlands, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

Dempster McIntosh, of Pennsylvania, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Oriental Republic of Uruguay, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

John E. Peurifoy, of South Carolina, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Guatemala, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

Rudolf E. Schoenfeld, of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Colombia, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

George Wadsworth, of New York, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of Yemen, to which offices he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

C. Tyler Wood, of the District of Columbia, to be Economic Coordinator—special representative for Korea—to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

Persons to be members of the Public Advisory Board, Foreign Operations Administration, to which office they were appointed during the last recess of the Senate:

Mrs. Mildred C. Ahlgren, of Indiana.

Richard L. Bowditch, of Massachusetts.

Arthur J. Connell, of Connecticut.

Miss Helen G. Irwin, of Iowa.

Allan Blair Kline, of Iowa.

Mrs. Lucille Leonard, of Rhode Island.

Herschel D. Newsom, of the District of Columbia.

James G. Patton, of Colorado.

Abbott McConnell Washburn, of Minnesota, to be Deputy Director of the United States Information Agency, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

Notice is given that the nominations listed above will be considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations after 6 days have expired, in accordance with the committee rule.

BUNGLING OF DEFENSE AGREEMENTS IN EUROPE—ARTICLE BY GORDON W. RULE

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I hold in my hand an article which appeared in the Saturday Evening Post of November 21, 1953, and which is entitled "I Saw Us Bungle Defense Agreements in Europe." The author of this article is Capt. Gordon W. Rule, United States Navy Reserve, who was and is in a position to know what he is talking about. Captain Rule is a specialist in procurement and contract negotiation, and I consider him to be one of the ablest men in his field. I know he is an intensely loyal and patriotic American, and I am sure Senators will be interested in the article he has written. I therefore ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

I SAW US BUNGLE DEFENSE AGREEMENTS IN EUROPE

(By Gordon W. Rule)

For 9 months recently, I drew a handsome Government salary and allowance in Europe at the expense of the American taxpayers. They were gypped, and I feel they should know why. Not that this is a confessional, for I did not consciously go to Europe to ride the gravy train. I went there to do a job of the utmost importance to the security of Europe—and the United States. I was not permitted to do so by our embassies and our Department of State. It is the reasons behind this failure that are important, not just my unearned paychecks. For those reasons were the result of a situation which is exactly the same today as it was when I returned to Washington in disgust to have my job abolished as a waste of the taxpayers' money.

It was a good job, too, as Government pay scales go, for the basic salary, combined with overseas allowances and per diem pay, figured out to a stipend of nearly $17,000 a year after taxes—which is what I would have earned if I had had the gall to stick it out for a full year. Nine frustrating months were enough to convince me, however, that I should return to my private law practice in Washington. I did so with great relief, but also with much concern at what I had seen. For it had been my unhappy privilege to sit at the negotiating table and watch our State Department Foreign Service officers bungle major negotiations with our European allies, to the detriment of the United States Treasury and the efforts of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization to build the West's defenses against the Soviet threat—which we must continue to do.

After spending this time in Europe, working with our embassies on the Continent, I am convinced that the United States is woefully lacking in capable, experienced negotiators who can sit down at a conference table with representatives of other countries and at least hold their own. I think our average representatives—be they career foreign servants, politically appointed ambassadors or what have you—do the best job they know how to do, but just because a man spends 20 years in our Foreign Service or is a successful business or professional man who has made large political contributions is no assurance that he can properly negotiate in the best interests of the United States. I submit, the opposite may well be true.

Insofar as our defense negotiations with other NATO countries are concerned, I know that not only do we not have properly trained men conducting our negotiations but many of them are being conducted in a shameful fashion. When I speak of defense negotiations, I refer to the negotiating of important bilateral agreements which commit the United States to certain courses of action and under which hundreds of millions of our taxpayers' dollars will be spent in foreign countries. More precisely, I refer to the agreements which our country must make with our NATO partners for military bases and facilities for United States forces in those countries.

One thing I wish to make perfectly clear. I am not an expert on embassy procedure generally. I have neither the desire nor the ability to crusade for overall embassy reform. But I was exposed to a sufficient number of our career diplomats with whom I had to work on defense negotiations to realize that, in my opinion, they are not keeping uppermost in their minds at all times what to me is fundamental—namely, the best interests of the United States. I must confine the above statement to defense matters, because that is what I was engaged in.

These were the negotiations which I was supposed to conduct for the United States Department of Defense when I went to Europe in August of 1952 to conduct negotiations for United States military operating rights and facilities in NATO and Western European countries for the purpose of providing facilities for peacetime training and maneuvers and military operations in time of war. I took on the assignment because I felt it was so important that no man could or should refuse to take it if asked. It was obvious to me that the principal purpose of our forces being in Europe at all was to be able to fight for our allies and ourselves, and that in order to fight we must have the necessary bases and facilities as soon as possible. I felt that with just a fair amount of cooperation from the military and the United States embassies in Europe, the job could be done well and expeditiously.

The latter supposition was based on past personal experience, for I was not exactly a stranger to the art of negotiation. Though a lawyer by profession, I am a naval officer by avocation. I entered the Navy in April of 1942 as a junior grade lieutenant, serving in the South Pacific as a line officer until I was ordered back to Washington in July of 1944 to work on Navy contracts. I went to inactive duty in 1946 with the rank of captain, but as a result of the Korean war, I left my law office and voluntarily returned to active duty in March of 1951, to negotiate again on behalf of the Navy for ships and other items. During my two periods of active duty with the Navy, I personally negotiated and signed contracts involving more than $2 billion of American taxpayers' money.

In the spring of 1952 the Navy sent me to Europe to negotiate with foreign governments approximately $150 million worth of contracts for naval vessels. This was under the offshore procurement program whereby we made part of our contribution to the military strength of European nations by paying for production of military items—in this case ships—to be used by our NATO allies. Although this was an entirely new field of Navy procurement, the job went quite well. As a contracting officer with power to make decisions on the spot and

sign for our Government, I was somewhat of an innovation to our embassies in the countries I visited, and in all but one country the State Department officials let me alone to conduct these government-to-government negotiations as I saw fit, because not even an ambassador can tell a contracting officer what sort of contract to negotiate and sign.

Not that I didn't have some troubles. Everywhere I went the foreign government officials with whom I negotiated would run to our embassy or our economic mission, during the negotiations, in an attempt to get me to change my position on various aspects of the bargaining. I do not criticize them for this at all—that is negotiating from their point of view. I did learn very soon that our embassy representatives were most anxious to help the foreign countries get what they wanted from us. In one case I made the mistake of telling our embassy team the best terms I hoped to get and the least I would settle for on several points under discussion. In less than a day the foreign negotiators were demanding the poorest settlement I would accept on every one of these points. I never made that mistake again.

One item on which I insisted was inclusion in the contracts of a clause limiting the profits to be made by the shipyards which would build the ships we were buying to give away. When I made this demand in the first country I visited on this assignment, a country with quite a reputation for getting everything it wants from us, I was told that only the president of the nation could make such a decision. So I gave their negotiators 48 hours to get the right decision or, I announced, I would close the negotiations and move on to another country. The proper decision was obtained, and we parted with respect for each other, although I was far from being a popular figure. This convinced me that foreign government officials prefer firmness and clarity to pussyfooting and indecision.

Nor did I ingratiate myself with a United States minister who had charge of all our give-away programs in another country. He knew how much money I could spend there, and he became quite unhappy because I negotiated the contract for about half the money allotted, thus reducing his total give-away for that year. The minister circulated reports that I had been too blunt in my talks with Government officials in that country. I confess that I was blunt, because I had received a signed statement that after the shipyards in that country had submitted estimates to their Government of what it would cost to build the required ships certain officials of that Government had told the yards to raise the estimates because Uncle Sam could pay more. I was thus on notice that the estimates were likely to be inflated and had to clear up the point. You don't clear up points like that with anything but plain talk. My friend, the minister, was understandably shocked, because he doesn't comprehend that such things really happen in this world.

These sour notes notwithstanding, the Navy concluded the best offshore procurement contracts in existence today, from the point of view of the American taxpayer. I returned to the United States, received a Navy commendation, and was released to inactive duty in July of 1952.

This experience abroad confirmed a set of basic negotiating principles which I had learned and which I firmly believe should be applied to any negotiation on behalf of the United States. These principles are as follows:

1. For lasting results, a negotiator must seek to accomplish a fair result for both parties; but if err he must, it should be in favor of the United States.

2. If the best possible results are sought, the first-team negotiators should conduct the negotiations. Don't play the second team or the reserves and expect first-team results.

3. There is no such thing as a popular negotiator. One can gain genuine respect, but a negotiator who thinks he can be popular and well liked while negotiating with the United States funds cannot achieve maximum results.

4. Where the United States funds are involved, a negotiator must think, act, and make decisions as though he were spending his own money—not someone else's.

Although I have always enjoyed Navy duty and consider it a privilege, I was anxious to get back to my law practice. But just as I was getting out the Department of Defense asked me to return to Europe as a civilian to undertake the bilateral negotiations for base rights and facilities. "What we need on this job," said the Defense Department official who offered it to me, "is an experienced negotiator who is also an S. O. B." I was persuaded he had the right man.

I realized when I took the job that there were difficulties inherent in trying to reconcile the views of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and the State and Defense Departments, in dealing with our own Embassies in Europe, and last but not least in negotiating with the foreign countries. These I accepted as hazards of the game and they only added to the challenge.

I underwent lengthy briefings in Washington and had conversations with all the top military authorities and with State Department officials. It became apparent, even before I left for Europe, that the difficulties would be greater than I had initially expected. I would be asking the foreign countries for something for the United States as distinguished from our giving them something. The distinction is important because the vast majority of Americans employed abroad today are engaged in one form or another of our aid programs. But I was amazed to learn, while still in Washington, that there was no connection whatsoever between give away and get back. In other words, no matter how many hundreds of millions we might give country X, I could in no way try to synchronize this with what the United States might want from that country by way of land, for example, on which to train United States soldiers so they would be better prepared to help defend that country in case of war. I wasn't interested in any strict quid pro quo—just a commonsense, businesslike approach such as any of our NATO partners would use under similar circumstances. But the Assistant Secretary of State in charge of these matters told me flatly that the Department would not permit the two aspects to be handled together in any way. I began to wonder whether there was any meaning to a part of my official job description which said I was to "see that American aid and diplomacy are utilized to achieve the facilities which we require."

I left for Paris to join the staff of Ambassador William H. Draper, special representative of the President in Europe, assigned to NATO. I recruited three young able lawyers to assist me. We worked day and night studying economic, political, and military data about the NATO countries, analyzing and codifying all previous agreements, and generally preparing to do the job and come home.

In the first country I visited I found that our Ambassador—supposedly one of our best career men—and his staff literally refused to cooperate with anyone from Ambassador Draper's staff. Moreover, our Ambassador delegated all responsibility for the negotiations, which I thought I was sent to conduct, to a first secretary five steps removed from the Ambassador. The first secretary—one of several—was a pleasant young man, in his late twenties or early thirties, with absolutely no experience in such matters. He also had a full day's work to do aside from the military base negotiations.

But we were informed that I would not be permitted to negotiate with the country because that was the Embassy's job and all contacts, appointments, telephone calls, and the negotiations themselves would be handled by the first secretary. He informed me and my three associates that we could advise him if he asked us to, but otherwise it was his show.

I was shocked at the negative attitude prevailing in that and other embassies. They are staffed with experts on why something could not be done, on why meetings could not be set up. They wanted to compromise issues immediately, and they even refused to let us ask the country for certain contracting procedures, because they felt they knew best what was good for that country. Finally, when a special ambassador was sent from Washington at the request of the Secretary of Defense, and he bypassed the embassy by going directly to the foreign officials on the procedural questions, they were readily agreed to.

But weeks would go by before we could even have a meeting in some countries. When a session was finally arranged, the unprepared first secretary insisted on doing the negotiating, and he got nowhere. It was pitiful to watch. Even more discouraging was the fact that by putting a first secretary in charge for the United States, the pattern of the whole negotiation was set. The foreign country, naturally, used a representative of equivalent rank. There we were, five grades down from the top levels on both sides, so decisions had to travel a most tortuous and devious route. This is what is known as relegating negotiations to the "mattress mice" rather than keeping them on the proper plane. Under such circumstances we could hardly expect any country to take seriously the contention of American military authorities that the requirements for bases and facilities were of the utmost importance and deserving of the highest priority.

Many able people work for months preparing requirements, language, and so on, in the field, in the military services in Washington, in the Office of the Secretary of Defense, in the Department of State, and in the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and after all this effort and work an ambassador tells one of his young men, who never saw such a thing before, to conduct the actual negotiations.

And there I sat, able, willing, and ready to conduct the negotiations, drawing a large salary supposedly for doing just that, but not permitted to do so. There was no accountability on the first secretary's part for his failures or mistakes. All that happened was that our NATO commitments fell further behind schedule, our military services had to live with the mistakes, and in some cases we had to do without the desired bases entirely.

I can't blame the negotiators from the foreign countries for taking every advantage of our juvenile representatives. They would be foolish, from the viewpoint of their immediate national interest, not to do so. I could hardly blame them for laughing at our immature efforts in the so-called art of diplomacy.

But the results can be terribly serious. For example, the United States had been trying for more than 2 years to conclude an agreement for construction of an aviation-fuel pipeline from a French seaport to a point beyond the Paris area, which was to be financed with United States funds. Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway, then Supreme Allied Commander in Europe, had placed this pipeline as No. 1 on his list of priority projects, for you can't fly a jet fighter on cognac, and French cognac is good. But the issue was bogged down in a debate over control of the pipeline.

Although several United States congressional groups have cited this pipeline as an example of French noncooperation, I can't

blame the French. I blame ourselves for our inept handling of the matter. If our Paris Embassy really wanted to get prompt results, the Ambassador or at least his No. 2 man would have gone to work; or the Embassy might have permitted Ambassador Draper's full-time, experienced, but unemployed negotiators to move in and conclude the job. I warned the Embassy that the assignment would be taken out of its hands if action was not forthcoming. That is just what happened when Secretary of Defense Charles E. Wilson and Assistant Secretary Frank Nash came to Paris for the NATO meetings last April and concluded the negotiations the easy way, by capitulating completely to the French. Even the Embassy could have done this, months ago. Thus there never was a negotiation worthy of the name, and the whole job was thoroughly bungled. There must have been some anxious head scratching in American military circles during the French public-utility strikes last August.

While weeks and months passed with no progress at all toward obtaining bases and facilities for our forces, our missions and Embassies all over Western Europe were driving full speed ahead on our giveaway programs, which had priority over everything else. I can't adequately describe the cajoling, the arguing, the threatening, the fighting we went through with the people in our own Embassies in an attempt to get action on our military-base rights in step with our aid programs. We couldn't seem to convince them that if war came, all the aid in the form of dollars, offshore procurement items, and so on, would not fuel a single fighter, build a single airstrip, or provide naval port facilities.

These base-rights agreements are not only necessary for the logistic support of our troops but are also most important from a dollars-and-cents point of view. We can't just walk into a country, pick out a nice 5,000-acre site and build an airbase as if we were so many Russians. We have to negotiate what local taxes, what import and export duties, what port, landing, and other fees we should pay. We must get an agreement for general operating rights for our troops in the host country, determine what kind of money we shall use to pay our troops, agree on the residual value of our installations when we leave, work out many questions of jurisdiction over our forces while we are in the country, agree on the sharing of costs of our occupation, and on many other questions involving not only rights and privileges but dollars and cents. These agreements set the basic ground rules for hundreds of millions of dollars in expenditures on construction and contracting. Much congressional criticism has been leveled at the armed services for wasteful expenditures and faulty construction of bases, but I know of no group in Congress that ever looked at the heart of the question—to see just how and by whom the agreements that set the construction procedure were negotiated.

Generally speaking, where only United States money is involved, the military wants to make construction contracts the way it makes them in the United States—to draw the plans and specifications, determine the lowest responsible bidder, award and sign the contract and then inspect and supervise the work. Some foreign countries, however, feel they should do all these things, thereby gaining control of our expenditures.

In one country, notorious for its 10-percent kickbacks on all construction contracts, I was to draft a memorandum restating our position, which had already been given orally. The foreign country's position was directly opposite ours. Again, a part-time first secretary was put in charge with exactly the same lack of experience and lack of results—his full-time job was on giveaway programs. I wrote in my memo that in order to safeguard the expenditures of United States funds we must have the right to award the contract, and we must have the right to inspect and supervise the work. This was only a negotiating paper, but the Ambassador concerned struck out all the "musts" and inserted "desires to" in each instance. One can imagine how impressed the foreign government was with our desires.

I also got a sharp verbal rap on the knuckles from the Embassy for presuming to mention during these negotiations that a contractor in that same country had come to our military to ask where he should pay his 10-percent kickback. But the contractor was properly startled when we took care of that matter by cutting his bill to Uncle Sam by 10 percent.

My experiences with American diplomats abroad were not all bad, of course. The smaller Embassies, I found, were by far the best from the standpoint of a will to get ahead with a job and produce results. Ambassador Eugenie Anderson and her staff in Denmark, and Ambassador John E. Peurifoy in Greece, were the outstanding examples in this respect. But two of our larger Embassies on the Continent offset such happier experiences.

In another country we had been waiting more than 2 months for a very basic decision, and time was of the essence. Coincidentally, word came to notify this particular government that we now had so many more millions of dollar aid available for that country. Again I went to the Ambassador and begged him at least to mention the decision we wanted, and had to have, while breaking the pleasant news of our new bounty. He and his staff refused even to mention the two things together.

This was the last straw for me. I had gone to Europe to conduct negotiations with foreign countries for military bases that we urgently needed. Our Embassies wouldn't let me do this. I had pleaded for some businesslike approach to synchronize our aid with the facilities we needed, as my job description said I should, but I failed to budge the Embassies' determination not to do so. I had drawn large paychecks monthly without earning one of them—unless it was by negotiating with our own Embassies. This can become most demoralizing.

I therefore sent the Secretary of Defense a very strong cable, by military rather than Embassy communications, in which I warned that we might never get one agreement, while another would be far from satisfactory as a result of the Embassies' ineptitude. I further stated that under existing procedures my job was a complete phony, that I was not earning my pay, that I was not hired to advise a first secretary, and that I wanted no further part of the show unless the situation was changed to allow me to conduct the negotiations as I was hired to do and could do.

When one of the ambassadors concerned heard about this cable he sent an "Eyes Only" cable to Secretary of State John Foster Dulles, asking that I be withdrawn from the negotiations for criticizing his Embassy and sending a message by military communications. I was delighted to learn that this cable had been sent, because I felt certain that Secretary Dulles, who had taken office nearly 6 months after I was sent to Europe, would be fair enough to look into the merits of my complaints and possibly take corrective steps. I had called the shots as I saw them, and knowing the Secretary's reputation, I felt that he would appreciate honest criticism.

But a friend of the Ambassador, a career man in the State Department, evidently came to my same line of reasoning, because I was reliably informed that this career man stopped the message intended only for the eyes of the Secretary of State and that Mr. Dulles, in fact, probably never saw the Ambassador's dispatch. In any event, I immediately became persona non grata at the Embassy involved, whereupon I returned to Washington and had my job abolished in order that no one else would get stuck with it.

One might ask why, instead of writing this article, I do not take this matter up with the new men now running our State Department, for surely they would do something about it. I wish it were that simple. I think the case of the "Eyes Only" cable, just cited, indicates a part of the problem. It must be remembered that the faces of only a relatively few top people are new ones in the Department, that, basically, the same team is calling the signals and running the show. It would be the height of optimism—and I am an optimist—to expect the necessary changes to come from within. Moreover, although the United States may have appointed new and able ambassadors to some foreign countries, the career Foreign Service officers in those countries will most assuredly attempt, and perhaps with success, to indoctrinate our freshly minted diplomats into their way of thinking and acting. The ultimate of this indoctrination is a benevolent mental state whereby we always know better what is best for a particular country than the country does itself.

It is not entirely a State Department matter either. The Defense Department has known, and in detail, of this situation, but either cannot or will not take steps to correct it. It must therefore share some of the responsibility, although the military and the three service Secretaries gave us wonderful cooperation at all times.

The fundamental issue involved in this whole uphappy episode remains unsolved. To me the issue is how the United States can obtain, train, and have available top-flight negotiators to represent our country and conduct the highly important defense negotiations with other nations. Perhaps in their other negotiations also, if we can reason by analogy. These first secretaries and most of the career Foreign Service people I met may be qualified to undertake the day-to-day routine problems which confront our Embassies. But what is it that makes an Ambassador or the Department of State think they can put an inexperienced young man, who wants to be well liked so he can be promoted in our Foreign Service, on a major negotiation on a part-time basis and expect to get the best results for our country?

No business would think of combining the jobs of sales manager and purchasing agent in one man. These career Foreign Service people, many of whom I have known for years, are uniformly charming people and may fill the bill as sales representatives of the United States. But they are about as effective in negotiation as a cup of warm water. We certainly are in need of a different breed of purchasing agents to represent us.

Perhaps what is needed is trained and qualified defense experts who can be appointed to the Ambassadors' staffs to handle these new problems, reporting directly to them. Alternatively, and I believe preferably, we might have a hard core of well-trained negotiators based in Washington in the Department of State who could go into a country, headed by a man with the rank of minister, be accountable only to the Ambassador, complete a negotiation and return home with no thought of becoming well liked or remaining in the country. In addition, we should be more general in our approach and not try, in a diplomatic agreement, to get in everything but the kitchen sink. We should agree on general principles and leave the later working out of details to the operating levels in the country.

We need trained men who understand the basic principles of negotiation set out above, who have the will to be firm, though polite; purposeful, while remaining considerate of others' rights, and who can temper their judgments with humility. This, plus less of

a desire to be popular. I am not advocating a "get-tough" policy, but rather a "get-wise" policy of using a little God-given commonsense.

This is not, in my opinion, a political problem; rather, it is a problem of training and constant objective review to make sure that our foreign servants do not go stale, social, or get imbued with a burning desire to be well liked above all else in the country where they are serving. Indeed, there is one school of thought among those who have been exposed to the vacillating, paternalistic, and negative attitudes of some of our embassies, that if more United States Ambassadors were declared persona non grata, the American people would have a clearer indication that their interests were being properly protected. Perhaps the United States Congress should give all such ambassadors medals to equate them properly with the popular individuals who get decorations or medals from the foreign countries when they leave.

Although we still indulge in the luxury of appointing completely untried and untested ambassadors from the ranks of political contributors, we most certainly should stop playing games when it comes to the hard task of conducting actual negotiations. Only experience should be tolerated. Man for man, the foreign countries will outnegotiate the United States if we do not train and make available the best our country can produce. In the absence of such men to negotiate on behalf of our country, I am forced to agree with the proponents of the so-called Bricker amendment which would limit the scope of our international negotiations without congressional approval. If we are to continue to have agreements concluded by such inexperienced persons as are today conducting them, the very least that should occur is some review of their terms by the appropriate committee of the Congress.

Above all, it seems to me that we could certainly use some new blood. I am thinking, in particular, of the career Foreign Service Officer who gave orders that the American flag should not be flown on our Embassy in Rome last May 1 for fear the Communists would not like it. Mrs. Clare Boothe Luce, our Ambassador, was not aware of this piece of pussyfooting nonsense, but Secretary of Defense Wilson, visiting Rome, certainly was. To his everlasting credit, Mr. Wilson refused to set foot in the Embassy that day until the flag was flown. What he doesn't know, however, is that 5 minutes after he left the Embassy, the career man had the flag hauled down, again. To me, this incident epitomizes the mentality I faced throughout the 9 most frustrating months of my life.

STATEHOOD FOR HAWAII AND ALASKA

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs is taking a final look at the question of statehood for Hawaii, and many of us are making an effort to add statehood for Alaska to the current proposal. The Scripps-Howard newspapers recently carried an editorial, entitled "Hawaii and Alaska," which points to the necessity of bringing statehood to these two Territories at the same time. I desire to have the editorial reprinted at this point in the RECORD, and to have it followed by a letter which appeared in the Anchorage Daily Times of Wednesday, December 23, 1953, in which Republican residents of Alaska protested to Governor Heintzleman over the way his office was being conducted, and in which these prominent Republicans urged the Governor to take a positive stand in favor of passage by the current Congress of the Statehood Act for Alaska. I ask that the editorial and the letter be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

HAWAII AND ALASKA

As President Eisenhower and Republican congressional leaders discuss a legislative program this week, statehood for Hawaii doubtless will be on the agenda, and if the past attitude maintains it will be designated as one of the "must" items for the forthcoming session of Congress.

There is no good reason why Hawaii should not be admitted to the Union—nor Alaska.

The political complexions of the two Territories and of the present Congress make it virtually impossible to push Hawaii statehood through in 1954 unless Alaska is granted the same status.

That is because Republicans have been able to maintain a steady majority in Hawaii over the years, while Alaska more often than not votes Democratic. To politicians this means Hawaii probably would send two Republican Senators to Washington, while Alaska would be likely to send two Democratic Senators.

The GOP does not even have a majority in the Senate now, and its margin of control in the House is too thin to assure it of a victory on any strictly partisan issue. Obviously, then, this Congress will not pass Hawaii statehood if the Republicans continue to make it a partisan issue, even if it is the No. 1 item on the President's "must" list.

To pretend otherwise is to perpetrate a hoax on the Hawaiians, without accomplishing any other discernible end.

This matter, of necessity, has to be treated on a bipartisan basis. It involves the granting of self-rule to hundreds of thousands of citizens who want to get out from under the rule of bureaucrats from Washington.

The Republican leaders should face up to the facts of the matter and support statehood for both Hawaii and Alaska. Anything less would be simply another meaningless gesture.

B. FRANK HEINTZLEMAN,
Governor of Alaska,
Juneau, Alaska.

DEAR GOVERNOR HEINTZLEMAN: We, the undersigned Republicans residing in Anchorage, wish to advise you that we are displeased with the present administrative program and policies of the Territorial government.

Our chief complaints pertaining directly to your office include the following:

1. We feel that controls of Territorial affairs are in the hands of stateside groups and special interests.

2. We feel a lack of representation by western Alaskans in Territorial affairs.

3. We feel a lack of strong leadership necessary to consolidate and unite the Republican Party throughout the Territory.

4. We feel a lack of interest by the Department of the Interior and other Government agencies for the economic welfare of the Territory.

5. We feel a lack of interest by the Governor's office on the statehood program is disastrous.

6. We feel the Governor's office has taken a negative attitude for a special session.

To show that you respect the will of the people; to demonstrate that the Republican Party deserves support at the next election; and to enable our rightful economic development, we specifically request:

1. Replacement of DeArmond by a progressive man from the rail belt.

2. The calling of a special session of the legislators within 60 days.

3. A positive stand by you in favor of passage by the current Congress of a statehood act for Alaska.

4. A public declaration and vigorous support by you of necessary Federal action, to include:

(a) A documented program for APW appropriations up to the authorized limit.

(b) Division of Bureau of Reclamation survey funds on an equitable development basis throughout the entire Territory.

(c) Creation of a joint commission of Canadians and resident Alaskans for power, transportation, and other matters of common interest.

5. A vigorous protest to the Department of the Interior regarding the cut in road appropriations.

E. E. Rasmuson, J. C. Morris, Harold Strandberg, George R. Jones, Glenn S. Miller, Fred W. Axford, John McManamin, Robert A. Baker, Carl T. Rentschler, Neil S. Mackay, Walter J. Hickel, K. M. Lesh, B. C. Rutherford, Gerald J. Foley, John H. Clawson, Jack Anderson, William A. O'Neil, Don H. Goodman.

WHY THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY SHOULD NOT BE CONSIDERED BY THIS SESSION OF CONGRESS

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, today the 2d session of the 83d Congress starts its legislative work by considering measures which were on the calendar at the end of the first session. Among those measures is one providing for construction of a St. Lawrence seaway. If and when that bill comes up for discussion by the Senate, I hope to speak again and to give reasons showing why it should not pass. I should like to explain why the proposal to construct a St. Lawrence seaway deserves no consideration at this session of Congress. The bill merits no consideration for the following reasons:

The administration is asking for an increase in the national debt limit beyond $275 billion. With a $9-billion deficit this year, the unnecessary spending of $105 million—only a fraction of the ultimate cost—is not justified.

The pending proposal to construct a 27-foot channel in the 46-mile stretch of the International Rapids section of the St. Lawrence River would provide only a 27-foot channel as far as Toledo, Ohio, on Lake Erie, and is, therefore, only a small part of a project that would ultimately cost billions of dollars.

The seaway would, at best, be a part-time transportation facility, frozen over for 4 or 5 months of each year.

Fewer than 4 percent of American-flag ships, fully loaded, could use the proposed 27-foot waterway, and 30 leading American steamship operators have stated they would not use the 27-foot seaway if built. Shipping experts estimate that about 20 percent of foreign-flag tonnage could use it. To the extent it would be used by small foreign, cheaply operated, tramp steamers, the American fleet would have to be further subsidized.

The seaway would not contribute to national defense, but, on the contrary, in time of war it would be a defense liability. With its 2 dams and some 15 locks, it would be most vulnerable to bombing or sabotage, and could be put out of commission for long periods of time. Any effort to afford protection

against such hazards, even though ineffective, would be costly, not only in money but to an even greater extent in manpower and material.

The seaway would serve primarily for the movement in lake vessels of Labrador-Quebec iron ore and for the movement of taconite rock or low-grade ore from Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Michigan iron-ore ranges to the Lake Erie steel plants which have invested vast sums in ore and taconite development. At the present time these steel and mining companies have committed over $500 million for construction of commercial taconite plants in the Lake Superior region; and within the next 20 years they expect to produce annually some 30 million tons of taconite concentrate. Such a capacity will require an investment of about $1 billion; and to produce 30 million tons of taconite pellets annually will cost between $750 million and $1 billion.

These investments by the steel and mining interests are made with the knowledge that the source of supply will be continuous. Even the estimates submitted by the proponents of the seaway show that the supply of high-grade iron ore, not taconite, in the Lake Superior region is adequate to meet anticipated needs from that source for approximately 30 years.

Added to this are the virtually inexhaustible quantities of taconite ore in the same Lake Superior region—reserves, estimated as high as 60 billion tons—enough to provide for all foreseeable needs of the future for more than 100 years.

If the steel and ore mining companies who so strongly advocate the building of a seaway are willing to invest billions of dollars as just outlined, why cannot they spent $105 million to complete their investment instead of saddling it onto the United States Government? Last Saturday, January 9, the Washington Evening Star carried an Associated Press story stating that the United States Steel Corp. is climaxing 7 years of exploration, 2 years of construction, and a $170 million investment by shipping its first load of ore mined in the Venezuelan wilderness. The Associated Press dispatch reported that the President of Venezuela would press a button completing loading of the ship, and that "the chartered vessel will then begin a 176-mile journey down the Orinoco Channel dredged by the company to the sea."

Why do not the companies interested in Labrador ore do the same? The answer is clear. The St. Lawrence seaway is necessary neither for the development of Labrador ore nor for the transportation of taconite ore to steel mills in the United States. The group of steel and ore companies interested in the development of taconite and the Labrador field would like to have our Government build the seaway only because it would improve their competitive position in the steel industry. In fact, they are going ahead with their development regardless of whether the seaway is built. But it is increasingly clear that their advocacy of this project is more self-serving than anything else. They would like to have the Government subsidize their transportation costs for many years in the future, without regard to the adverse effect on major American industries and localities, including the railroads, the coal industry, the American merchant marine, the Atlantic and gulf ports, and every individual employed in those industries and localities.

Those of us from coastal States know only too well how the seaway would affect us. Maryland's port is in the market for more business, and because our economy is greatly dependent upon the activity of the port of Baltimore, we are at this moment concerned with a decrease in port business. Baltimore's shipping during 1953 dropped 2,205,194 tons below the port's 1952 level. The reduction consisted largely of lower overseas shipments of coal and grain—the very items which Baltimore is best able to handle—cargoes for which the seaway would offer the greatest competition.

The seaway proponents have now gained the support of the present administration and they sold the administration by arguing that, if we do not join, Canada will build it alone. What is their complaint then? They plan to bring in the ore regardless of whether the seaway is built, but, if Canada is going to build it, why should they insist that we do it?

It cannot be that they are afraid of doing business with Canada. The iron ore is in Canada. They are developing the ore under an agreement with the Canadian Government. The Canadian Government receives a royalty on every ton they produce. They have to bring this ore 360 miles by rail—a common carrier subject to the regulation of Canada. Then the ore is moved down the St. Lawrence more than 400 miles, in Canadian territory, before it reaches the International Rapids section. All this time the ore has been produced and moved at the pleasure, so to speak, of the Canadian Government.

Suddenly, here at the International Rapids, these operators insist that for the next 46 miles they want the friendly embrace of the United States Government, and they say it will cost the taxpayers only $105 million. What makes the situation all the more amazing is that the ore, moving on from the rapids, will again be in Canadian clutches at the Welland Canal.

From a socialistic standpoint, the proposed seaway fits into the plans of those who would expand governmental activities into all possible fields. It would put the Government in the transportation business primarily to benefit five or six steel operators by giving them an advantage over their competitors, through a subsidized waterway competing with rail transportation.

Should the railroads be forced into bankruptcy brought on by this subsidized competition which would make it impossible for them to do their job, the Government would have to take them over. Government-operated railroads would then be in direct competition with all other forms of transportation; and the end result would be the taking over by the Government of all forms of transportation, as has been done in Great Britain. From nationalization of transportation to that of many, if not most, basic industries, such as communications and utilities, would be but a short step. This has been the pattern in other countries.

So, without any conscious choice or desire on their part to promote the socialistic way of life, the advocates of the seaway, if successful, could bring about, through gradual steps and changes in our American economy, conditions under which private enterprise would no longer earn enough to continue without Government aid. The seaway from this standpoint affects the very life of our economy. The Congress could do more by continuing its policy of eliminating government in business, as typified by abolition of the RFC and disposal of Inland Waterways Corporation and the defense rubber plants.

The political repercussions in the various States and congressional districts which would follow any attempt to take up the seaway bill at this session of Congress would be far-reaching and no doubt disappointing, from my partisan point of view.

To bring up the seaway bill, with no possible assurance that it could pass the Senate and would incur rougher opposition in the House, seems to be courting trouble. A defeat of the project in either the Senate or House certainly would not enhance the prestige of the administration or Republican leadership.

Because of the close division in both the Senate and House, the support of the opposition will be sought in order to carry out the administration's program. In June 1952, when the St. Lawrence project was being advocated by a Democratic administration, 19 Democratic Senators in 15 States voted to send it back to committee, and 3 others were paired to do likewise. At the same time, 24 Republican Senators from 16 States voted to recommit, and 2 were paired to recommit. While there have been a number of changes in the Senate since 1952, they have not been sufficiently numerous to indicate that consideration of the St. Lawrence project, even in a watered-down form, would promote harmony for the administration, particularly at the beginning of a session so pressed with issues of really vital importance to the Nation.

In the congressional election of 1952, there were 40 districts in which the candidates from my party won by less than 55 percent of the total vote. These marginal districts are not lumped together in big electoral vote States, but are sprinkled widely across the country, in 22 States. Similarly, in another 45 districts, in the same 22 States, plus 9 others, the candidates of my party received more than 45 percent of the total vote. Here is a total of 85 so-called marginal seats in 31 States. It would be political folly to think that a vote for the seaway in many of these districts would not seriously influence the outcome of elections next November. Many of the districts are in States that are strongly opposed to paying taxes for a project that brings them no benefit. Such a controversial project injected in an election year could have the effect of weakening the party in power.

It should not be forgotten that the seaway is opposed by business organizations and trade unions in some 30 States, including such groups as the Chicago Association of Commerce and Industry, representing the largest port on the Great Lakes, the West Side Association of Commerce of New York City, the Indiana State Chamber of Commerce, and many others just as important.

In the Congressional Quarterly of September 4 appeared an article entitled "Congress Picks the Issues." The Congressional Quarterly listed 40 issues and asked Members of the 83d Congress to check the ones they thought would be the major issues in their districts. Some 184 Representatives and 39 Senators replied and voted. With respect to bringing up the St. Lawrence seaway bill, it is interesting to note that as a rated issue it ranked 34th out of the 40. Obviously it is not considered sufficiently important to be brought up at this time.

In another endeavor to determine the issues of Congress in 1954 the U. S. News & World Report sent telegrams to all Members of Congress. Upward of 200 Members responded, and in the publication of December 18, 1953, 8 big issues for 1954 are listed in order. The seaway was not one of those selected by either Republicans or Democrats. In fact, of the 88 Members quoted, only 1—the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY]—mentioned the seaway.

The seaway project has been defeated or pigeonholed in Congress on four occasions, and since its last defeat, no new arguments have been presented to justify reconsideration by the 83d Congress.

We of the Republican Party and the administration can ill afford to subject ourselves to the controversy and resultant difficulties which a debate on the seaway would create. All evidence indicates that Congress will be very busily occupied with more important issues and problems than the seaway, which would primarily benefit a very small segment of our economy, at the expense of all.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, if the business of the morning hour has been concluded, I wish to suggest the absence of a quorum before the Senate proceeds to a call of the calendar for the consideration of measures to which there is no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk (Emery L. Frazier) called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Cordon	Hennings
Anderson	Daniel	Hickenlooper
Barrett	Dirksen	Hill
Beall	Duff	Hoey
Bennett	Dworshak	Holland
Bricker	Eastland	Hunt
Burke	Ellender	Jackson
Bush	Flanders	Jenner
Butler, Md.	Frear	Johnson, Colo.
Butler, Nebr.	Fulbright	Johnson, Tex.
Byrd	George	Johnston, S. C.
Capehart	Gillette	Kefauver
Carlson	Goldwater	Kennedy
Case	Gore	Kerr
Chavez	Griswold	Kilgore
Clements	Hayden	Knowland
Cooper	Hendrickson	Kuchel
Langer	Morse	Smith, N. J.
Lehman	Mundt	Sparkman
Lennon	Murray	Stennis
Long	Payne	Symington
Magnuson	Potter	Thye
Malone	Purtell	Upton
Martin	Robertson	Watkins
McCarran	Russell	Welker
McCarthy	Saltonstall	Wiley
McClellan	Schoeppel	Williams
Millikin	Smathers	Young
Monroney	Smith, Maine	

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] are necessarily absent.

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

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I announce that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senators from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN and Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] is absent because of illness.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, pursuant to the prior announcement, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of bills on the calendar to which there is no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The clerk will state the first order of business on the calendar.

ESTABLISHMENT OF VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION DOMICILIARY FACILITY AT FORT LOGAN, COLO.

The bill (S. 242) to provide for the establishment of a Veterans' Administration domiciliary facility at Fort Logan, Colo., was announced as first in order.

EARLY RELEASE OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES BECAUSE OF WEATHER CONDITIONS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief announcement. The Traffic Bureau of the District of Columbia requests that Federal employees be released today at least 2 hours earlier than usual because of the weather and ice conditions and the traffic congestion which is expected to develop. Under the circumstances, I believe that the various Federal departments are cooperating in this regard. I have notified my own staff to that effect. It is up to each individual Senator, of course, to determine what his own "ground rules" shall be. However, I feel that Senators should know that such a request has been made by the Traffic Bureau. Pursuant to that request, I shall endeavor, within reasonable limitations, to conclude the session of the Senate shortly after 3 o'clock this afternoon, if it is possible to do so.

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I should like to comment briefly on President Eisenhower's message on agriculture, which was read to the Senate a short time ago. The message proposes a program which I believe constitutes a broad basis for enacting the best and soundest agricultural legislation which we have ever had.

The President has drawn on our experience with all types of programs affecting agriculture, which have been in effect up to this time, and has made his recommendations accordingly. It is significant that, in accordance with the promises he made during the campaign last year, he is not requesting a repeal of the acts of Congress which provide for 90 percent of parity price supports for the basic commodities, through the years 1953 and 1954; nor is he asking for repeal of the suspension of the modernized parity formula with respect to the basic commodities which will carry through until January 1, 1956.

He is, however, requesting a return to the basic legislation which was enacted in 1948 and 1949, after those two exemptions expire.

The basic legislation, first enacted in 1948, and amended and improved upon in the Agricultural Act of 1949, contrary to reports which we have read in some newspapers lately, was included in the platforms of both the Democratic and Republican Parties of 1948. It was not an issue in the campaign of that year. It was enacted as sound legislation; and it was, I believe, fully applicable to conditions which prevailed at that time.

However, the President recognizes that there have been material changes in the situation affecting agriculture since the Agricultural Act of 1949 was passed. Therefore, his recommendations deal with ways to meet those changes.

The new conditions have been created primarily as a result of the Korean conflict. During 1949 and in the spring of 1950 there was developing an agricultural price decline. Then the Korean conflict broke out and the farmers of the United States were urged to overproduce beyond what would be sufficient under normal conditions.

The administration at that time, of course, could not tell how long the Korean conflict would last. Therefore, the farmers were urged to overproduce as a safety measure. They overproduced with a vengeance in 1951, 1952, and 1953. Probably some controls should have been imposed on certain crops in 1953, particularly on wheat, but that was not done. Consequently, we find the United States Government owning and lending on several billion dollars worth of farm commodities. In fact, the Government owns so much of the commodities now that by June 1 the borrowing authority of the Commodity Credit Corporation, now limited to $6,750,000,000, will be completely exhausted.

It will be noted that the President has asked for additional borrowing authority amounting to $1.750.000,000, to take care

of the crops which will be produced during 1954.

The President recognizes the fact, with the tremendous surpluses hanging over the market, it is impossible for any farm program to work as we would like to have it work, without imposing extremely severe conditions upon the producers of this country.

Therefore, he suggests that we set aside and take out of the normal channels of trade $2½ billion worth of commodities which may be regarded either as surplus or as reserve.

He does not go into detail as to how this should be done. Indeed, it will not be easy to do it in such a way as to accomplish the objective and still be safe otherwise. Congress must work out the details as to how much of each commodity will have to be set aside, and how it shall be handled. The commodities proposed to be set aside primarily are cotton, wheat, dairy products, vegetable oils, and possibly other commodities of lesser value. Some wool will be set aside, too. So far as cotton and wool are concerned, probably it will not be too difficult to set these commodities aside in a reserve pool, to be used in case of emergencies. It will not be so easy to handle wheat and vegetable oils, and we will have to use our abilities to the fullest extent to handle surpluses of dairy products adequately.

At the present time the Federal Government buys practically every bit of cheese and powdered milk produced in the United States.

Mr. President, the President of the United States puts emphasis on the need for developing new markets. I believe new markets may well be developed in the so-called undeveloped areas of the world—markets which are presently outside the present normal channels of trade. That is a situation into which we shall have to look very carefully. It is probable that we may be able to develop new markets in countries whose currencies it will be necessary to accept in exchange for commodities which we have in excess of our own requirements in the United States.

Last summer we placed a provision in the Mutual Security Act, section 550, which gave our Government an opportunity to try out, in a small way, a program of selling our surplus commodities to foreign countries in exchange for their currencies. I believe we have learned a good deal from that small beginning, and we shall have to make full use of our experience in that regard.

The President also suggests that we pay attention to increasing the normal carry-over of corn. He is on sound ground there, because what was a normal carry-over in 1948 certainly could not be considered an adeuaqte carry-over as of today. It is entirely possible that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry may wish to consider increasing the carry-over of certain other commodities as well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. SMITH of Maine in the chair). The time of the Senator from Vermont has expired.

Mr. LANGER. Madam President, I did not know that we were going to debate the agricultural program today. I remember very well that a few years ago, when Wendell Willkie was the Republican candidate for President, he said he was against war. A short time later he testified before a committee, and a distinguished Senator asked Wendell Willkie, "When you were campaigning, did you not say so and so?" Wendell Willkie's answer that rang around the world was, "Yes, but that was campaign oratory."

Mr. President, Candidate Eisenhower came to Fargo, N. Dak., and said he was in favor of the present 90 percent parity. He said he was for REA. I read nothing in the President's message today which carries out the promises made by Candidate Eisenhower.

I did not know that we were going to debate the subject at this time. If I had known, I should have brought the speech which was delivered by Candidate Eisenhower at Fargo, N. Dak., so that I might read it to the Senate. I shall avail myself of the very first opportunity to bring it here and read it to the Members of this body so that they may become familiar with the speech made by the candidate, not in Minnesota or in Iowa, but when he came to the State of North Dakota, and spoke to an assembly of farmers who were depending, in order to make up their minds, upon what he said relative to the 90 percent of the present parity, and relative to other subjects. For example, he stated that before anything would be done with reference to the farm program, farmers would be invited to Washington and that their advice would be heeded. Changes were made in the REA program, without, so far as I know, any farmer being invited to give his views on that subject. We shall take that up a little later. I remember Madam President, that a caravan of cattlemen came to Washington to be heard. When they were half way to Washington the distinguished Secretary of Agriculture said he wished there were not so many of them coming. Yet Candidate Eisenhower said, when he spoke in Fargo, N. Dak., that he wanted the farmers to come and that "their advice would be heeded."

I cannot sit here in silence when my distinguished friend from Vermont, under the 5-minute rule, makes such statements as he has made.

ESTABLISHMENT OF A VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION DOMICILIARY FACILITY AT FORT LOGAN, COLO.—BILL PASSED OVER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of Senate bill S. 242 to provide for the establishment of a Veterans' Administration domiciliary facility at Fort Logan, Colo.?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Madam President, I reserve the right to object, and shall object to its consideration at this time. I do so by request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The clerk will call the next bill on the calendar.

ERICH ANTON HELFERT

The bill (S. 56) for the relief of Erich Anton Helfert was announced as next in order.

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. AIKEN. Madam President, I shall not undertake to discuss the matter of the REA in North Dakota at this time, but I wish to state that the State of North Dakota is receiving more under the present administration than it ever did before. The whole country is getting more than it got last year.

There are certain things that must be considered in working out an agricultural program. We have to consider, first, that some of the surpluses are temporary in nature and will be overcome by an increase in the population of the United States. There are certain surpluses which probably will not be overcome. We have to consider the growing use of substitutes for our fiber crops. I noticed only last week that the Du Pont Co. has reduced the price of orlon fiber 10 cents a pound. We have noticed reductions in the prices of other commodities. That is something which we must consider. We must also consider what shall be done with the twenty-five or thirty million acres which are taken out of the production of wheat and cotton. In years when acreage controls are in effect, our basic crops would account for only 21 percent of the agricultural income of the United States. We cannot permit the acreage diverted from those crops to upset the situation with respect to other crops.

I wish to call attention also to the terms "flexible" and "rigid" as applied to price levels. We are confronted with a paradoxical situation. Ninety percent does not always mean 90 percent of parity for all crops. It is possible that farmers might receive 90 percent of parity in the market a greater percentage of the time without rigid 90 percent price supports, although at harvest time last year farmers received only 75 percent of parity for their crops.

I also wish to point out that under the act of 1948–49, price support at 90 percent of parity is mandatory for the basic commodities so long as supplies are kept in line with demand.

We all want a prosperous agriculture. We all want freedom from dependency on Government checks if it is possible to attain that end.

The Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has been at work for a full week, and it is going to continue to work.

On January 14 we shall take up the so-called watershed bill.

On January 18 Secretary Benson will discuss the agricultural outlook and, presumably, the President's message before our committee.

On January 21 we expect to take up the so-called range improvement bill. We hope to have these conservation measures out of the way this month.

We shall have a new program and new legislation soon with reference to wool. We shall have to ask Congress for perhaps $2 billion more borrowing authority to support the agricultural program

for 1954, over and above that which is already available.

We shall take up as soon as possible, probably this month, the President's request for setting aside certain supplies which are now acting as depressants on the market. Time is of the essence. If we are going to relieve the pressure on the dairy farmers of this country, we must have legislation ready before April 1.

I realize that my 5 minutes have expired, but let me say that a prosperous agriculture and a healthy economy are the objectives of all of us. I hope that no one will take the position that he is against anything in the way of legislation that President Eisenhower recommends. I hope a good agricultural program will not be opposed simply because Senators may be on the other side of the question as to this or that detail. Let us consider the program as a whole. Let us work wholeheartedly for the good of the American farmer and of the American economy. I am sure that if we do that—and I know we are going to do that, so far as the committee is concerned—we shall have full cooperation and will bring forth legislation which the Congress may well be proud of having had a part in enacting.

ERICH ANTON HELFERT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill (S. 56) for the relief of Erich Anton Helfert?

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. LANGER. Madam President, I desire to say to my distinguished friend from Vermont I am certain that, so far as I know, the farmers are going to cooperate with the President of the United States, provided he carries out the promises he made during the campaign, which were published in newspapers all over the United States. The farmers relied upon those promises, and unless recommendations are made which carry out those promises, some of us upon the floor are going to oppose the proposed legislation.

The Senator from Vermont mentioned the fact that Du Pont lowered the price of a certain commodity 10 cents a pound. I also noticed in the Washington press that bread had gone up another cent a loaf. Nearly every product which the farmer buys is just as high today or is higher than it was a year ago.

I wonder what has been done to enforce the antitrust laws so far as they relate——

Mr. AIKEN. Madam President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield?

Mr. LANGER. I only have 5 minutes. I reluctantly am compelled to decline to yield at this time.

Mr. AIKEN. There are 20 cases now underway.

Mr. LANGER. I wonder what has been done to enforce the antitrust laws and the antidumping provision to prevent grain from Canada being dumped into the United States of America.

With acreage allotments going into effect all over the Northwest, a large amount of land which last year was planted in wheat has now been planted in rye. Yet what do we find? We find that month after month after month rye has been coming in from Canada. We have been trying to have the importation of rye from Canada stopped. Although the United States produces roughly only from 23 to 25 million bushels of rye, nevertheless between 5 and 7 million bushels of rye were poured into the United States from Canada within the past few months.

Similarly, we find the same thing happening with respect to oats. Millions upon millions of bushels of oats have been imported, to the detriment of the American farmer. Not much has been done about that, although I read recently that the Department of Justice finally took cognizance of the situation.

Mr. President, the importation of rye, which has forced the price of rye down almost 50 percent since Congress adjourned last August, could have been stopped months ago by the authorities, if they had wanted to do so. The officials of the Department of Agriculture sat idly by for a long time and did nothing about it. Finally they made an investigation, after the antimonopoly committee had had a hearing on it. The Department then referred the matter to the President. After it had lain on the President's desk for a while, he referred it to the Tariff Commission, which is now making another study of the conditions. But rye is still pouring into the United States. The Wall Street Journal recently stated that 250,000 bushels were received in Chicago in 1 day.

ERICH ANTON HELFERT

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Madam President, reserving the right to object, I understand that the Senate is considering Calendar No. 48, S. 56, a bill for the relief of Erich Anton Helfert.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I have been sitting here rather patiently, hoping that Senators would abide by the spirit of the 5-minute rule, under which the Senate is now operating, until the call of the calendar is completed. Certainly there is a special purpose in following that rule. There is a special purpose for the rule. The call of the calendar was announced last week. Senators who are charged with the handling of the calendar must sit by, on many days, hour after hour, while debate goes on under the 5-minute rule. In my judgment, that is strictly a violation of the spirit of the rule.

I hope that from now on, today, Senators will abide by the spirit of the rule and will carry on with the calendar call. We have alrcady been operating for 25 minutes on the calendar call and have acted on but one bill. When we have finished with the call of the calendar, controversial speeches can then be made without objection of any sort.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of Senate bill 56?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I object.

Mr. McCARRAN. Calendar No. 48, S. 56, would undoubtedly be objected to if the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] were on the floor. Therefore, I should not at all insist upon its being considered. However, I ask unanimous consent that I may make a very brief statement explanatory of the bill and, if possible, by unanimous consent, offer, and to have lie on the table, an amendment to the bill, which has been printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would advise the Senator from Nevada that the bill was objected to. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nevada to make a statement? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Nevada may proceed.

Mr. McCARRAN. This is the case of a 20-year-old native of Czechoslovakia, and a citizen of Germany, who came to the United States in August 1950 as an exchange student. He attended the school of journalism at the University of Nevada until June 1951. He is presently employed by the Martin Iron Works, where his services are said to be needed in the interests of the defense effort.

There is no question about the fact that this is a young man of clean character and good morals who will make an excellent citizen.

In order to meet objections by certain Senators who contend that an exchange student should not be permitted to receive the benefits of the so-called Fulbright program in the way of expenses, school fees, maintenance, and so on, and then frustrate the program by failing to return to his native country, I propose to offer an amendment, which I now send to the desk, to require that before this young man shall be granted the privilege of permanent residence in the United States he shall be required to repay in full all of the sums which he may have received from the Institute of International Education, which administers for the State Department certain funds in connection with the student exchange program. This amendment has been printed and is lying on the table, so Senators have had an opportunity to familiarize themselves with it and it does not come as a surprise. I hope this proposal may solve the difficulty which has arisen with regard to this bill and also with regard to the next bill on the calendar, which is entirely similar.

Madam President, I ask that the amendment be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, line 7, immediately preceding the period, it is proposed to insert: "and refund to the Institute of International Education, New York, N. Y., of all sums paid or advanced by such Institute for expenses, including travel, school fees, room, board, clothing, books, and spending money, of said Erich Anton Helfert."

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Madam President, will the Senator from Nevada yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I wish to ask the Senator from Nevada if his amendment would include interest on the investment so far as the State Department is concerned.

Mr. McCARRAN. I do not know that the present language would include interest, but I shall be glad to have the language so amended.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Can that amendment be offered?

Mr. McCARRAN. I shall be glad to accept it, so as to read at the end of line 3: "with interest thereon," at whatever rate may be proper, 4 percent or 5 percent.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I should like to offer such an amendment. I may say to the Senator from Nevada that I think he has proposed a good, constructive formula. There are at present a great many cases of this type, and there will undoubtedly be others in the future, and such a provision should be a condition with respect to each one of them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to considering the bill so that the Senator from Nevada may offer his amendment?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Madam President, since the Senator for whom I am objecting is not on the floor, and since the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada does not change the principle involved, I feel constrained to ask that the bill go over until the next call of the calendar.

Mr. McCARRAN. Will not the Senator permit me to amend my bill so that it may appear on the calendar as amended?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I have no objection to that.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is all I ask.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I am merely indicating that I would have to ask that the bill go over until the next call of the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bill will be considered for the purpose of enabling the Senator from Nevada to offer his amendment.

Mr. McCARRAN. I now offer the amendment which has been read, with the modification proposed by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment, as modified, is agreed to, and the bill, as amended, will go over.

Mr. McCARRAN. I ask that the bill be printed as amended.

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

FELIX KORTSCHOK

The bill (S. 59) for the relief of Felix Kortschok was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMATHERS. Over.

Mr. McCARRAN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment which I have proposed, with the modification of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], may be agreed to.

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

Mr. SMATHERS. I withdraw my objection, so that the request of the Senator from Nevada may be considered, namely, that the amendment proposed by him may be acted upon. Then I shall renew my objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bill will be considered so that the Senator from Nevada may offer his amendment. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, line 7, immediately preceding the period, it is proposed to insert: "and refund to the Institute of International Education, New York, N. Y., of all sums paid or advanced, with interest thereon, by such institute for expenses, including travel, school fees, room, board, clothing, books, and spending money, of said Felix Kortschok."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to, and, under objection, the bill will go over.

Mr. McCARRAN. I ask that the bill as amended be printed.

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

PHED VOSNIACOS

The bill (S. 101) for the relief of Phed Vosniacos was announced as next in order.

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

Mr. SMATHERS. I make the same objection as was made to the previous bill.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I object to the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

RESOLUTION AND BILLS PASSED OVER

The resolution (S. Res. 57) to amend rule XIII of the standing rules relative to motions to reconsider was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMATHERS. Over.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I also ask that the resolution go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be passed over.

The bill (S. 389) for the relief of Dr. Alexandre Demetrio Moruzi was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 978) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act in order to expedite and facilitate the termination of railroad reorganization proceedings under section 77 of the Bankruptcy Act and to require the Interstate Commerce Commission to consider, in stock modification plans, the assents of controlled or controlling stockholders, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMATHERS. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

PROMOTION OF CERTAIN NAVAL OFFICERS—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1063) to authorize and request the President to promote certain naval officers, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Tennessee if there is any fundamental objection to the bill? In its present form it was passed by the Senate in 1949. It is an effort to correct certain injustices suffered by approximately 600 officers of the Navy during the war years.

I have no personal interest whatsoever in the bill. It is the same as a bill which has heretofore passed the Senate. That bill was reported favorably by the House committee and then died in the House because it could not pass on the Consent Calendar.

This is a bill which I discussed with the Senator a few days ago. As I have said, I have no personal interest in the bill, except that I believe it insures fair treatment to a number of officers to whom injustices may have been done.

Mr. GORE. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I am through.

Mr. GORE. In his conference with me the distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts was, as he generally is, very persuasive. The objection which I have voiced is not on my own behalf, but by request of a fellow Senator. If the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts would confer with the Senator who has registered objection, it might be possible that he would as a result withdraw his objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard, and the bill will be passed over.

SALARIES OF MEMBERS OF CONGRESS AND OTHERS

The bill (S. 1663) to increase the salaries of Members of Congress, judges of the United States courts, and United States attorneys, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. LANGER. Over.

Mr. McCARRAN. Madam President, this bill must of necessity go over, but I ask unanimous consent that I may make a very brief statement regarding it.

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

Mr. McCARRAN. The figure on page 4, line 16, of the calendar print of the bill, is $15,000. That should be $15,500. This is a typographical error, and in order to correct it I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered and be amended by striking out on page 4, line 16, the figure "$15,000" and inserting in lieu thereof the figure "$15,500." This is merely to provide for a correction of the bill. I then desire to make a very brief statement regarding the bill.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Nevada.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, did the Senator indicate that he desired to make a statement regarding the bill?

Mr. McCARRAN. I wish to make a very brief statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator may proceed.

Mr. McCARRAN. Madam President, as Senators know, the Commission on Judicial and Congressional Salaries, created by Public Law 220, is required by that law to make its report to the Congress not later than January 15. Public Law 220 requires in terms that the Congress within 60 days after the submission of this report shall act on the report making such adjustments in judicial and congressional salaries as the Congress sees fit to direct. It is assumed by all that the vehicle for such congressional action will be the bill now under consideration, which is No. 259 on the Senate Calendar, S. 1663, reported favorably from the Committee on the Judiciary on May 12, 1953.

In order that Senators may know what to anticipate in this connection, I ask the majority leader if he can tell the Senate at this time what plans the leadership has made for bringing Senate bill 1663, Calendar No. 259, before the Senate. I hope the bill may be brought up as speedily as possible after the salary commission makes its report, so that in the light of that report the bill may be amended, as the Senate may determine, and sent to the other body of the Congress for consideration and action within the 60-day limit.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Madam President, in response to the inquiry of the Senator from Nevada, I would say that Senate bill 1663, No. 259 on the calendar, has not been scheduled as yet by the policy committee or the leadership on this side of the aisle. I have announced the general program for the coming week or two, but I shall be glad to call this measure to the attention of the policy committee, and also to discuss it with the minority leader, the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], and I may be prepared to make an announcement about it at an early date.

Mr. McCARRAN. I wish to say that my inquiry stems from the fact that it has been my privilege to act as an advisory member of the salary commission appointed by the Vice President. The commission will make its report on or before the 15th of this month, and the law requires that something be done with it by the Senate within a reasonable time.

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, I wish to make a very brief statement with respect to the bill. It may be that a careful examination of the facts will support the conclusion that judges are entitled to some increase in salary, but I am satisfied that any increase should be much less than the amount provided for in the bill.

I seriously doubt that a case can be made for any increase in salary for United States attorneys. They are fairly well paid now. The salary of a United States attorney is far above the average income of other American lawyers. In fact, I think it is considerably above other lawyers of equal ability in most instances.

I am satisfied that no case can be made for increasing the salaries of Members of Congress. I think they are very well paid as public servants. When they go into public service they do so with the knowledge that they are not going into it for their financial advantage.

I do think that the financial problem of service in Congress is not so much one of inadequate salary, but of an inadequate accountable expense allowance. What we need to do is to inform the American people of the office expense problem that confronts the Representatives of the people, and to seek to have appropriated enough to meet the expenses that can be shown on the record to be justified in order to enable their Representatives to serve effectively the people in the Congress of the United States. The expense allowance problem is what really should concern Members of Congress, and not the matter of salary. The expense allowance should be absolutely accountable and made a matter of public record. It seems to me that we ought to seek to improve the services of our offices to our constituents through an increase in expense allowance.

Madam President, with thousands and thousands of people in America becoming unemployed each week, with many factories going on 2- and 3-day per week schedules, with signs on the horizon of a very serious economic recession sweeping across the country, I am at a loss to understand how any serious consideration can be given in the Senate of the United States to increasing the salaries of Members of Congress. I think such a suggestion is an affront to the American people.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard, and the bill will go over.

RESOLUTIONS AND BILLS PASSED OVER

The resolution (S. Res. 20) amending the cloture rule with respect to the number required for adoption of a cloture motion was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1857) to amend certain statutes providing expeditious judicial proceedings for the condemnation of lands for public purposes was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. By request, I ask that the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard, and the bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1461) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, concerning requests of common carriers for increased transportation rates was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1691) to authorize Potomac Electric Power Co. to construct, maintain, and operate in the District of Columbia and to cross Kenilworth Ave. NE., in said District, with certain railroad tracks and related facilities, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMATHERS. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1396) to authorize the adoption of certain rules with respect to the broadcasting or telecasting of professional baseball exhibitions in interstate commerce, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMATHERS. Over.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. By request I ask that this bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard, and the bill will be passed over.

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, was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2150) providing for the creation of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corp., was announced as next in order.

Mr. McCARRAN. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1806) to amend the Navy ration statute so as to provide for the serving of oleomargarine or margarine, was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. By request I ask that the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 848) to prescribe policy and procedure in connection with construction contracts made by executive agencies, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMATHERS. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2314) to prohibit transmission of certain gambling information in interstate commerce by communication facilities, was announced as next in order.

Mr. MORSE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 4557) to amend section 319 of the Communications Act of 1934, with respect to permits for construction of radio stations, was announced as next in order.

Mr. LANGER. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 4558) to amend section 309 (c) of the Communications Act of 1934, with respect to the time within which the Federal Communications Commission must act on protests filed thereunder, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMATHERS. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 4559) to amend section 501 of the Communications Act of 1934, so that any offense punishable thereunder, except a second or subsequent offense, shall constitute a misdemeanor rather than a felony, was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 281) to amend section 1 (17) (a), section 13 (3), and section 13 (4) of the Interstate Commerce Act in order to extend to the Interstate Commerce Commission power to prescribe the discontinuance of certain railroad services in intrastate commerce when found to be unreasonably discriminatory against or to constitute an undue burden on interstate commerce, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMATHERS. Over.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. By request, I ask that this bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard, and the bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 1026) to amend the Public Health Service Act, with respect to the provisions of certain medical and dental treatment and hospitalization for certain officers and employees of the former Lighthouse Service and for dependents and widows of officers and employees of such Service, was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Madam President, may we have an explanation of the bill? Until we are able to have an explanation of the bill, I ask that the bill go over.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard, and the bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 3704) to provide for the incorporation, regulation, merger, consolidation, and dissolution of certain business corporations in the District of Columbia was announced as next in order.

Mr. LANGER. Let the bill go over.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Madam President, by request, I ask that the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 2351) for the relief of Sam Rosenblat was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMATHERS. Let the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection being heard, the bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2413) to provide an elected mayor, city council, school board, and nonvoting delegate to the House of Representatives, for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Let the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection being heard, the bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2457) to authorize the Administrator of General Services and the Postmaster General to enter into building purchase contracts; to extend the authority of the Postmaster General to lease space for post office purposes, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Madam President, I ask that the bill go over, by agreement. I should like to have that appear in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over, by agreement.

The bill (S. 2038) to amend the act approved July 8, 1937, authorizing cash relief for certain employees of the Canal Zone Government, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMATHERS. Let the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2231) to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act relating to debt claims was announced as next in order.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1243) to amend the War Contractors Relief Act with respect to the definition of a request for relief, to authorize consideration and settlement of certain claims of subcontractors, to provide reasonable compensation for the services of partners and proprietors, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. I should like to have an explanation of the bill.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Madam President, the bill is clearly not a measure to be disposed of during the call of the calendar. I ask that the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection being heard, the bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 6287) to extend and amend the Renegotiation Act of 1951 was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Let the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1688) to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I ask that the bill go over to the next call of the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection being heard, the bill will be passed over to the next calendar call.

The bill (S. 796) to permit the charging of tolls on certain highways constructed with Federal aid was announced as next in order.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Let the bill go over.

Mr. MORSE. I request that the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 666) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain land and right-of-way in the State of Wyoming to the town of Jackson, Wyo., was announced as next in order.

Mr. MORSE. Let the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2474) to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces to commemorate the tercentennial of the founding of the city of New York was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Madam President, I understand that this measure and the next two measures on the calendar—Calendar No. 730, House bill 1917, to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces to commemorate the sesquicentennial of the Louisiana Purchase; and Calendar No. 731, Senate bill 987, to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the tercentennial celebration of the founding of the city of Northampton, Mass., are very soon to be made the unfinished business of the Senate. So I ask that all three of those bills be passed over at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, all three bills will be passed over at this time.

The Chair will state that Calendar No. 731, Senate bill 987, to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the tercentennial celebration of the founding of the city of Northampton, Mass., will be the order of business at the completion of the calendar call.

The bill (H. R. 116) to amend title 18, United States Code, so as to prohibit the transportation of fireworks into any State in which the sale or use of such fireworks is prohibited, was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. By request, I ask that the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection being heard, the bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 395) to confer jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims with respect to claims against the United States of certain employees of the Bureau of Prisons, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMATHERS. Let the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over. Amendment of Merchant Ship Sales Act—bill passed over.

The bill (S. 1918) to amend section 9 of the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946 was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMATHERS. Let the bill go over.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Madam President, let me inquire of the acting minority leader from what Senator comes the objection to consideration of the bill at this time.

Mr. SMATHERS. Let me say to the Senator from Maryland that I shall be happy to discuss the matter with him at the appropriate time. However, there is objection to consideration of the bill at this time.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the RECORD at this point an explanation of the bill.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BUTLER OF MARYLAND

Senate bill 1918, as amended by the committee, does two things:

First, it repeals section 9 (c) (3) of the present law which no longer has any application. That section was made dependent specifically upon the existence of a national emergency declared by the President on May 27, 1941. That emergency was terminated by proclamation of the President on April 28, 1952 (No. 2974). This simply takes out of the statute books a provision of law which is obsolete and without effect.

Secondly, the bill amends section 9 (c) (2) of the present law and adds a new section 9 (c) (3), in lieu of the one repealed. The effect of these changes is briefly as follows:

At the time the Merchant Ship Sales Act was adopted in 1946, the Committee on Commerce was faced with the problem of permitting the Government to dispose of its surplus war-built vessels, which were constructed and used by the Government during World War II years, in an orderly manner,

and upon prices and terms approved by the Congress.

Section 9 of the act was authorized by the Congress due to the fact that a substantial number of Government-owned, war-built vessels had been purchased from the Maritime Commission in good faith prior to the enactment of the act and on the basis of the wartime construction costs. Section 9 was enacted in order to place those prior purchasers on an equal footing with those who purchased such vessels after the date of enactment on the basis of the much lower statutory sales prices.

Therefore these prior purchasers were given an opportunity to seek an adjustment from the Government. However, there were then in existence charters entered into before the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946 was enacted. There was a desire on the part of the Committee on Commerce to protect the Government in connection with those charters. Accordingly, it was decided to place into the law a specific limitation of liability for use or loss of the vessel under a charter already in existence at the time the 1946 act was adopted as a condition to adjustment.

There could not logically have been an intent to place the same limitation of liability for use or loss in charters to be entered into after enactment of the 1946 act, because no such limitation was being placed in the act upon future charters with citizens or foreigners purchasing after the enactment of the act. The whole emphasis of section 9 was to place prior purchasers on an equal footing with those who purchased such vessels after the date of enactment on the basis of much lower statutory sales prices.

However, while the emphasis in the hearings and debates was placed upon this desire to place prior purchasers upon an equal footing with the new purchasers, the wording of section 9 (c) (2) was not too specific upon this point. Applicants for adjustment under section 9 contended from the start that section 9 (c) (2), limiting the amount of charter hire and indemnity loss in such cases, applies only to charters made before the Merchant Ship Sales Act was enacted and has no application to charters entered into after the enactment of the Ship Sales Act. The Maritime Administration held that the limitations applied to any charters made with prior purchasers before or after the act.

Our committee held hearings upon this matter, and we were convinced that the intent of the 1946 act was to place the limitation for use or loss upon charters made before enactment of the 1946 act only. Otherwise there is a real discrimination in favor of alien and American purchasers who bought their vessels after the enactment of the 1946 act. Section 9 would fall far short of its clear intent to put prior and past purchasers upon an equal footing.

Accordingly, the bill as amended by the committee adds to section 9 (c) (2) after the words "any charter party" the new language, "executed prior to such date." This language simply clarifies the intent of section 9 (c) (2) and makes it evident that prior purchasers seeking an adjustment are to be limited to specific remuneration for use or loss only in connection with charters entered into before enactment of the 1946 act. As to prior purchasers having charters entered into or to be entered into after the 1946 act, they are on an equal footing with new purchasers in that they are entitled to negotiate an agreement and the Government, in case of seizure, is bound to pay just compensation, as it must pay to new purchasers.

The language of the bill does not authorize refunds by the Government upon adjustments already entered into and concluded by the Maritime Administration. A vessel owner cannot insist on a return from the United States of charter hire sums reimbursable to the United States in connection with the adjustment of a prior sales under section 9 (b). The hearings, the committee report, and this statement make that abundantly clear should anyone look upon the language of this bill as somewhat ambiguous in this respect.

There was some question as to the effect of section 9, as contained in this bill, upon charters executed after March 8, 1946, particularly in connection with the Korean emergency. It was established at the hearings that all charters made on and after that date have been charters made on a voluntary basis. They have not been requisition charters and not charters made across the table on a bargaining basis. They have been made on the basis of rates, terms and conditions promulgated by the Government agency that sought those charters for the furtherance of our military effort. The charters are subject to renegotiation and, therefore, there is no possibility of excess compensation.

The pending bill, as reported by the Senate, is simply a clarifying amendment to make evident what should have been made more clear in the 1946 act, that the limitation upon use and loss contained in section 9 is applicable to charters entered into before the enactment of the 1946 act, even though these charters might still be in existence today. Thus, the 1946 act is strengthened in its purpose to place prior purchasers upon an equal footing with purchasers of vessels who bought after enactment of the 1946 act. It entails no refunds by the Government of adjustments voluntarily concluded while the 1946 act was misconstrued.

The new section 9 (c) (3) is technical and simply furnishes the mechanics for placing all purchasers upon an equal footing as outlined above. The Government is not made liable to make refunds on prior, concluded adjustments. It is simply required to relieve prior purchasers of the added and discriminatory liability on charters entered into after the enactment of the 1946 act under the construction placed upon section 9 by the Maritime Administration in the past.

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, I wish to raise a procedural point. I think the request of the Senator from Maryland as to the source of the objection to present consideration of the bill is a perfectly fair one. When bills are objected to on the floor of the Senate, I believe the sponsor of the bill or any other Senator is entitled to know what Senator is objecting. In fact, I believe the rules of the Senate provide that the objecting Senator be made known. I do not know why the matter should be kept secret.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I do not insist on it.

Mr. MORSE. I do, if I have a right to do so.

Mr. SMATHERS. Madam President, for the sake of the RECORD, the junior Senator from Florida objects to the bill.

Mr. MORSE. That is quite all right, but that is different from objecting for some other Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection having been made, the bill will be passed over.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 5976) to amend section 1 of the Natural Gas Act was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Let the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection being heard, the bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 6648) to amend section 205 of the Small Business Act of 1953 was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Let the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection being heard, the bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2643) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMATHERS. Let the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over, upon objection.

That completes the call of the calendar.

The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is Senate bill 987.

COINAGE OF 50-CENT PIECES IN COMMEMORATION OF FOUNDING OF CITY OF NORTHAMPTON, MASS.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 987) to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the tercentennial celebration of the founding of the city of Northampton, Mass.

ENDORSEMENT OF THE UPPER COLORADO STORAGE PROJECT, INCLUDING THE ECHO PARK DAM

Mr. WATKINS. Madam President, there is before the Senate a bill (S. 1555) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, and for other purposes. These projects are reclamation projects of great benefit to the States of New Mexico, Wyoming, Colorado, and Utah.

Recently there was discussion of the advisability of constructing the Echo Park Dam as one unit of the project. Several bills in relation to this unit of the project have recently been introduced.

There recently appeared in the New York Times an excellent letter to the editor, written by Ernest H. Linford, of Salt Lake City, Utah.

I should like to explain that the author of the letter in the New York Times is chief editorial writer of the Salt Lake Tribune. The same Mr. Linford was in Washington last October to accept a plaque from the American Forestry Association for "distinguished service to conservation through his courageous editorials and writings dealing with the various phases of western land management."

Officials of the AFA pointed out at the ceremony that for 5 years Mr. Linford has "spearheaded the Salt Lake Tribune's crusade to protect watersheds and encourage good management of soil and water." They cited more than 100 of his editorials on conservation subjects, many of which have received wide circulation beyond the borders of Utah.

Mr. Linford's award was for the field of press and radio. Other recipients of the 1953 conservation awards were Sherman Adams, assistant to the President, for his work while Governor of New Hampshire in helping to frame and secure enactment of key legislation in connection with forest management; George L. Drake, vice president of the Simpson

Logging Co., of Washington, for his leadership in cooperative forestry between public and private agencies; Thomas V. Downing, Virginia State Department of Education, for his work in pushing youth programs in forestry in the Southern States; and P. H. Gladfelter, of Pennsylvania, for his pioneering work in impressing the importance of sound woodland management.

Madam President, also a very valuable aid in fighting this campaign of misinformation is an editorial published in the January 7, 1954, issue of the Salt Lake Tribune, under the heading "Scenic, Recreational Values at Echo Park."

This very fine factual summary attacks the arguments now being propounded by the opponents to Echo Park, who would have the general public believe that Echo Park Dam would flood about 90 percent of the spectacular canyons of the Green and Yampa Rivers.

I invite the attention of my colleagues in the Senate to this editorial, which refers to the Bureau of Reclamation's report showing that not more than 11 percent of the Dinosaur National Monument would be flooded.

Madam President, on the same subject a very excellent editorial, entitled "Time To Stop Backpedaling," appeared in the January 5, 1954, issue of the Deseret News and Telegram, of Salt Lake City. We, in the upper basin States of the Colorado River Compact, have been plagued by the false propaganda generated by pseudo-conservationists in their attempt to deprive us of our life blood, which is water. Misrepresentations and misleading phrases have been used by the opponents to Echo Park Dam as substitutes for the facts; and innocent, well-meaning organizations, victimized by this scurrilous practice, have blindly entered opposition, when if the truth were presented to them they would have entered support, instead.

Madam President, I conclude by asking unanimous consent that the three matters to which I have referred be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the New York Times of January 9, 1954]

ECHO PARK DAM UPHELD—ITS CONSTRUCTION DEFENDED AS PART OF NEEDED PROGRAM FOR AREA

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

It is disheartening to me to note that the New York Times, usually temperate and factual, is repeating the irresponsible allegations of some wilderness zealots regarding the proposal to build Echo Park Dam.

Your editorial, No Dam at Dinosaur, of December 22 repeats the familiar shocker that this dam (in a remote and almost inaccessible section of western Colorado) would destroy one of the West's great scenic preserves and that Secretary McKay's decision is, as the Sierra Club of California claims, a threat to the national park system.

Actually, as many sincere conservationists have testified, Echo Park Dam and Split Mountain Reservoir, scheduled for later construction, would flood nothing much of scenic, historical, or geological value except in a small section of the canyon, and this can be duplicated in a hundred other areas.

ALTERNATIVE SITES

Your editorial argues that alternative dams could be constructed outside the national monument that would accomplish the purpose of Echo Park Dam without destroying forever one of the unique remnants of primeval America. These alternative sites have been subjected to intensive engineering scrutiny and were studied just recently by Under Secretary of the Interior Tudor before the Interior Department approved the plans. The sheltering canyons and low temperatures prevailing at Echo Park, plus other considerations, make it far the superior site.

This dam is called the "wheelhorse" of the nine-dam upper Colorado River Basin storage project and many elements enter into the complex picture. Evaporation loss is paramount. The "most favorable" alternative site—as to storage, cost economy, electric power production, and so forth—would evaporate 300,000 more acre-feet of water annually than would Echo Park. Such a water loss would supply a good-sized city, would irrigate 200,000 acres of western land, now needing such water, and would supply an agricultural livelihood for more than 20,000 persons.

In addition, substitution of another dam or dams for Echo Park would eliminate from the upper basin program Split Mountain and the Gray Canyon Dams downstream on Green River.

The upper Colorado River Basin program must be considered as an entity. It is carefully integrated and balanced—as to storage, power links, other use of water and as to repayment to the Government. Eliminating or radically changing one element in the coordinated plan could throw the overall program out of balance, making it economically or otherwise unfeasible.

USE OF WATER

This program is the only means by which Utah, Colorado, and other upper basin States can fulfill their compact obligations to the lower basin States and put to beneficial use their share of the Colorado River water. Perhaps one has to live in this semiarid country to realize just how important this "last water hole" is to the region.

You warn that Echo Park is a kind of foot in the door—a threat to the inviolability policy of national parks. I read of no such alarmist material about construction of the great tunnel and water and power works in the Colorado Big Thompson reclamation project. And I have not been aware of mourning over the "damage" to the scenic or recreational value done by these works to the immensely popular Rocky Mountain National Park.

The 1938 Presidential order increasing the size of Dinosaur National Monument from the 80-acre "Dinosaur graveyard" to 200,000 acres, including the Green and Yampa Canyons, clearly contemplated future use of the area for a water project. Moreover, Park Service spokesmen made definite pledges to residents of this area that the monument extension would not interfere with such a project.

With so much at stake in the battle over the public lands it is difficult to understand why Echo Park is being made the blazing symbol of conservation at this time. The epidemic of editorials and intemperate statements arouses the suspicion that Echo Park is the mere window dressing for a behind-the-scenes movement of far greater consequence to the Intermountain West and, indirectly, to the Nation.

ERNEST H. LINFORD.

SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH, *January 2, 1954.*

[From the Salt Lake Tribune of January 7, 1954]

SCENIC, RECREATIONAL VALUES AT ECHO PARK

Anomalies and ironies are multiplying in the hysterical campaign against the proposed Echo Park Dam.

The Washington news conference show held this week by vociferous opponents of the key storage power project in the upper Colorado River Basin program was clearly an attempt to inflame public opinion prior to the congressional hearing scheduled for January 18. The wild and fantastic statements made in the name of impressive-sounding organizations might well cause rank-and-file members of these organizations to examine aims and leadership long and hard. Good would accrue from the calamity howling if Congress were moved to look behind the facade and probe the financial backing of some self-styled conservation groups involved in the emotional crusade.

Ironically, some foot dragging and downright opposition comes from Colorado, the State in which Echo Park Dam would be built, and which would receive more than half the firm water rights and other benefits from the upper basin program. The dam, which would be just below the confluence of the Green and Yampa Rivers, in Dinosaur National Monument, 2 miles east of the Utah-Colorado line, would be constructed under Colorado labor laws and contractors and others would be subject to Colorado taxation. Denver and other Colorado cities would benefit from the electrical power output as would other communities in both upper and lower basins.

Vernal, Utah, less than 30 miles from the damsite, and other Uintah Basin communities would benefit economically in many ways from the dam project because of their close proximity and because of the low-cost electric power it would make available.

Fish and wildlife spokesmen have joined in the loud wail about Echo Park, yet neither the Green nor the Yampa currently yields any fish but the "trash" variety. The creation of miles of quiet, clear water in the canyon bottoms would pave the way for splendid bass and trout fishing in the park and the wildlife situation there could be improved otherwise.

A sportsmen's group leader, writing in the Denver Post, says Echo Park Dam would "flood out about 90 percent of the spectacular canyons" of the Green and Yampa. And a Los Angeles Times columnist writes that the dam's "vague in purpose and staggering cost, would flood virtually every inch of them (the canyons)."

Bureau of Reclamation reports assert, on the other hand, that rivers within the Dinosaur Monument now inundate about 3 percent of the area. After construction of Echo Park and Split Mountain Dams the total flooded area would be increased to about 11 percent of the monument, with most of the increase in the vicinity of Pat's Hole, near the dam. The water would be deep, of course, at the dam, but farther up the canyon gorges—in the areas of best scenery—the reservoirs would gradually decrease in depth.

There are many definitions of beauty and scenic values, but it would seem that covering sandbars, sagebrush, and rubble in the bottom of a canyon would improve the general appearance to many unprejudiced eyes. In the steep canyons the dams would result in widening the present water channel only 1½ to 3 times.

Some sincere wilderness enthusiasts see a concrete dam as sinister and horribly ugly, artificially held water as a crime against nature. Yet annual figures on recreational visits to Hoover Dam and Lake Mead indicate that the popularity of this national recreation area, administered by the National Park Service, is exceeded only by that

of Yellowstone National Park. Some hardy outdoorsmen abhor the idea of opening a wilderness area to the public and fight all means of making such sections more accessible. These and others would put preservation of a wild land above the economic and agricultural development of a whole region. Their attitude is hardly consistent with the concept of serving the best interests of the largest number.

[From the Deseret News and Telegram of January 5, 1954]

TIME TO STOP BACKPEDALING

Three years ago the Federated Utah Artists learned a lesson on the importance of facts. It is a lesson we submit—not very hopefully—for the consideration of a good many people who badly need it.

The association of artists at its annual meeting in January 1951 had before it a proposed resolution opposing construction of Echo Park Dam. Sentiment was high in favor of the resolution. After all, these were artists, interested mainly in preservation of beauty. Other artist organizations throughout the country were opposing the dam on the basis of what they had been told. The resolution seemed certain to sweep through the Utah group in the same way.

Then, just before a vote was to be taken, someone rose to ask whether more information wasn't needed. The membership agreed it was. A committee was appointed to investigate.

In the fall of 1951, after a summer of looking into the problem, the committee—chairmanned, incidentally, by the person who made the original motion—made its report. It concluded that building the dam would make possible development of a beautiful recreation area, that concern about the much-discussed destruction of areas of geological and archaeological value is a myth, that there is no comparable alternative site, and that Utah has many other canyons of comparable or greater beauty and wonder from the aesthetical or any other point of view.

That ended that particular resolution against construction of the dam.

What a pity that so many other well-intentioned but misguided organizations and individuals who are making such a public clamor over the dam haven't bothered to similarly inform themselves.

For make no mistake about it, the Echo Park Dam still has rough going ahead. It has been approved by the Secretary of the Interior for immediate action, but Congress still holds the purse strings. Congressmen live on votes, and the national campaign of misinformation is going to make a good many Congressmen tread very softly—or not at all—where this project is concerned.

We might as well face it. California wants Colorado River water that belongs to Utah. As long as Echo Park and other upper Colorado River project dams go unbuilt, she will get that water. So the present campaign will continue. And it is effective. Shibboleths such as "bureaucratic boondoggling," "stealing the public's inheritance," "destroying nature's wonderland," and other empty phrases make an effective substitute for facts in the public mind.

It is time, we believe, to stop backpedaling and apologizing and explaining.

It is time Utah and Colorado and other States with a stake in the lifeblood of the Colorado took the ball away from the pseudo-conservationists and did some ground-gaining for themselves.

We suggest that the chambers of commerce of Utah and western Colorado cities and other organizations interested in the economic development of this area cooperate in building a fund to acquaint key people in the Nation with exactly what we have here. Let's challenge the opponents of these dams to come out here themselves and actually take a look, not only at the canyons in question but also at others along the Green and Colorado and San Juan equally worthy of public recognition.

A task force of the Department of the Interior saw for itself last summer and was convinced. So did a House Interior Committee. Whenever the facts have been studied, as the Utah artists studied them, the projects have won approval.

And yet, the Los Angeles Times, in a typical sob-sister story, writes:

"When people of the United States discover what they own in these unscarred, unsurpassed, unbelievable canyons, they will no more surrender them up for materialist uses than they would a Yosemite, a Zion, or a Crater Lake."

Mere facts never catch up with that kind of romantic tripe. Not unless we find some way to expose it to the public for what it is. And unless we do, the upper Colorado River project may never get beyond its blueprint.

FINANCING OF MOUNT RUSHMORE NATIONAL MEMORIAL

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, the unfinished business is Senate bill 987, a bill introduced by the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the tercentennial celebration of the founding of the city of Northampton, Mass. I understand that following the disposition of that bill, another special coinage bill will be considered.

For a number of years Congress has been enacting bills of this character. I have had pending, both in the House and in the Senate at different times, a bill to provide for the completion of the Mount Rushmore National Memorial and the financing thereof by the issuance of a special coin. If now it is to be the policy to consider bills of this character, I trust that the Committee on Banking and Currency will give early consideration to my bill, Senate bill 1657.

For the information of Senators, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill may be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1657) to provide for the completion of Mount Rushmore National Memorial and the financing thereof by issuance of a special coin, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That to complete the Mount Rushmore National Memorial and to commemorate the lives and perpetuate the ideals of the four Presidents of the United States there sculptured—George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, Abraham Lincoln, and Theodore Roosevelt—there shall be coined by the Director of the Mint not to exceed 2 million silver 50-cent pieces of standard size, weight, and fineness and of a special appropriate design carrying a replica of the memorial to be fixed by the Director of the Mint, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of the Interior. The United States shall not be subject to the expense of making the models for master dies or other preparations for this coinage but may accept the services to be provided by the Mount Rushmore National Memorial Society therefor and may accept such other services as may be contributed in carrying out the provisions of this act.

SEC. 2. The coins herein authorized shall be issued at par, and only upon the request of the Mount Rushmore National Memorial Society, incorporated under the laws of the State of South Dakota.

SEC. 3. Such coins may be disposed of at par or at a premium by banks or trust companies selected by the said Mount Rushmore National Memorial Society or at the studio of the Mount Rushmore National Memorial, and all proceeds therefrom shall be used for the following purposes: (1) To provide additional parking space in the Mount Rushmore Reserve and adequate comfort and sanitary facilities for visitors; (2) to complete the monument as specified by the models in the administration building maintained by the National Park Service at the memorial, such completion to be under the direction of Lincoln Borglum under the general supervision of the National Park Service; (3) to remove a portion of the debris at the base of Rushmore Mountain and to construct there an appropriate open-air amphitheater suitable for holding public gatherings on historical occasions; (4) to complete the construction of the Hall of Records and the native stone stairway and other features of the memorial as originally conceived by the sculptor, Gutzon Borglum; all such expenditures and construction to be under the supervision of the National Park Service.

SEC. 4. All laws now in force relating to the subsidiary silver coins of the United States and the coining or striking of the same; regulating and guarding the process of coinage; providing for the purchase of material; and for the transportation, distribution, and redemption of coins; for the prevention of debasement or counterfeiting; for the security of the coins, or for any other purpose, whether such laws are penal or otherwise, shall, so far as applicable, apply to the coinage herein authorized.

SEC. 5. The coins authorized herein shall be issued in such numbers and at such times as shall be requested by the Mount Rushmore National Memorial Society and upon payment to the United States of the face value of such coins: *Provided*, That none of such coins shall be issued after the expiration of a 10-year period immediately following the enactment of this act.

AMENDMENT OF AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1938, AS AMENDED

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the last bill on the calendar today was Calendar 831, Senate bill 2643, a bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended. I understand that it was objected to primarily as a matter of procedure because the bill is to be brought up for consideration and full debate in the very near future.

The bill contains an amendment which was submitted by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER], which deals with a very serious Irish-potato problem in the Pacific Northwest.

I received today a series of telegrams from some leaders in the potato industry in my State, representing the potato growers. I ask that these telegrams be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

REDMOND, OREG., *January 11, 1954.*

HON. WAYNE MORSE,

Senate Office Building:

The bill permitting the Secretary of Agriculture to use section 32 funds for diversion

of Irish potatoes comes on floor tomorrow. We need these funds. Work for passage.

ROY SNABEL,
Chairman, Oregon-California Marketing Committee.

REDMOND, OREG., *January 11, 1954.*
Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building:

Work for passage of bill on floor of Senate permitting Secretary of Agriculture the use of section 32 funds to divert Irish potatoes.

H. W. STEELHAMMER,
President, Central Oregon Potato Growers Association.

REDMOND, OREG., *January 11, 1954.*
Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building:

Back legislation to pass bill authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to use section 32 funds for diversion of Irish potatoes. We need this help.

BEN DAVIDSON,
Administrator, Oregon Potato Committee.

Mr. MORSE. The first telegram is typical. It reads as follows:

The bill permitting the Secretary of Agriculture to use section 32 funds for diversion of Irish potatoes comes on floor tomorrow. We need these funds. Work for passage.

I have been informed that what the potato growers of Oregon are seeking to do is to obtain authorization for the Secretary of Agriculture to use funds for the purchase of potatoes in such programs as the school-lunch program. It is claimed by the Secretary of Agriculture that at the present time he does not have such authority. It seems to me obvious, Madam President, that such authority should be given him. The Welker amendment is a sound one. I not only support it, but I shall urge its favorable consideration when the bill comes up for debate in the near future.

THE PRESIDENT'S AGRICULTURAL PROGRAM

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I do not know that I have anything world-shaking to say about the farm problem. It is a little difficult to make one's self heard with the overtones in the galleries. I hope they will subside, so that this feeble voice of mine may reach into the appropriate corners of the Chamber.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order. Let there be order on the floor and in the galleries.

Mr. DIRKSEN. By way of prelude, let me say that I am unequivocably and unreservedly for the President's agricultural program.

As Senators know, I come from the Corn Belt. Next to Iowa, Illinois produces more corn than any other commonwealth in the entire United States. We think of corn not only in terms of a cereal grain, but also in terms of its use in the commercial market. It is the fact that roughly 80 of every 100 bushels of corn produced go into livestock. Consequently we cannot think of the livestock problem without thinking of the corn problem.

In my section of the country we measure corn not only in terms of bushels, but also in terms of gallons on occasion, because it enters into the commercial market in a rather large way.

As I sense the President's program, in seeking to simplify what I think are its fundamental items, I should say that it would permit mandatory supports on basic commodities at 90 percent of parity to expire with the 1954 crop. Secondly, it would provide for flexible parity based upon supply after 1955. Under present law there is authority to use the old or the modernized parity on basic commodities, which authority expires January 1, 1956.

There is also what is known as adjusted or transitional parity. That is nothing more than an adjustment, to enable us to go from the old to the new formula.

The plan also provides the setting aside of about one-half the commodities now owned by the Government, for a variety of purposes, including national defense, the school-lunch program, and other diversions, so long as they do not have any effect upon the commercial market.

I think the effect of the program is very nicely stated in the President's message at the bottom of page 6, under the heading "Conclusion." I could do no better, for the purpose of my remarks, than to read it. It reads as follows:

It will help the farmer attain full parity in the market. It will avoid creating burdensome surpluses. It will curtail the regimentation of production planning, lessen the problem of diverted acreage, and yield farmers greater freedom of choice and action.

It has some other objectives, of course, but those are all that are necessary for my purpose.

If I were to recite the reasons why I think this is a sound program, I should say, first of all, that it is fundamental. Secondly, it conforms to certain basic economic principles. I believe it is fair to every segment of our society, including both producers and consumers. I think it presents the best hope for some kind of durable solution, after nearly 30 years of failure. When all is said and done, in connection with the farm problem, we are back where we were 30 years ago.

In indicating to the Senate why I am in favor of this program, I think it would be well to invite attention to a little history.

I was in the House of Representatives in 1933, when there was agricultural distress in the United States. I remember how we wrestled and struggled in the hope that we might find a practicable, workable, and durable solution.

Those were the days when it was urged—and I suppose with some truth—that we were destroying little pigs, and probably trying to teach birth control to the rest of the hog population, in order to overcome the surplus problem. Those were the days when we were talking about plowing under every third row of cotton. I would be less than candid if I did not confess that there was distress in agricultural areas, because corn was selling at a very low price, and so were hogs. Senators know what the price of wheat was at that time. I very freely confess that there was an agricultural stringency, and that the spectral hand of foreclosure was moving over the country.

Nor would I be quite candid if I did not at least say that the emergency programs which we had in 1933, in some degree, at least, represented decisive action, whether right or wrong. I have not had too many pleasant things to say about the New Deal, but I will say at least that there was decisive action at that time. It was sought to meet something which was an emergency if we ever saw one.

We had ever so many farm measures in those days. There was the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1934. I am not sure whether my esteemed colleague [Mrs. SMITH of Maine] was in the House at that time or not. That measure was the beginning of an entire series of legislative proposals, which went back, in large part, to the basic Agricultural Adjustment Act. As I saw the legislative program unfold, I sometimes wondered whether or not we were getting into an atmosphere of confusion. I tried on occasion to spell out all the things which were designed, first, to increase productivity; second, to increase production; and third, to cut it down by acreage allotments, marketing quotas, and otherwise. Then of course there was the attempt to put it all together to determine whether it was a realistic, reasonable, and consistent program.

Let us consider productivity for a moment. Let us remember the improvement in fertilizers, the amount of money expended in order to make the soil produce more, and the expenditure of money which resulted in producing more corn. More cotton can be produced per acre, and more wheat can be produced per acre, and more of everything can be produced per acre.

I remember not so long ago when, on the basis of averages, 25 bushels of corn per acre seemed a good yield in the Corn Belt. Today 100 bushels and even in excess of 150 bushels are grown. All those improvements have been made on the productivity side.

So far as production is concerned, let us consider the potato situation. I remember when millions of bushels of potatoes were made inedible by being dyed with an indelible dye or by being sprinkled with kerosene.

It seemed for all the world as though the conjunction of good weather, rainfall, and fertility in the acres devoted to potatoes produced more potatoes than ever before. The result was, of course, that not only did the price go down, but it became necessary, out of the Public Treasury, with the dollars of the taxpayers, to support the price; and the further the price went down the more support was required. The cost ran into hundreds of millions of dollars.

We had a similar situation with respect to eggs. I think the policy finally was to buy them in order to support the price, and to dry them. Many drying plants were developed. Then they had to be stored somewhere. I recall as a member of the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations in the House

that we caused an investigation to be made of a cave which the Government took over in Kansas. It was air conditioned and electrically lighted, so that the equivalent of literally millions of dozens of eggs could be stored there. The hens had become too productive. The balanced ration fed them had become too effective. So there we were, with a surplus. We had to move in and take over. I am afraid the aroma finally reminded the people of the United States what such a program would finally lead to.

In all this time, despite all the plasters which were placed upon the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and all the implementing legislation which was passed up to 1949, there was no solution to the problem. I say that very kindly, and I express the hope at the same time that this will not become a very tart and severe partisan issue. I do not see how we can put it on a partisan basis. I mean to be just as kindly about it as I can. Probably some testy things could be said. However, I am content to say now that the farm problem was never solved at any time since I first came to Congress in 1932.

The best answer I know is the bulging bins we have today, the waste, the losses, the giveaways, and all the rest. With all that, we are plagued in the year of our Lord 1954 with surpluses such as we have never seen before.

What finally did solve the problem—or rather sidetrack it, because it cannot be called a solution—was the intervention of war, with its attendant inflation, and all the evil and ulcerous things which come out of the crucible of war. There was a giveaway program. When other countries saw their economy slipping and they could not till their soil, obviously we had to dip into the American economy to help them maintain a solid front and enable them to retain their vitality as allies in a worldwide effort.

We had troops in the field. The demands upon our economy were necessarily multiplied. So, of course, the economy had to be stimulated in wartime. The fact of the matter is that nearly 1 out of every 3 bushels of wheat which we produced went abroad at that time. Nearly 1 out of every 3 bales of cotton went abroad for one purpose of another. Probably the equivalent of 1 out of every 3 bushels of rice went abroad. So there was an almost unlimited area in which our farm commodities could find a market with the qualification, however, that the very farmers who produced the surpluses had to pay, in part, through their taxes, for that kind of giveaway program.

Frankly, that is not a solution. I am sure that no one would have the temerity to stand up and say that it was a solution. But we must confess that the problem was sidetracked.

We must also confess that the problem was sidetracked because a false prosperity, which was conditioned upon conflict and broken bodies, had sidetracked it. Surplus labor had gone into the war plants. Wages were firm and reasonably high, and there was great buying power in the country. That helped to sidetrack the problem. But God forbid that anyone should ever undertake to call that a solution, when it depends upon sending young Americans into all corners of the earth, and sending materiel, munitions, and all the other things that such a condition involves. A synthetic and artificial condition was produced in our country which sidetracked the problem for the time being.

We have now reached the point where it seems that we can diminish the number of our troops abroad in small part, because of the progress we have made in the field of atomic weapons. It seems that we do not need quite so many of the accoutrements of war; and when we do not need them, we do not need quite so many men to operate them. I think it is fair to say that probably we shall experience some reaction in our country—how much or how little, we do not know.

War is an abnormal thing; and when we excise it from our economy, it is the same as removing a hideous, cancerous growth from the body. There is a little pain accompanying the operation; but I am confident that we have not only the courage, but the capacity and vitality, to take it in stride and see it through.

Here we are with respect to this problem which has been gathering momentum for a long time, except when it was sidetracked temporarily by the conditions to which I have referred. We have been floundering again, and we are in an area of confusion.

I think it is interesting perhaps, to note that our friends on the other side, at their national convention in 1948, wrote a provision in their platform which endorsed the principle of a permanent system of flexible price supports. It intrigued me a great deal; in fact, two suggestions intrigued me: First, the one respecting flexible price supports, such as the President now advocates, and, secondly, the one making it a "permanent system." Certainly, those who wrote that provision in the platform were doing their earnest and most sincere best in order to find a basis for what looked like a durable and workable policy.

Immediately thereafter came another proposal. I examined rather carefully the suggestion made by the former Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Brannan, in Des Moines, Iowa. Many people had gathered there. Then, of course, the attack began, and I am delighted now that the Congress saw fit to turn that proposal aside, because I have no idea, nor does any finite mind, what the Brannan plan, with its almost unlimited provisions, would accomplish, in paying the difference between the price the market would bear and what the price should be. Who can estimate what the burden upon the Federal Treasury would have been?

Then came the act of 1948. I think my friend from Tennessee was in the House at that time, and I know he gave a great deal of attention to the act to extend high supports until 1949, as I recall, and then we were to drop back to a flexible basis in 1950.

As I understand, the act of 1949 was extended through 1950, with a provision that the flexible scale should not become effective until 1951 and 1952.

There was action in the Congress last year dealing with the same problem. If I correctly remember—and I would do no Member of this body an injustice—I thought at the time of the discussion the word "temporary" was used. In other words, it was not a solution. So we had to wait for new facts and data to assure that a sound program would be enacted.

Mr. President, I have indicated briefly the unhappy inheritance President Eisenhower received in the agricultural field. He can say with truth that he received an unsolved problem that was only temporarily aborted and sidetracked by the conflict which intervened, and that in fact we are about where we were 20 or more years ago. He can say, of course, that there has been a diminution of export markets. Certainly we are stimulating the export of agricultural commodities, but nations are today stimulating their own production; they are trying to develop a self-sustaining basis for themselves. In addition to that, many countries, directly and indirectly, developed war debts of their own that have to be paid. Consequently, they have to turn to that field of activity and endeavor to find something with which to pay their debts.

This is a reasonably kindly observation to make, Mr. President. I do not believe we looked the economic facts of life fully in the face when we were dealing with agriculture.

I remember that Mr. Truman went to Detroit and said he thought the farmers would be ungrateful if they did not vote for his ticket. I think he could have better served the country if he had told the whole story and everything involved in it and told them that here was a shadow which was going to plague not only his party but the Republican Party, and the entire Nation as well.

Congress provided that 66 million acres could be used for the production of wheat at 90 percent of parity, when the Department of Agriculture, under their own findings, said the amount should not be more than 55 million acres.

If we are going properly to serve the farmers of the country and the Nation itself we must be courageous about it and put aside some of the political considerations which have too freely intervened.

Mr. President, I am not so naive as to believe that any feeble effort on my part or any mere words are going to dispel political considerations, but I think it is proper to remind everyone that if there should be a crucifixion it will not be a case of crucifying one party or the other; it will be a case of hanging the country upon an economic cross.

I do not want to be charged with that responsibility. Like Pilate, I do not want that blood to be upon my hands.

So, Mr. President, it behooves us to give almost prayerful thought to this problem, because we cannot aid the economy of the Nation unless we do.

Mr. President, there is another factor in the picture which certainly ought to make us prayerful, namely, the carryover of commodities. It is astounding.

Let us consider the wheat situation. There was a carryover in 1952 of 236

million bushels. By 1953 it jumped up to 559 million bushels, and the estimated carryover for 1954 amounts to 780 million bushels. That is a whole year's requirement. What are we going to do with it? Place it in unused liberty ships, or put it in storage in holes in the ground? We did that for a while, Mr. President; but there will come a day when there will be such a revulsion on the part of the consumers of the country that our whole agricultural picture may be in danger.

Let us consider cotton. There was a carryover of approximately 2,800,000 bales in 1952. It jumped to 5,500,000 bales in 1953. It was up to 9 million bales in October of 1953. The estimated amount for 1954 is 9 million bales. The Department of Agriculture advises us that that is a whole year's supply.

What shall we do? It is one of those items which certainly press upon the conscience of the people when they deal with the policy.

With reference to corn, there was a carryover in 1952 of 486 million bushels. It increased to 764 million bushels in 1953, and the corn carryover in 1954 is estimated at 900 million bushels. Whether we spell it out in bushels or in gallons, Mr. President, that is a lot of corn. Of course we have to gear that great supply of feed to the livestock industry, because we cannot divorce these problems one from another.

Let us look at the Commodity Credit Corporation's report on its investment in commodities. I remember the days when we started out with very modest sums for the Commodity Credit Corporation, but, little by little, they grew, until, even before I left the House of Representatives, the line of credit for the Commodity Credit Corporation was up to $5,250,000,000. It could issue debentures and could borrow from the Treasury, and then it could operate in the whole field of price supports and purchases. The fact of the matter is that the Commodity Credit Corporation's borrowing power today is $6,750,000,000. That is 2 times the whole budget of the United States Government for 1932. We cannot laugh that figure off. We have committed to the Commodity Credit Corporation twice as much as the whole cost of operating this Government, including the Army and Navy, in 1932, 21 years ago.

The value of the commodities which the Commodity Credit Corporation owns is estimated at $4,500,000,000. The remainder of its obligations is accounted for by the commitments and the promises the Corporation has already made.

Let us consider what has happened in the last year. Two and one-half billion dollars has been the increase in commodity holdings in a single year. It is an unhappy thing to have to continue to buy wheat and to put it in storage and to buy corn and to put it in galvanized containers, of which there are hundreds of thousands in the Corn Belt. One can fly over that region on a clear night and see those cans, containing thousands of bushels of corn, glistening in the moonlight.

The point I wish to make, and I shall not be too sharply partisan, is that it is not Eisenhower corn that is in those bins. That corn got there before the Eisenhower administration. I say this because I mean to make my argument as well as I can. But it is an added reason why every Senator, irrespective of his political persuasion, has something more than a political interest in a problem which has been presented to the Senate by the President of the United States.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GOLDWATER in the chair). Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I wish to say that in 1953 the production of corn was not very far out of line with the requirements of the country.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. The total carryover or total surplus, on which we are paying storage, was produced in previous years. It goes back as far as 1948.

However, what I now wish to point out is the cost of carrying this supply. Not only is there involved the interest on the money involved, but it is estimated that by May 1 it will be costing the Commodity Credit Corporation $1 million a day in storage charges. That will be $365 million for storage alone each year.

There was a time when it was thought that that amount would be the entire annual cost of the farm support program. Indeed, it should be. I think that if we once get started afresh, that amount probably will carry the farm program year after year. But when it is considered that it costs $365 million a year for the storage of Government-owned commodities alone, that gives us something to think about in addition to the cost of supporting farm prices themselves.

This year Congress has imposed acreage controls on wheat and cotton. Of course, under the law, controls should have been imposed on both those commodities last year, in which event we would be seeing our way out of the woods by this time. But that was not done. Congress did not have the heart to reduce wheat planting from 76 million acres to 55 million acres, as required by law. In order to soften the shock and to prevent real hardship among wheat farmers, Congress decided that the farmers could plant a total of 62 million acres of wheat for the present year. That will not reduce the carryover at all. Probably it will result in the addition of another 100 million bushels of carryover, because 62 million acres of wheat grown by modern methods of production will grow more than can be used.

There is now before the Senate a bill to permit cotton growers to plant 21 and a third million acres of cotton this year, a reduction from the 24½ million acres harvested last year. Under the law, cotton farmers would have had to reduce their planting to a little under 18 million acres. That would have been a shock. It would have been an economic shock to a large number of small cotton growers of the United States.

The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has reported a bill to the Senate, which has been made the unfinished business for tomorrow, which will permit cotton growers to plant a little more than 21 million acres this year. I am sorry to say that that will not reduce the carryover at all. In fact, that, too, probably will result in adding a little to the surplus of cotton.

The emergency measures we have adopted will not solve the problem at all. They will not reduce the carryover. They will simply keep the carryover from increasing as fast as it has increased in the past few years.

I am making this statement now in order to point out that the problem we face is not simple. As the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] will recall, the continuous piling up of these commodities began in 1949, and only the Korean war kept us out of serious agricultural trouble at that time.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. Twice in the last 20 years we have been bailed out of agricultural catastrophe by war. We do not want to depend upon war to keep agricultural prices on an even keel. I do not believe we should have to depend on war. I do not think the American people want to depend on war. What we are trying to do now is to devise a program which will result in continuing agricultural prosperity at a high level. None of us is satisfied with 90 percent of parity. We want the American farmer to get his full share of the economic dollar. I believe that that can be done. I believe Congress will devote every effort to that end. I believe those who constantly attack the President in his effort to do that are not making too much of a contribution.

I realize that we cannot all be expected to agree on details. Necessarily this has to be a give-and-take proposition. But if I am any kind of prophet at all, I prophesy that the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry will bring forth a good program within the next 7 weeks.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am glad to hear the Senator from Vermont say that.

While we are still talking about the Commodity Credit Corporation and the money that is involved, it is my understanding that a request will be made to increase the borrowing authority of the Commodity Credit Corporation to $8,500,000,000. That is a tremendous sum. It means that prices will be supported, that there will be borrowing, and that commodities will be placed in storage. Then will come the real headache of wondering what is to be done with the surplus.

We cannot let spoilage, deterioration, and aging of grain go on forever. We cannot let hungry people notice, on the front pages of newspapers, that corn has been hauled out of storage bins, where it has been deteriorating, to be sold at a great discount in the market. I remember encountering that situation once before. I remember a couple of thousand troops being around me as I was standing on a platform in Frankfurt, Germany.

I said, "Ask me any question you wish to ask."

The first youngster brought up a clipping from a newspaper and asked, "Is this what they are doing back home?"

Of course, he pointed to the fact that bulldozers were running over and mascerating potatoes so that they could not be used.

Ultimately we get to moral considerations when food is destroyed in that way. So we shall have to find the answer, as we go into this astronomical problem. We must consider the impact it will have on the budget.

I do not know what amount will be received finally for the commodities which are in storage, but I know that, under the Commodity Credit Act, the Commodity Credit Corporation, with a hundred million dollars of capital, is mandated to make a report to the Treasury, and every year the Treasury is mandated to make a report to Congress, showing what the impairment of the capital structure of the Commodity Credit Corporation is. Under that law, it is the responsiblility of Congress to appropriate from the Treasury of the United States to compensate for those losses.

So we come right back to the unending spiral as it affects the taxpayers of the United States. Suppose that out of this great accumulation we lose two or three billion dollars. That simply means that the deficit faced by the Treasury will be greater than it ever was.

I am still one of those who believe it is proper, sound, and prudent to try to balance the budget of our country if we can do so. So as the matter moves into the stratosphere, it demands attention.

At this point we might consider the amounts of commodities on hand as of October 1952 and October 1953. In October 1952 the Commodity Credit Corporation owned 289 million bushels of corn; in October 1953 it owned 520 million bushels, almost double the amount.

In the field of wheat, in October 1952, it owned 451 million bushels; in October 1953 it owned 806 million bushels. As I recall, it had only 700,000 bales of cotton in October 1952. In October 1953 there were in its inventory 3⅓ million bales of cotton.

In 1952, it had 448 million pounds of tobacco, and in October 1953 that had jumped to 512 million.

It had 335 million pounds of fats and oils, and the amount has now reached the astronomical figure of 1,070,000,000 pounds.

In October 1952 it had only 31 million pounds of dairy products in the investment account. Today there are 1,700,000,000 pounds.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. GORE. The distinguished junior Senator from Illinois earlier made reference to the junior Senator from Tennessee, which I very much appreciate. In former years it was my privilege to work with the distinguished Senator from Illinois, then a Member of the other House, in the formulation of agricultural legislation.

The distinguished Senator has just called attention to the stocks of butter on hand.

Mr. DIRKSEN. No, I did not specify butter. I said "dairy products," although I think I have the figures as to butter. But if the Senator has the figure, he can offer it.

Mr. GORE. I do not have the exact figure as to butter.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I think it is 331,000,000 pounds.

Mr. GORE. Is the distinguished Senator from Illinois aware of the fact that the only recommendation today with respect to dairy products is for a continuation of the present law? The Senator will find that on page 9 of the President's message. No improvement, no change whatsoever, is recommended.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I expect to deal with that.

Mr. GORE. If the Senator will yield one moment further, I may say that the cattle producers of the United States, many of whom have faced bankruptcy and are now facing bankruptcy, have been hoping that the farm program to be recommended by the administration would provide some improvement in their position. The conditions have been tragic. In my State, and in the State so ably represented by the Senator from Illinois, and in many other States, conditions have been so tragic that failure has already been the fate of many cattle farmers; and an equally desperate plight faces many more. Yet, in spite of those conditions, let me read the concluding sentence of the President's message, under the hearing "Meat Animals":

> It is recommended, therefore, that the existing conditions with respect to meat animals be continued.

The cattle farmers have been hoping the conditions would be remedied, not continued.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senator says the cattle farmers hope the condition will be remedied, and I prefer to deal a little more specifically with the matter. They thought the cattle population would finally hit the 100 million head figure because of the policy of the past, which encouraged the raising of cattle. Now, however, the Secretary of Agriculture is pretty confident that he is going to hold the figure well under 95 million head, and the conditions since the recent drought, over which the Secretary, of course, had no control, have resulted in so many canners and cutters moving into the market that it is becoming a manageable problem, and that is why the statement was included in the message.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to say that the Secretary of Agriculture has not been unaware of the condition of cattle raisers and of the low price which has prevailed for low-grade beef animals. We all know what has been done and what the Congress has done at the request of the administration for the relief of farmers in the drought areas.

I might add that the Secretary of Agriculture has purchased the equivalent of about 800,000 head of low-grade beef animals during this year. I do not know whether or not that program should be continued. I think we shall have to wait until we get the cattle census as of January 1, which I understand will be made public on February 12.

If the cattle census shows that there is no increase in beef animals this year or shows a slight reduction, I think it will have a very healthy effect on the market. If, however, it shows a substantial increase, I would say that the Secretary then would have to continue the purchase program of low-grade animals, because they are the ones which are selling at a low price at the present time.

I know a good deal of pressure has been put upon the Secretary to go into the livestock business, to purchase live animals. Personally, I can see no point in the Federal Government's supporting live animals except for subsidizing the meat industry; and I do not think the people of the United States have yet been conditioned to that point; in fact, I would say they are being deconditioned in that respect at the present time.

If anyone would like to find good reasons set forth why the Government cannot feasibly purchase live animals, I suggest that he refer to some of the Senate Agriculture Committee hearings of, I think, 1951. At that time, Secretary Brannan was undergoing the same type of pressure to purchase live hogs which is now being put on the present Secretary. He came before the committee and explained very clearly why it was impossible for the Government to go into the livestock industry. Of course, the Government could go into the purchase of live hogs much easier than it could go into the purchase of live cattle, because of the smaller number of grades involved. Secretary Brannan's reasons why the Government could not purchase live animals are clearly set forth in one of the Senate committee hearings. I will furnish a copy for any Senator who desires to read it.

For 20 years officials of the Government have tried to develop some means of supporting the livestock industry through the purchase of live animals, and they have not been able to do it. Secretary Benson this year has probably purchased more beef animals than have been purchased in any previous year during the past 20 years.

One reason why there has been overproduction of dairy products is that farmers are milking old cows instead of selling them. My section of the country is offending in that respect more than other sections. In the country as a whole that is true to the extent of 1 percent more than last year. In New England and New York it is true to the extent of 10 percent more than last year. The farmers are milking old cows which they should have sold. They are getting the same income and producing 10 percent more milk in order to get it. If they produced the same amount of milk as last year they would get the same price.

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

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. The junior Senator from Oklahoma happens to be against the purchase of live animals, just as the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry is; but the junior Senator from Oklahoma feels that if we again enter upon a beef-buying program, such as the Secretary of Agriculture engaged in to the extent of over 200,000,000 pounds, it should be a beef-buying program for the relief and the benefit of the cattle raisers and not the big meat packers.

If it is a part of our tradition to support prices by removing the glut, whether it be in the case of dairies which had contracts with the creameries, or otherwise, I cannot see why we should not require that the prices to the producers of live cattle reflect the price normally received, and which they have historically received when it comes to sales to the Government.

In the case of cottonseed, I may call attention to the fact that we required cotton ginners to pay a certain price to the cotton producers, and the price for their cottonseed bore an historic ratio to what the Government was paying for the refined cottonseed oil.

If the Government buys pecans, the processor must certify, in order to get the Government to buy his product, that the producer has received a price which preserves the historic ratio in relationship to the price received by the processor.

But when we study the program that is designed to help the cattle farmer, we find that the Secretary of Agriculture has completely ignored the price to the producer; that while 38 cents a pound was being paid for much of the beef sold to Armour, Wilson, Cudahy, and Swift, the Government had buyers throughout Oklahoma who were waiting until the market got as low as 5 cents on the hoof for cutters and canners.

If the market had been strengthened, as could easily have been done if the Secretary of Agriculture had used the commonsense and good judgment of any administrator who was seeking to benefit the producer; and if there had been a requirement that a minimum of 11 or 12 cents a pound be paid for the cutters and canners, if 38 cents a pound was being paid to the processors, we would have found that the market would have rectified itself long before now, and we could have stopped this situation in February or March with very little money, or in June with a very little more money. But the conditions caused not only by drought but by liquidation of the herds and the hopelessness of the cattle raisers have made this agricultural problem a major one.

I, for one, am tremendously disappointed to read that in the President's program there is nothing except a statement that the existing conditions with respect to meat animals shall be continued.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I wish to make one observation; namely, that the Secretary of Agriculture and the Advisory Board, on which the cattle raiser is well represented, believe they have this matter within manageable dimensions now.

Let me say also that during the summer I noticed that those who came to Washington in an effort to have something done for the cattle industry received considerable publicity. I was traveling up and down the country, and at the time I talked to cattlemen in California. They said the situation was not nearly so acute as it would seem to have been represented. I was in Oklahome, as may be known from the press. I talked to some cattlemen there, and also I had talks in Los Angeles. I did not receive the impression that the situation was nearly so acute as some sought to make it appear.

I must add that I state only what I know. I sat down with the feeders in northern Illinois, where cattle feeding is engaged in almost as extensively as in any other State of the Union. In speaking and in conferring in that feeder area with a great many persons engaged in that activity, I learned that they were going to make out reasonably well.

I do not say that to indicate that I do not believe no one was hurt, because somebody in that business did get hurt. When there is a drought, when there is a lack of feed, and when it is necessary to assemble feed and to pay the transportation charges on it, very often damage to some extent is done before an inert government can move.

I do not say that no damage was done; but I say that in view of the number of marketable cattle that can be handled in the country, relatively little damage was done.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield to me at this time?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. Let me point out to my colleague from Illinois that in the markets in Oklahoma, Texas, Arkansas, and Kansas, he will find that the price being paid today for low-grade cattle is still a distress price.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is true.

Mr. MONRONEY. I grant that an inert Government with an inert Secretary of Agriculture, if you please, finds it difficult to move. However, the situation must be acute, if it is important enough to warrant the purchase of more than 200 million pounds of meat.

What the junior Senator from Oklahoma is saying is that certainly we are entitled to expect some of this largesse to go to the producers. It will not suffice to show big profits to the processors. It is the producer who is being hurt; and the program the administration recommends will only continue that situation.

If the Government buys another million pounds of beef, the only result will be larger profits for the processors; but the cattle raisers will still be left in a very precarious situation.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I think we are mindful of the distress of those who sent canners and cutters into the markets; but too often that operation was the one which received the headlines. On the other hand, in a good many areas there was still a pretty good market for the prime and the good beef.

So it becomes a matter of having just half the information reach the country. I think sometimes that situation misleads even those of us who are here in this great deliberative and, shall I say, omniscient body.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield to me?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Let me say that I think the Senator from Oklahoma is partly right and partly wrong.

There is a great divergence between the price in the small country markets and the price in the large markets in Chicago, Omaha, St. Paul, and elsewhere. In the large markets, the price of canners, cutters, and utility cows and bulls has gone up materially, as I have followed the market prices, since the Secretary of Agriculture has inaugurated his program.

However, there seems to be a difference of 3, 4, or sometimes 5 cents a pound between the price in the small markets and the price in the major cattle markets of the country.

I wish to say that in the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry we have appointed a subcommittee on price spreads between the producer and the consumer, and that situation is one of the subjects which will be studied. Why do the smaller eastern markets pay so much less for second-grade, or low-grade beef animals than is paid in some of the major markets, such as Chicago? In New England, prices run consistently behind those in Chicago, when an attempt is made to sell a cow from a dairy herd. But I must submit that I do not see how the Secretary of Agriculture is going to go into a thousand and one small markets throughout the country and make sure that the price in all of them is sustained.

I hope that can be done. The first thing we want to do is ascertain who is manipulating the market, if it is being manipulated, and what we can do about it.

There can be no question that every major packing company and probably most of the smaller packing companies have made large profits this year. However, if all their profits are added together, they will not amount to what the farmers have been losing.

Probably the big gain that is being made is in the tremendously increased consumption. We know that the increase in consumption was the direct result of the administration's removal of price controls and the unworkable regulations for the grading of beef last February.

Unfortunately the dairy farmer who wishes to cull his herd has little incentive to do so, so he continues to overproduce dairy products.

I agree with the Senator from Illinois, and I hope we will find the answer.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, if the Senator from Illinois will yield further to me——

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. Let me say that what the distinguished Senator from Vermont has said regarding the wide divergence is absolutely true; but there is wide divergence in the market in the case of wheat, cotton, and corn; and many markets are involved in those cases.

Yet because the Government has a policy of establishing a certain reasonable floor the reasonable price is maintained in every county in the United States.

I am not asking for a rigid system of supports; but I say that, if the Secretary of Agriculture had geared his purchase of more than 200 million pounds of beef to a minimum price of 11 or 12 cents, which would have preserved the historic ratio between 38-cent hamburger from the packer and the price of the live animal, such a minimum price of 11 or 12 cents for cutters and canners would have been reflected in every market in the United States, because the farmer would have known that was what those animals were worth, and that the Government was buying at that figure.

Mr. AIKEN. It is entirely possible that conditions will improve, and we hope to find some way of achieving that result.

But, so far as I know, that has not been done in previous years, even when the price of all the cattle in the country, both high grade and low grade, went to 7 cents a pound, as occurred in 1940.

As to being able to enforce a fairly equitable support price throughout the country, the Senator from Oklahoma has used wheat as an example. Wheat is a good example of how it cannot be done.

Mr. MONRONEY. How about using butter?

Mr. AIKEN. At harvesttime this year the wheat farmers were guaranteed 90 percent of parity, but they were selling their wheat for an average of 76 percent of parity at harvesttime; and today the farm price of wheat on the average is only 82 percent of parity. In other words, over at least half of the country the farmers received, instead of $2.21 a bushel, which the Government guaranteed them, $1.50 or $1.75 a bushel. That is how the matter worked out. It is working that way in the case of livestock.

Mr. CASE rose.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Before we get away from cattle, I yield to the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. AIKEN. He comes from a cattle-producing section. He should have the answers.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, it seems to me that not all the blame should rest at the door of the Secretary of Agriculture. A part of the responsibility properly rests upon Congress. During the debate last summer when we were working on the foreign-aid bill, in which we provided funds for the procurement of beef in the purchase program, the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. GRISWOLD] and I did all we could to persuade the Senate to write a 10-cent floor under the price of cattle. We did not obtain sufficient support on the floor of the Senate to make it effective.

Our argument at the time was that if there were a 10-cent floor for the poorest of the canners and cutters, prices would grade up from that figure. It would have made a substantial difference at a time when it would have been quite important. Canners and cutters were selling as low as 6, 7, or 7½ cents—perhaps even as low as 5 cents.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. In connection with the livestock problem, under the present law the Secretary can do what he does in connection with butter, and in connection with purchases of other commodities. He could establish a figure of 10, 11, or 12 cents if he chose to do so. He does not require legislation to do it.

Mr. CASE. Perhaps that is true; but the Congress could have insured that he would do it had the Senate been responsive to the pleas which the Senator from Nebraska and I made at that time.

Furthermore, the price of cattle has somewhat improved. I have been following the market fairly closely, because I have a few cattle to sell. I know that the price of stockers and feeders has improved. The price of cows has improved somewhat during the past few months. It sagged a bit, but it improved after the Department started its purchase program in earnest.

Mr. MONRONEY. Will the Senator make it clear that in connection with the beef buying program, the butter program, and other purchasing programs, the Secretary of Agriculture is acting under discretionary authority, and not under a mandatory direction by Congress? We could have written decent provisions into the law, but we could not have forced the Secretary of Agriculture to pay a decent price to the cattle producer.

Mr. CASE. We could have provided for a minimum floor price. There are minimum floor prices in connection with other commodities. However, the Secretary of Agriculture is, of course, on notice that the Senate had the opportunity to establish a floor of ten cents, and failed to do so.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I suppose it is an established fact that members of the Cabinet and their advisory groups and staffs probably read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. President, I have detained the Senate far too long this afternoon. I wish to make only a few additional points.

First, at the end of nearly a quarter of a century there is on the books no solution for the farm problem.

Second, the farm problem was sidetracked by the war. Of course, as our preparations for war diminish, the agricultural program takes on a new difficulty, and I think furnishes a new anxiety, not only for the Congress but for the farm producers and for the entire country.

I earnestly believe that any program which is to be durable and workable over a period of time must be geared to the essential principles of the law of supply and demand. After we have estimated our carryover and reserve, and have indicated pretty well what we can let go into the export market, and after we have estimated what consumption is to be, when we go beyond that point we are beginning to produce for storage. That is what we have been doing, at the expense of the taxpayer. I am confident that realistic farmers will go along with the program which has been advanced by the President of the United States. I am confident that in the main the great bulk of our farmers in Illinois, so far as I can tell, will go along with the essential principle which has been expressed in this program.

I wish to analyze only one further aspect of the program. I am not so sure but that we can produce more than we can finally dispose of in one way or another. The majority of the populations in countries over the world are farmers, and they are producing to make themselves self-sufficient and to sell something in the market. So probably there will be a diminution of our exports.

I have been intrigued by a study made by the Department of Agriculture, in which it is pointed out that actually, in terms of pounds of food consumed per capita, the situation is not much different today from what it was a long time ago, although, of course, there have been shifts in the diets of our people which account for a certain disturbance of the balance.

The program which is now before us is designed to get back to the principle of supply and demand, and to maintain, as nearly as possible, a reasonably free market for the farmers of the United States, and at the same time to obtain, as nearly as possible, parity income in that market.

In my judgment the suggested program offers the best hope for agriculture and for the country. I intend to give my full support to the program, which follows out the principles delineated by the President of the United States.

Mr. President, I am ready to yield the floor.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, earlier in the day I announced that because of the weather conditions the Traffic Bureau had requested Government departments to release their employees about 2 hours earlier than usual. So far as the Senate is concerned, I hope it may be possible to comply with that request as nearly as possible. However, the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] has spoken, and I have been informed by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] that he has some remarks to make at this time. It is not my purpose to foreclose any Senator, but I wish to say that I plan to recess the Senate until tomorrow as soon as the Senators have concluded their remarks.

Tomorrow it is our purpose to take up the coinage bills, to be followed by the cotton acreage allotment bill, which it had been previously our purpose to take up today. When those bills are disposed of, it is our purpose to take up for consideration the St. Lawrence seaway bill.

I make the announcement so that Senators may know the general program I have in mind. There is no desire on my part to foreclose anyone, but when the discussion has been concluded this afternoon, I shall move a recess until tomorrow.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I have been listening with interest to the very able discussion of my distinguished friend from Illinois. I would not like him to interpret the remarks which I have made as indicating a partisan consideration of the President's message.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Indeed I would not do so.

Mr. GORE. There are many praiseworthy features in the message. I notice that the President recommends the continuation of the tobacco program, without change. That recommendation I applaud. The tobacco program has been perhaps one of the most successful of our farm programs. I should like to point out that in paragraph after paragraph, and in section after section, continuation of the present law and of the present program is recommended. With respect to the parts of the program that have proven very successful, I believe the President is to be congratulated upon his recommendations.

What I rose to point out was the fact that I find nothing new in the recommendation except the sliding scale of supports. There is also in the message a recommendation that we insulate certain stockpiles from the economy, from the market. That is already effective now. The Government holds these commodities through the instrumentality of the Commodity Credit Corporation. Cotton, wheat, and corn held by the Commodity Credit Corporation cannot go upon the market except under conditions prescribed by Congress. The market is already insulated. So I ask: What is new there?

I expect to join with the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], as I have in years heretofore, in giving careful, nonpartisan consideration to farm legislation. However, I do not believe the proposed program should be held up as a panacea for all agricultural ills.

It recommends a continuation of existing conditions in the case of the most deplorable parts of our agricultural program, and all I can find new is a sliding scale for supports in the case of the most successful parts of the program.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, let me make a brief observation for the information of my gracious friend from Tennessee. Government is a continuing operation. It has continued ever since the beginning of our country. When, by the will of the people, we get a new administration of government, it does not mean that we must kick everything out the window. I voted for some of the programs which were put on the books of our land ever since 1933. Some of them I rejected. In some cases it was necessary to take the good with the bad, because there was no choice in the matter. However, because a new administration comes into power is no reason to fling out the window those things that have been tested in the fire of experience and found to be sound. That which is good ought to be retained in the continuing process of government.

The second point I wish to make is that the flexible part of the program is, after all, the essence of the whole program. If we are to continue the farm program on a high, rigid, mandatory level, and not gear parity and price supports to the law of demand and supply, there is no use talking about a program. That is the essence of the program. In that way it is possible finally to develop a balanced agriculture.

Finally there is the matter of the insulation of two and a half billion dollars' worth of commodities. Insulation is not the word used in the President's message, if I am correct in my recollection. I believe the word was "frozen."

Mr. AIKEN. Set aside.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Set aside. It is intended to make sure that the surpluses will not impinge upon the price structure. I wish to give one illustration of what I have in mind.

I remember when the old Farm Board was operating. At the time I was in the bakery business and I bought great quantities of flour. A flour salesman would come in, and I would say to him, "Do you have a quotation for 5,000 barrels of flour?"

He would say, "If you can tell me what Alexander Legge and the farm board will do, I will tell you what flour will cost for future delivery, 10 months or 8 months hence."

Unless the surpluses are set aside, they amount to an overhang, which would defeat the whole program. In that way we would never get to the desired goal of parity income in a reasonably free economy.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes; I shall yield to the distinguished Senator from Alabama. I wanted to yield the floor, as a matter of fact.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I understand, but I shall be very brief in my question. As I remember, the President used both the term "insulate" and the term "frozen." However, I wish to ask a question of the Senator from Illinois with reference to his statement that flexibility is the essence of the whole program. I notice that there is no flexibility in the wool program, but that it is a direct subsidy up to 90 percent. I wonder how that part of the program fits into the rest of the program as a justification of the application of the Brannan plan to this particular segment of agriculture.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I will give an answer to my distinguished friend from Alabama by saying that he was running the show for 20 years. Two-thirds of the wool needed today in the Nation is imported wool. The number of sheep is less than it was 40 years ago. That is what has happened to the sheep and woolen industry. It is in a bad fix. I do not know what the answer is unless one wishes to listen to the many protestations of the people who use wool.

We have 100 million pounds of wool in the pool. Meanwhile foreign wool is coming into the country. That is about as distressing a situation as can be in the agricultural picture today. Probably that commodity requires heroic and rugged treatment, quite more so, perhaps, than any other commodity in the whole list. However, we inherited that problem. We did not create it.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I may say that the fixed guaranty for the wool-support program is an effort made in the interest of national security. We cannot fight a war, even a defensive war, without wool. At least we have not been able to do so up to date. In the interest of national security it was deemed necessary to produce in this country, if possible, at least 260 million pounds of shorn wool a year. When wool production in the United States reaches that point, I believe the Senator from Alabama will find 90-percent price supports are not required. That is an incentive.

With reference to the method of supporting prices as proposed by the President, that is what we had in 1948, when we provided that the Secretary of Agriculture could support prices of farm commodities through loans, purchases, or payments. The word "payments" was written into the law expressly for the purpose of providing a wool program such as we have proposed here today.

In the spring of 1949, the Senator from Alabama may recall, the Secretary of Agriculture came before Congress and advocated applying that principle to practically the whole consumer list of commodities. The minimum cost would have been approximately $4 billion. Some persons calculated it would cost up to $10 billion. Congress rose up in arms against Secretary Brannan. They voted unanimously against his proposal and kicked it out. Along with it they kicked out authority for making payments for wool. The President advocates putting that particular authority back in the law. At that time we had to use $200 million to buy up Government wool. By the method of making direct payments it would have cost only $20 million. In the case of wool, of course, there is only one purchaser and that is the Boston Wool Trade Association. The payment system is applicable to wool, whereas it is not so applicable to potatoes or a great many other commodities.

I repeat, the main purpose is in the interest of national security, that is, of producing sufficient wool so that if the wool supply from Australia, for example, should be shut off we would at least be able to wage a partial war, so to speak.

I may say that the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] tells me that the figure is 360 million pounds of shorn wool, instead of 260 million pounds, as I stated. He is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield briefly to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I wish to ask the distinguished Senator from Illinois if he knows of any time in his legislative experience when there has been so much effort and thought and care given to the preparation of a program as has been given to the one presented today.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am sure that a sincere endeavor has been made in other days by other Secretaries to find the answer to the problem. I doubt

whether more attention and deliberation have been devoted to finding an effective solution.

Mr. WATKINS. I listened to the message as it was read to the Senate this morning. We may well be assured that every care has been given to the preparation of the message in consultation with the various segments in the farm industry in a sincere effort to work out a difficult situation.

I happen to be interested in the production of fruits. Many people in my State are interested in the production of fruit. There are many growers of perishable fruit who would be given no protection at all in the proposed program. The same has been true of past programs.

We are not complaining about it. We realize it is almost impossible to provide a price-support program that would not be an outright subsidy. Fruits cannot be stored. Fruitgrowers sustain many losses. Yet there is no way of giving relief. We are not complaining about what has happened or about the proposed program. In fact, we believe it to be the best program in principle. Ultimately we must get some kind of balance between production and consumption. We must work in that direction, unless we are to completely nationalize the farms of the Nation.

I wish to say further that I appreciate what the Senator from Illinois has stated today, and I wish to be associated with him in his remarks. I believe we have before us a program that is one of the best we have ever had to meet a situation as difficult as the present one is.

I realize that nothing will ever be 100 percent perfect. However, we have gone along in the past, and the result has always been surpluses. It is a very difficult problem. We will have losses, of course, on commodities that have been stored. I do not believe, however, that they should be destroyed. Instead, they should be consumed. Those that can be used only for animal feed should be used for that purpose. I do not believe that any food should be destroyed.

It seems to me at least we have made an approach as best we can to bring us through the transition period, to the operation of the law of supply and demand. There must be some protection given to the farmer. He is engaged in a hazardous business. It is a speculative business. Farmers cannot control the elements. They cannot control production in the same way that a manufacturer can control his production. Therefore some protection must be afforded the farmer.

Mr. DIRKSEN. In closing, Mr. President, I should like to add with respect to the matter of agriculture, that I do not believe I have encountered a man who has devoted so much thought and attention to this problem, who has pursued it with so much vigor and so much courage, and has shown greater diligence in his efforts to solve it than has Mr. Benson. I salute him and take off my hat to him as a great citizen and as a great Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO SENATE RULES REGARDING COMMITTEES

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I rise to express my feelings of amusement over the proposed amendments to the Senate rules submitted to the Senate committee by the leadership of the Senate, referring to the committee issue.

Of course, Mr. President, the representative of the Independent Party did not expect the courtesy of being consulted in regard to any proposed changes in the rules on the committee issue. He was not extended the courtesy of such a consultation. Not expecting it, he, therefore, does not take offense. But I want to say, Mr. President, that since Congress adjourned I probably have spoken in more places in the United States and to more audiences than has any other Member of the Senate. I was pleased to find that in audience situation after audience situation—and the audiences were a pretty good cross-section of our citizenry, Mr. President—I found a great deal of resentment over the unfairness of the Senate of the United States in the last session in its handling of the committee issue. The people of America understand sportsmanship and the rules of fair play.

I want to say that the people apparently understand those ethical principles much better than do many of my colleagues. The people are aware of the fact that there is no precedent for the course of action which the Senate has followed in denying to me my seniority rights except one, and that is the unfortunate precedent of 1871. In that instance Sumner of Massachusetts, having years of seniority in the Senate, was denied his committee seniority rights in the Senate. There is no other precedent in the entire history of the Senate. The one which the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] tried to advance on May 25, 1953, is no precedent at all, as the Senator from Oregon pointed out at the time. The Senator from Texas cited the case of Hale of New Hampshire who was elected as a Free Soiler. However Hale had no seniority in the Senate at the time that the dispute over his committee assignments arose. When he entered the Senate as a newly elected Senator he was discriminated against because he was a Free Soiler. However, in my case I had 8 years of seniority in the Senate when the Senate voted to discriminate against me and my State.

I repeat today, and no one can successfully contradict it, that there is only one precedent in the history of the Senate for the course of action which the leadership of the Senate has followed in the controversy over my committee assignments. All the other precedents and there are many of them, support my position in this fight.

The action today on the part of the leadership of the Senate in both parties makes it very clear that they intend to continue the gross injustice which they did to the people of the State of Oregon in the last session because of the discriminatory course of action which the Senate leaders took against the people of Oregon.

The people of my State understand that, Mr. President, and they resent it. They resent it because, irrespective of what the personal view of any group in the State may be toward the Senator from Oregon, the Senator from Oregon represents his people in the Senate. The people of my State look to me to continue to raise my voice in protest against the unconscionable, inequitable conduct of the leadership of the Senate toward the Senator from Oregon in this whole committee fight. I have been informed by some of my friends among the Democratic Senators that the minority leader has not presented the proposed changes in the rules to a conference of the Democratic Senators for approval.

It is interesting, Mr. President, that, having had a new opportunity to right a wrong, the leadership of the Senate proposes to repeat the same mistake which it made in the last session of the Congress. The representative of the Independent Party intends to continue to keep it fresh in the minds of not only the people of Oregon, but of the people of the country. He will give fairminded men in the Senate an opportunity to reject this proposal for changes in the rules which, obviously, has been drawn in a manner which will continue the injustice done to me.

It is interesting to see the kind of amendment which the leadership proposes, Mr. President. They propose to increase the membership of the Public Works Committee. I know something about the workload of the Public Works Committee. As I said last year, on the basis of a garbage-can disposal principle, I was relegated to the Public Works Committee. Therefore, I know something about its workload. There is no justification, in my opinion, for increasing the membership of the Public Works Committee on the basis of any workload the committee has to do.

I am sure the same goes for the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. But, of course, the leadership does not want to increase the membership of one committee, which was the only major committee last year whose membership it did not increase—the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

I wonder why. Obviously to increase the membership of the Labor Committee would serve to focus attention on the wrong done last year to the Senator from Oregon.

There is some major legislation to be put through that committee, Mr. President. One would think that the Senate majority and minority leadership would want to have the membership of the Labor Committee large enough to carry the load, instead of increasing the Public Works and Post Office Committees which I say cannot be justified. I think everyone knows why the Senate leaders did not want to increase the membership of the Labor Committee. It would be a little more difficult for them to alibi the injustice they have already committed against the representative of the Independent Party.

Mr. President, I think I have made it very clear that once the Senate speaks on an issue I take the decision and abide by it, which I did when the decision

was rendered last year. There is not a Member of this body who could say, after consulting with any member of the Committee on the District of Columbia or the Committee on Public Works, that the Senator from Oregon, once assigned to those committees, has not carried out to the fullest his responsibilities of committee duty on those committees.

When the Senate makes its next decision on this issue, I shall abide by it, but I shall give them a chance, now that I know the action proposed by the leadership of the Senate, to vote on a choice of amendments to the rules. I believe that if the Members of the Senate will follow the dictates of their consciences on this issue a huge majority will correct the injustice of their past votes. Therefore, in due course, the representative of the Independent Party will submit amendments to the rules which he thinks should be adopted in order to do equity and justice on this issue—amendments which will give to the people of Oregon their just deserts in the Senate of the United States, amendments which will bring to an end all unfair discrimination against the people of Oregon of which the Senate of the United States is guilty as the result of the discriminatory policy which the majority of the Senate followed last year on the committee assignment issue.

So, Mr. President, I shall prepare, overnight, amendments to the rules which, if adopted, will correct the continuation of a great injustice done the people of Oregon by the Senate last session when I was denied my seniority rights of 8 years. Let me assure the leadership of the Democratic Party that it is making a grave mistake in the course of action it is following on this issue. The people of the country are fast coming to expect such actions of political expediency from the Republican Party leadership. However, I am satisfied that most people expect the rank and file members of both of the major parties in the Senate to play fair and square. They expect the Democratic Party in the Senate to enter into no deal for inflicting discipline upon the Independent Party.

Once again the Senate has a chance to correct an injustice which a majority of its Members committed on January 13, 1953, and again on May 25, 1953, when the committee issue was before the Senate.

RECESS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, if there be no further remarks, pursuant to the previous statement which I made, I now move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 49 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, January 12, 1954, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 11 (legislative day of January 7), 1953:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Willard L. Beaulac, of Rhode Island, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Chile, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

Wiley T. Buchanan, Jr., of the District of Columbia, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Luxembourg, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

Selden Chapin, of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Panama, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

Hugh S. Cumming, Jr., of Virginia, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Indonesia, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

Robert C. Hill, of New Hampshire, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Costa Rica, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

U. Alexis Johnson, of California, Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Czechoslovakia, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

H. Freeman Matthews, of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of the Netherlands, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

Dempster McIntosh, of Pennsylvania, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Oriental Republic of Uruguay, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

John E. Peurifoy, of South Carolina, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Guatemala, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

Rudolf E. Schoenfeld, of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Colombia, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

George Wadsworth, of New York, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of Yemen, to which offices he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

FOREIGN OPERATIONS ADMINISTRATION

The following-named persons to be members of the Public Advisory Board, Foreign Operations Administration, to which office they were appointed during the last recess of the Senate:

Mrs. Mildred C. Ahlgren, of Indiana.
Richard L. Bowditch, of Massachusetts.
Arthur J. Connell, of Connecticut.
Miss Helen G. Irwin, of Iowa.
Allan Blair Kline, of Iowa.
Mrs. Lucille Leonard of Rhode Island.
Herschel D. Newsom, of the District of Columbia.
James G. Patton, of Colorado.

Webster Bray Todd, of New Jersey, to be Director, Office of Economic Affairs, United States Mission to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and European Regional Organizations, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

Morris Wolf, of Pennsylvania, to be General Counsel, Foreign Operations Administration, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

C. Tyler Wood, of the District of Columbia, to be Economic Coordinator (Special Representative for Korea), to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

The following-named persons to the offices indicated, to which they were appointed during the last recess of the Senate:

Frederick A. Seaton, of Nebraska, to be Assistant Secretary of Defense.

Thomas Sovereign Gates, Jr., of Pennsylvania, to be Under Secretary of the Navy.

Hugh M. Milton II, of New Mexico, to be Assistant Secretary of the Army.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Ross Rizley, of Oklahoma, to be an Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Lothair Teetor, of Indiana, to be Assistant Secretary of Commerce, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Eugene James Lyons, of New Jersey, to be an Assistant Postmaster General, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

J. H. S. Ellis, of New York, to be a member of the Advisory Board for the Post Office Department, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT

Louis B. Toomer, of Georgia, to be Register of the Treasury, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE

Frank H. Weitzel, of the District of Columbia, to be Assistant Comptroller General of the United States for a term of 15 years, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

James P. Mitchell, of New Jersey, to be Secretary of Labor, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

Alice K. Leopold, of Connecticut, to be Director of the Women's Bureau, Department of Labor, to which office she was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

John William Tramburg, of Wisconsin, to be Commissioner of Social Security, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

Samuel Miller Brownell, of Connecticut, to be Commissioner of Education, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS

The following-named persons to be members of the Council of Economic Advisers, to which office they were appointed during the last recess of the Senate:

Neil H. Jacoby, of California.
Walter W. Stewart, of New Jersey.

RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

Laurence Ballard Robbins, of Illinois, to be Deputy Administrator of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

Robert O. Boyd, of Oregon, to be a member of the National Mediation Board for the remainder of the term expiring February 1, 1954, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

RENEGOTIATION BOARD

George C. McConnaughey, of Ohio, to be a member of the Renegotiation Board, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

FEDERAL COAL MINE SAFETY BOARD OF REVIEW

Edward Steidle, of Pennsylvania, to be a member of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review for the remainder of the term expiring July 15, 1955, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Ross Rizley, of Oklahoma, to be a member of the board of directors of the Commodity Credit Corporation, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Robert E. Lee, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the Federal Communications Commission for the term of 7 years from July 1, 1953, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

Harmar D. Denny, of Pennsylvania, to be a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board for the term of 6 years expiring December 31, 1959, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate. (Reappointment.)

UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY

Abbott McConnell Washburn, of Minnesota, to be Deputy Director of the United States Information Agency, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

The following-named persons to be members of the Federal Farm Credit Board, Farm Credit Administration, for the terms indicated, to which office they were appointed during the last recess of the Senate:

For terms of 1 year from December 1, 1953, and until their successors are appointed and qualified:

Clark L. Brody, of Michigan.

Harlan Bruce Munger, of New York.

For terms of 2 years from December 1, 1953, and until their successors are appointed and qualified:

John David Anderson, of West Virginia.

Raymond Sayre, of Iowa.

For terms of 3 years from December 1, 1953, and until their successors are appointed and qualified:

H. W. Clutter, of Kansas.

Marshall H. Edwards, of Florida.

For terms of 4 years from December 1, 1953, and until their successors are appointed and qualified:

Marvin J. Briggs, of Indiana.

C. H. Matthews, of Texas.

For terms of 5 years from December 1, 1953, and until their successors are appointed and qualified:

Golden F. Fine, of California.

Elbert J. Hodge, of Alabama.

For terms of 6 years from December 1, 1953, and until their successors are appointed and qualified:

Earl H. Brockman, of Idaho.

L. V. Ritter, of Arkansas.

BUREAU OF THE MINT

Charles O. Parker, of Colorado, to be Assayer in the Mint of the United States at Denver, Colo. (Mr. Parker is now serving under temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.)

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REDEVELOPMENT LAND AGENCY

Andrew Parker, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency for the unexpired term of 5 years from March 4, 1952, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON WEATHER CONTROL

The following-named persons to be members of the Advisory Committee on Weather Control, to which office they were appointed during the last recess of the Senate:

Lewis W. Douglas, of Arizona.

Alfred M. Eberle, of South Dakota.

Joseph J. George, of Georgia.

Capt. Howard T. Orville, United States Navy, retired, of Maryland.

Kenneth C. Spengler, of Massachusetts.

CALIFORNIA DEBRIS COMMISSION

Col. Arthur H. Frye, Jr., Corps of Engineers, to be a member of the California Debris Commission, under the provisions of section 1 of the act of Congress approved March 1, 1893 (27 Stat. 507) (33 U. S. C. 661), a position to which he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

Col. William J. Ely, Corps of Engineers, to be a member of the California Debris Commission, under the provisions of section 1 of the act of Congress approved March 1, 1893 (27 Stat. 507) (33 U. S. C. 661), a position to which he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Earl Warren, of California, to be Chief Justice of the United States. He is now serving under a recess appointment.

THE JUDICIARY

The following-named persons to the offices indicated, to which they were appointed during the last recess of the Senate:

John A. Danaher, of Connecticut, to be United States circuit judge, District of Columbia Circuit.

Carroll C. Hincks, of Connecticut, to be United States circuit judge, Second Circuit.

Elmer J. Schnackenberg, of Illinois, to be United States circuit judge, Seventh Circuit.

Edwin F. Hunter, Jr., of Louisiana, to be United States district judge for the Western District of Louisiana.

Edward William Day, of Rhode Island, to be United States district judge for the District of Rhode Island.

George T. Mickelson, of South Dakota, to be United States district judge for the District of South Dakota.

James Lewis McCarrey, Jr., of Alaska, to be United States district judge, Division No. 3, District of Alaska.

Albert M. Felix, of Hawaii, to be third judge, First Circuit, Circuit Courts, Territory of Hawaii.

Harry R. Hewitt, of Hawaii, to be fifth judge, First Circuit, Circuit Courts, Territory of Hawaii.

Calvin C. McGregor, of Hawaii, to be seventh judge, First Circuit, Circuit Courts, Territory of Hawaii.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

The following-named persons to the offices indicated, to which they were appointed during the last recess of the Senate:

Fred Elledge, Jr., of Tennessee, to be United States attorney for the middle district of Tennessee.

Heard L. Floore, of Texas, to be United States attorney for the northern district of Texas.

Donald R. Ross, of Nebraska, to be United States attorney for the district of Nebraska.

W. Wilson White, of Pennsylvania, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Pennsylvania.

J. Leonard Walker, of Kentucky, to be United States attorney for the western district of Kentucky.

Jack D. H. Hays, of Arizona, to be United States attorney for the district of Arizona.

William T. Plummer, of Alaska, to be United States attorney for division No. 3, district of Alaska.

Theodore F. Bowes, of New York, to be United States attorney for the northern district of New York.

Louis Gorman Whitcomb, of Vermont, to be United States attorney for the district of Vermont.

Donald E. Kelley, of Colorado, to be United States attorney for the district of Colorado.

Julian T. Gaskill, of North Carolina, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of North Carolina.

George Edward Rapp, of Wisconsin, to be United States attorney for the western district of Wisconsin.

Duncan Wilmer Daugherty, of West Virginia, to be United States attorney for the southern district of West Virginia.

Osro Cobb, of Arkansas, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Arkansas.

Madison B. Graves, of Nevada, to be United States attorney for the district of Nevada.

Robert E. Hauberg, of Mississippi, to be United States attorney for the southern district of Mississippi.

N. Welch Morrisette, Jr., to be United States attorney for the eastern district of South Carolina.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

The following-named persons to the offices indicated, to which they were appointed during the last recess of the Senate:

Claire A. Wilder, of Alaska, to be United States marshal for division No. 1, district of Alaska.

Fred S. Williamson, of Alaska, to be United States marshal for division No. 3, district of Alaska.

Albert Fuller Dorsh, Jr., of Alaska, to be United States marshal for division No. 4, district of Alaska.

Cooper Hudspeth, of Arkansas, to be United States marshal for the western district of Arkansas.

Donald A. Fraser, of Connecticut, to be United States marshal for the district of Connecticut.

Eugene Levi Kemper, of Kansas, to be United States marshal for the district of Kansas.

Louis O. Aleksich, of Montana, to be United States marshal for the district of Montana.

Xavier North, of Ohio, to be United States marshal for the northern district of Ohio.

Frank Quarles, of Tennessee, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Tennessee.

John Overall Anderson, of Tennessee, to be United States marshal for the middle district of Tennessee.

Peter Auburn Richmond, of Virginia, to be United States marshal for the western district of Virginia.

J. Bradbury German, Jr., of New York, to be United States marshal for the northern district of New York.

Cedric E. Stewart, of Nevada, to be United States marshal for the district of Nevada. (He was appointed to this position during the recess of the Senate.)

COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS

The following-named persons to the offices indicated, to which they were appointed during the last recess of the Senate:

James W. Bingham, of Texas, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 22, with headquarters at Galveston, Tex.

Douglas Butler, of Texas, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 24, with headquarters at El Paso, Tex.

Gustav F. Doscher, Jr., of South Carolina, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 16, with headquarters at Charleston, S. C.

Edward C. Ellsworth, Jr., of Montana, to be collector of customs for customs collection

district No. 33, with headquarters at Great Falls, Mont.

Edward M. Elwell, of Maine, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 1, with headquarters at Portland, Maine.

J. Chalmers Ewing, of Colorado, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 47, with headquarters at Denver, Colo.

Frank W. Hull, of Washington, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 30, with headquarters at Seattle, Wash.

John G. Kissane, of Vermont, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 2, with headquarters at St. Albans, Vt.

James L. Latimer, of Texas, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 21, with headquarters at Port Arthur, Tex.

Josiah A. Maultsby, Sr., of North Carolina, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 15, with headquarters at Wilmington, N. C.

Anne A. Mitchell, of Connecticut, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 6, with headquarters at Bridgeport, Conn.

APPRAISER OF MERCHANDISE

Aleer J. Couri, of New York, to be appraiser of merchandise in customs collection district No. 10, with headquarters at New York, N. Y.

IN THE REGULAR ARMY

Maj. Gen. Emerson Leroy Cummings, O15500, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army), for appointment as Chief of Ordnance, United States Army, and as major general in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of section 206 of the Army Organization Act of 1950 and section 513 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

The following-named officers for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States to the grades indicated under the provisions of title V of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

To be major generals

Maj. Gen. John Max Lentz, O10343, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Bernice Musgrove McFadyen, O10384, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Riley Finley Ennis, O11854, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Joseph Sladen Bradley, O12428, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army).

To be brigadier generals

Maj. Gen. William Nelson Gillmore, O16196, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Garrison Holt Davidson, O16755, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. James Maurice Gavin, O17676, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Emerson Leroy Cummings, O15500, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Richard Warburton Stephens, O15569, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Lawrence Russell Dewey, O15575, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Maj Gen. Gordon Byron Rogers, O15620, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Joseph Pringle Cleland, O16239, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

UNITED STATES ARMY EUROPE

Lt. Gen. William Morris Hoge, O4437, Army of the United States, for appointment as Commander-in-Chief, United States Army Europe, with the rank of general, and as general in the Army of the United States under the provisions of sections 504 and 515 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

The following-named officers for appointment to the position indicated and for appointment as lieutenant general in the Army of the United States, under the provisions of sections 504 and 515 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

Maj. Gen. Floyd Lavinius Parks, O10582, United States Army, to be commanding general, Second Army, with the rank of lieutenant general.

Maj. Gen. Walter Leo Weible, O11308, United States Army, to be Deputy Chief of Staff for Operations and Administration, United States Army, with the rank of lieutenant general.

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States to the grades indicated under the provisions of subsection 515 (c) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. William Shepard Biddle, O15180, United States Army.

Brig. Gen. John Alexander Klein, O7536, United States Army.

Brig. Gen. John Charles Macdonald, O8402, United States Army.

Brig. Gen. Laurin Lyman Williams, O8425, United States Army.

Brig. Gen. Albert Carl Lieber, O8884, United States Army.

Brig. Gen. Philip Edward Gallagher, O11249, United States Army.

Brig. Gen. John Harrison Stokes, Jr., O12181, United States Army.

Brig. Gen. John Bartlett Murphy, O12338, United States Army.

Brig. Gen. Charles Wilkes Christenberry, O8373, United States Army.

Brig. Gen. Robert Gibbins Gard, O12247, United States Army.

Brig. Gen. Donald Prentice Booth, O16395, Army of the United States (colonel, United States Army).

Brig. Gen. John Gibson Van Houten, O16669, Army of the United States (colonel, United States Army).

To be brigadier generals

Col. Sherman Vitus Hasbrouck, O12744, United States Army.

Col. Emery Ernest Alling, O16545, United States Army.

Col. Frederick Prall Munson, O16505, United States Army.

FOOTNOTE.—Above-named officers were appointed during the recess of the Senate.

RESERVE COMMISSIONED OFFICERS

The officers named herein for appointment as Reserve commissioned officers of the Army under the provisions of the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952 (Public Law 476, 82d Cong.):

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Hugh Meglone Milton II, O154541.

To be brigadier general

Col. Wendell Westover, O145721, Armor Reserve.

To be major generals

Maj. Gen. Homer Oliver Eaton, Jr., O201691, California National Guard, to date from October 9, 1953.

Maj. Gen. Carl Lawrence Phinney, O244577, Texas National Guard, to date from May 28, 1953.

To be brigadier generals

Brig. Gen. Lucien Abraham, O178022, Arkansas National Guard, to date from May 28, 1953.

Brig. Gen. Harold Arthur Doherty, O2270961, Indiana National Guard, to date from May 28, 1953.

Brig. Gen. Waldo Henry Fish, Jr., O282806, Rhode Island National Guard, to date from October 9, 1953.

Brig. Gen. Henry Kimmell Fluck, O415805, Pennsylvania National Guard, to date from October 9, 1953.

Brig. Gen. Joseph Ward Henry, O1293051, Tennessee National Guard, to date from May 28, 1953.

Brig. Gen. Robert Milliard Ives, O140472, Texas National Guard, to date from May 28, 1953.

Brig. Gen. John Rutherford Noyes, O2270935, Alaska National Guard, to date from October 9, 1953.

Brig. Gen. Maxwell Evans Rich, O323746, Utah National Guard, to date from October 9, 1953.

Brig. Gen. John Darrell Sides, O330823, Alabama National Guard, to date from October 9, 1953.

Brig. Gen. John Walter Squire, O155858, Virginia National Guard, to date from October 9, 1953.

Brig. Gen. James Edward Taylor, O376731, Texas National Guard, to date from May 28, 1953.

Brig. Gen. Edmund Robert Walker, O291567, Connecticut National Guard, to date from October 9, 1953.

Brig. Gen. Raymond Watt, O209364, Connecticut National Guard, to date from October 9, 1953.

Brig. Gen. Oscar Ivy Wrenn, O221793, North Carolina National Guard, to date from October 9, 1953.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Air Force under the provisions of sections 502, 508, and 509 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 and section 306 of the Women's Armed Services Integration Act of 1948. Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (×) are subject to physical examination required by law. All others have been examined and found physically qualified for promotion.

MAJOR TO LIEUTENANT COLONEL

Air Force

×McCluskey, Jack Lawrence, 3924A.
×Pocock, William Stephen, Jr., 5316A.
×Fisher, Henry Bishop, 5334A.
×Carey, Eugene Courtney, 5340A.
Monfort, Harry Nirkirk, 5343A.
×Ray, Hugh Jefferson, 5357A.
Batty, Paul Stewart, 5364A.
Mandel, Samuel, 5365A.
×Shelton, Calvert Probasco, 18078A.
×Newkirk, Raymond Francis, 19903A.
Nelson, James Edward, 18064A.
Strange, Luther Gragg, 18066A.
×Bryan, Loren Andrew, 5270A.
Stompler, Russell, 5288A.
Vaughan, Francis Lyle, 5367A.
Berry, Secrest Laughlin, 5368A.
Freeman, Forbes Snow, 5369A.
Bowen, Robert Lee, 5370A.
Frantz, James Tilden, Jr., 5371A.
×Price, James Albert, 5372A.
×Rauen, Robert L., 5373A.
Giegel, John Stanley, 5374A.
×Royal, Benjamin Ellis, 5375A.
Hancock, John Albert, 5377A.
Stattler, Cornelius James, Jr., 5379A.
×Wolf, Harold Clair, 5380A.
Myers, Robert Martin, 5381A.
×Emery, Daniel Breen, 5382A.
Kelley, Charles Williams, 5383A.
×Ritter, Robert Joseph, 5384A.
Cooke, Gilbert Cady, 5385A.
Etter, Richard William, 5386A.
×Mathews, Francis Joseph, 5387A.
×Schwandt, Harold Albert, 5388A.
×Darnell, George William, 5389A.
Gentry, Allison Phy, 5391A.
Gowdey, Hodges Clarence, 5392A.
Goldenberg, Carl Theodor, 5394A.
×Dawson, Van Brunt, 5396A.
×Yates, Joel Hume, 5397A.
Fuller, George Alvin, 5398A.

×Bankert, Ward Earl, 5399A.
Bolen, William Francis, 5400A.
Shipe, Frederick Wiliam, 5401A.
Abdalah, Ernest George, 5403A.
Williams, Donald Grant, 5679A.
Bates, Frederick Reed, 5404A.
×Gray, Richard Robert, Jr., 5406A.
Walters, Joseph Carl, 5408A.
Freeman, Lloyd Atmer, 5409A.
Johnson, Donald Walter, 5410A.
Dunn, Hardie McKowen, Jr., 5412A.
×Aebischer, Joseph Edward, 5413A.
Haun, James Robert, 5415A.
Gordon, Michael Jacob, 5419A.
Spees, Everett Kencheon, 5420A.
Smith, Leland Prather, 5422A.
Frankel, Arthur Grover, Jr., 5423A.
Nall, Harrold Edward, 5424A.
×Howell, Edwin Shelton, 5425A.
×Richman, Charles Phillip, 5426A.
Burgner, Newton Milton, 5427A.
×Forwood, William Garland, 5429A.
×Budway, George, 5430A.
×Swanson, Arthur Robert, 5432A.
×Hensch, Edward Konken, 5433A.
×Updike, Perry Collier, 5434A.
Guerin, Bernard Peter, 5435A.
Comer, Hubert Walker, 5436A.
×Keesling, James Clarence, Jr., 5437A.
George, Dominic John, 5438A.
×Parks, Gordon Thomas, 5439A.
Wolfsohn, Robert Soloman, 5440A.
Joy, Wilbur Rolland, 5441A.
Welch, Robert Newman, 5442A.
×Magrath, Joseph Stephen, Jr., 5443A.
Singleton, Emmett Fove, 5444A.
×Rhode, John Edward, 5446A.
×Strieber, Edward Miles, 5447A.
×Perry, Edward Lloyd, Jr., 5448A.
×Stephens, Elmer Shand, 5449A.
×Hutto, Earl Barry, 5450A.
Zeller, Winn Fredrik, 5451A.
Stratton, Max Millard, 5452A.
Dolezel, Edward Joseph, 5453A.
×Watkins, Guy Leroy, 5454A.
×Black, John Orville, 5455A.
Ellis, John Edward, Jr., 5456A.
Hoglund, Glen Arnold, 5457A.
Butler, Charles Duane, 5458A.
Marston, Glenn Frederick, 5459A.
×Smith, David Gage, 5460A.
Higginbotham, Raymond, 5461A.
Cassell, Ernest Murray, Jr., 5462A.
Almy, Donald Comstock, 5463A.
White, Warren Mason, 5465A.
×Reynolds, Douglas Hanford, 5466A.
Gunter, George Cleveland, Jr., 5467A.
×Carrithers, Judd McClelland, 5469A.
Wilson, Lewis Baron, 5470A.
Greer, Robert William, Jr., 5472A.
Koby, Francis Robert, 5473A.
Hamill, Estil Lee, 5474A.
McElroy, Edgar Earl, 5475A.
Morrison, Cleo Elwin, 5476A.
Beasley, Everett Lyn, 5477A.
Kage, Gordon Dayton, 5478A.
Adams, Bill, 5480A.
Caulfield, Donald Brown, 5481A.
×Quin, Harold Joseph, 5482A.
×Kogan, Edward Mart, 5483A.
Alyea, Louis French, 5484A.
Brown, Robert William, 5485A.
Truesdell, Ebin Trantham, 5487A.
Cowan, William Vincent, 5489A.
McCaskill, Bernard, Jr., 5490A.
×Halfman, Rollie Joseph, 5491A.
McCracken, Dwight Henry, 5492A.
×Payne, Roger Barton, 5493A.
Smith, Frank Malone, 5494A.
Hilderbrand, George Paine, 5495A.
×Beam, Howard Earl, 5496A.
×Mattoon, Ernest Ray, 5497A.
×Gray, George Arnett, 5498A.
Fantone, James Earl, Jr., 5499A.
×Vann, James Oliver, 5500A.
×Renshaw, Donald Earl, 5503A.
Nelson, Carl George, 5504A.
Irvine, David Raymond, 5505A.
×Ryan, Frank LeRoy, 5506A.
Bobela, Michael, 5507A.
Blume, Irving, 5508A.
Smith, Lynn Powers, 5509A.
Duke, James Laran, 5511A.
Toolin, Brendan Emmett, 5512A.
×Myszewski, Chester Frank, 5513A.
Leclaire, Wilfred Brassard, 5514A.
Leyendecker, Max Thomas, 5515A.
Wallace, James Hampton, 5516A.
Evers, Vincent August, 5518A.
×Kingston, Jarvis Rowland, 5519A.
Johnson, George Hill, 2d, 5520A.
Levi, James Cobb, 5521A.
Bertoni, Louis, 5522A.
×Hammer, Wendell Austin, 5523A.
Hurd, Richard Perkins, 5524A.
Walrod, Harold Henry, 5525A.
×Lindhard, Povl Verner, 5526A.
Lock, Raymond Harold, 5527A.
Swanson, Clyde William, 5528A.
Merritt, Willard Earl, 5529A.
Stachura, Walter, 5530A.
Durni, Fred Kenneth, 5531A.
Mauldin, Osberne C., 5534A.
Driggs, Chase, 5535A.
Weber, Robert Herman, 5536A.
×Harris, Riley Wickliffe, 5537A.
Mahan, Fulton Samuel Duval, 5538A.
×Rethke, William Henry, 5539A.
O'Bryan, Joseph Earl, 5540A.
Beamer, Harry Ramond, 5541A.
Smith, Clark Jackson, 5542A.
Thornton, Raymond Allen, 5545A.
×Botsford, Charles Goddard, 5546A.
×Dameron, Claiborne, 5547A.
×Ryker, Frederick Arthur, 18096A.
Adams, Ralph Wyatt, 5548A.
Arendt, Harry Stanley, 5550A.
Motyl, James Dimitri, 5551A.
×Thomas, George Oscar, 5552A.
×Bartlett, Edgar Earl, 5553A.
×Kelley, George Thomas, 5554A.
×Breeden, Lindsey Carlisle, Jr., 5555A.
Fulton, Gordon Roy, 5556A.
×Riordan, Leonard Daniel, 5557A.
×Wagner, Edward John, 5558A.
×Brown, Harvey Coleman, Jr., 5559A.
×Sawhill, Edgar Lewis, 5560A.
×Moran, Frederick Andrew, 5561A.
Bergin, Joseph Andrew, 5562A.
×Hughes, Robert Calvin, 5564A.
×Knouse, Lloyd Berton, 5565A.
Hertzler, John Garman, 5566A.
Persky, Jacob, 5567A.
×Mulholland, Howard, 5568A.
×Vestal, Waymoth Delmar, 5569A.
×Hoover, Edward Daniel, Jr., 5570A.
Patton, Joe Robert, 5571A.
×Nixon, Perry Edward, 5572A.
×Peters, Bernard, 5573A.
×Jarcho, Louis Morton, 5574A.
×Wayshak, Abraham Edward, 5575A.
Micka, Louis Joseph, Jr., 5576A.
×Cappucci, Joseph John, 5577A.
Eichhorn, John Dunn, 5578A.
×Gallagher, John Vincent, 5579A.
×Lash, Robert Louis, 5580A.
×Carroll, James Vincent, 5581A.
×Davies, William Velasko, 5582A.
×O'Brien, Raymond Ransom, 5583A.
×Suttle, Dale Davenport, 5584A.
Burgy, Eldred John, 5585A.
Hubbard, Raymond Marvin, 5586A.
McBee, Shannon Cleo, 5587A.
Woolever, Marshall Edwin, 5445A.
Grashoff, William Henry, 5588A.
×Lulejian, Norair Melkon, 5589A.
Peake, William Kilbourne, 5590A.
×Armstrong, Richard Elliott, 5591A.
×Curtis, Jack Harry, 5592A.
Nied, George John, 5593A.
×Dick, Robert Marcus, 5594A.
Van Buskirk, Arthur Brown, 5595A.
×Carpenter, Neal Holton, 5596A.
Cofield, Gene, 5597A.
Wolcott, John Payne, 5598A.
Foster, Ross Johnson, 5599A.
Emmertz, Roger Nelson, 5602A.
×Brown, Ted, 5603A.
×Graham, James Edward, 5604A.
×O'Neil, Raymond Francis, 5605A.
Barker, Paul Bernard, 5606A.
Tebbs, Jim Reid, 5607A.
DuBose, Robert Lee, 5608A.
Kay, Charles Woodford, 5609A.
×Fox, John Edward, 5610A.
×Hiller, Martin William, 5611A.
×Dawson, Harold Cleveland, 5612A.
d'Acosta, Uriel Pereia, 5613A.
Langley, Samuel Firth, 5614A.
Luck, Ellis Chester, 5616A.
Burns, Jackson Ralph, 5618A.
Smith, Vincent Edgar, 5619A.
Marthens, George Walker, 2d, 5621A.
×Cavender, Joe Judson, 5622A.
McGibeny, Arthur David, 5623A.
Lewis, Dwight Francis, 5624A.
×Carpenter, Donald Charles, 5624A.
Gravin, Irving Henry, 5626A.
Shewbart, William Monroe, 5627A.
Hunt, Edward Herman, 5628A.
Parkins, William Howard, 5629A.
Griffin, Charles Webster, 5630A.
×Burns, Charles Timothy, 5631A.
×Michael, Pierce Baynard, 5632A.
Coleman, Harry Southside, Jr., 5633A.
×Betz, Albert Leslie, 5634A.
×Gosling, Kenneth Reginald, 5635A.
×Smith, Don Ansel, 5638A.
Hastey, Raymond Lester, 5640A.
Eckert, Jacob Clayton, 5643A.
×Thrash, Joe Merriwether, Jr., 5644A.
McDouall, Bradford Houghton, 5645A.
Bauer, Christian Schmid, 5646A.
×Kandel, Edward Robert, 5647A.
×Egerland, Arnold Victor, 5648A.
×Spooner, Julius Leonard, 5649A.
Hunter, William Campbell, 5650A.
Lund, Theodore Karl, 5651A.
Correll, Victor Crosby, 5653A.
Disana, Joe Vincent, 5654A.
×Rush, Donald Wesley, 5655A.
Nettles, Jesse Eugene, 5656A.
×Dewey, Willis Alonzo, 5658A.
McDonald, Claud Wayne, 5659A.
×Gill, John Edwards, 5660A.
×Bennett, Herbert Holinworth, 5661A.
×Shealy, William Thomas, 5662A.
×Commons, Enos Larrance, Jr., 5663A.
×Hill, Jesse Gorham, 5664A.
×Fallows, Albert Dunn, 5666A.
Sinex, Charles Helm, Jr., 5667A.
×Ware, William, 5668A.
×Steele, William, 5669A.
×Wright, Lewis Walter, 5670A.
×Quinlan, Francis Emmet, 5671A.
Myers, Lawrence Talbot, 5672A.
Trojanowski, Maurice John, 5673A.
×Rosno, Raymond Joseph, 5674A.
Hilley, William Allen, 5675A.
Hunt, Robert Fletcher, Jr., 5676A.
Hansen, Robert Peter, 5677A.
Moist, Robert Elrose, 5678A.

Medical

Denslow, Joseph Carlos, Jr., 19580A.
Steinbock, Henry Fred, 19218A.
×Holliday, John C., 19219A.
Lawn, Raymond Arnold, 19220A.

Dental

Burch, Richard Jackmond, 18889A.
Williams, James Perry, 18890A.
Eastman, John Robert, 18891A.

Veterinary

×Madison, Russell Martin, 18992A.

Medical Service

×Moore, James Henry, 19424A.
×Doyle, James Michael, 19425A.
×Shutt, William Franklin, Jr., 19426A.
Runyon, Merlyn Walker, 19427A.

Chaplain

×Nolan, John Francis, 18736A.
Taylor, Robert Preston, 18737A.
×O'Connor, James Coleman, 18738A.

CAPTAIN TO MAJOR

Air Force

Webb, John Davis, Jr., 10383A.
×Woods, Durward Allen, 10467A.
×Hayes, Harold Carl, 10501A.
×Silger, James Edwin, 10502A.
×Perry, William Dewey, Jr., 10503A.
×Derck, Walter Frank, 10504A.
×Simonson, Sidney Arnold, 10505A.
Wallace, Robert Andrew, 10506A.

Fancher, Robert Edwin, 10507A.
×Teeter, James Harley, 10508A.
×Roelofs, Milton, 10509A.
Brundage, Robert Sayles, 10510A.
×Ervin, Davis Fletcher, Jr., 10511A.
Smith, Edward Douglas, 10513A.
×Netherland, James Ollian, 10514A.
×Williams, Roger Allan, 10515A.
×Paul, William Edward, 10516A.
×McElroy, Carroll Bernard, 10517A.
×Foley, James Edwin, 10519A.
×Fife, William Paul, 10520A.
×Powers, Clarence Arthur, 10521A.
Briggs, James Kay, 10522A.
×Walters, Benjamin Burton, 10523A.
×Clements, Manen Osco, Jr., 10524A.
Watters, John Furniss, 10525A.
Ross, Donald Harding, 10526A.
×Stowell, Philip Musgrave, 10528A.
×Van Dyk, William Cornelius, 10529A.
×Dean, Floyd Rhadamanthus, 10530A.
×Mihailov, Nicholas Nicholas, Jr., 10531A.
×Fritchman, Curtis Clayton, 10532A.
Truscott, James Calvin, 10533A.
Mitchell, Kirk Richard, 10534A.
×Lian, Elmer Theodore, 10535A.
Burris, John Franklin, 10537A.
Patterson, Jerry Frank, 10540A.
Gaygan, Jack Aloysius, 10541A.
×Harris, Wallace Andrew, 10542A.
Mays, John Billy, Jr., 10544A.
Clark, Jack Wilson, 10545A.
Davis, John Pharon, 10546A.
Lassiter, Charles Beers, 10547A.
Thompson, Donald Melvin, 10548A.
×Southall, Russell Melvin, 10549A.
×Vinson, Elmer Leroy, 10550A.
Sjodin, Daniel LaVerne, 10551A.
Colley, Gordon Townsend, 10552A.
×Berk, Irving Boris, 10553A.
Gilmore, James Robson, 10554A.
Spence, Claude Pierce, 10555A.
×Hupperich, Herman Culrose, 10556A.
Renz, L. Jay, 10557A.
×Smith, William Arthur, 10559A.
×Matthews, Jewell, Jr., 10562A.
Hathorn, Vernon Burkett, Jr., 10563A.
Jones, Robert John, 10564A.
×Batie, John Samuel, 10566A.
×Ball, Fred George, 10568A.
Zagorsky, Stanley Charles, 10569A.
Leyrer, Robert Joseph, 10570A.
Porter, Vernon Davis, 10571A.
Harrelson, Jay Barnard, 10574A.
Ross, James Montgomery, 10575A.
Rice, Charles Sutton, 10576A.
Van Wingerden, Nicolas, 10577A.
×Harrison, Robert Clarence, 10578A.
Herweg, John Bernard, 10579A.
Armstrong, John Alan, 10580A.
Jordan, Jay Julian, 10581A.
Baker, Robert Gordon, 10582A.
×Miller, James Earl, 10583A.
Daugherty, Francis Leslie, Jr., 10584A.
×Ward, Rufus Alexander, 10585A.
Williams, John L., 10586A.
×Kampmann, Charles William, 10587A.
×Gillett, Richard LeMar, 10589A.
Moseley, Wendell Ford, 10590A.
Barrett, Harold Warren, 10591A.
×Downey, Robert John, 10592A.
×Clark, Cortis Anderson, Jr., 10594A.
Rea, Kenneth Ross, 10595A.
×Coleman, William Woodrow, Jr., 10596A.
×Cottrell, Bert Maxwell, Jr., 10597A.
×Kjelland, James Oliver, 10598A.
×Gay, Robert Eugene, 10599A.
×Koerschner, William Frederick, Jr., 10600A.
Beaty, William Emery, Jr., 10601A.
×Bruner, William Preston, 10602A.
Kelleher, William Francis, 10603A.
Dale, Theodore Roosevelt, 10604A.
Proctor, Kenneth Earle, 10605A.
×Bynum, Clyde Holstun, 10606A.
×Tisone, Albert Anthony, 10607A.
Blackwell, Lynn Douglas, 10608A.
Barnes, George Roy, 10609A.
×Helvey, Hazen Dale, 10610A.
Whalen, John Lester, 10611A.
Moutier, John Louis, Jr., 10612A.
Back, Charles Harold, 10613A.
×Pratt, Dwight William, 10614A.
Smith, James Charles, 10615A.
Howe, Robert Maitland, 10616A.
Dahl, Paul Warren, 10617A.
×Manley, James Colby, 10618A.
Culp, William Kenneth, 10619A.
×Mueller, Glen Edward, 10620A.
Gaede, David Livingstone, 10621A.
×Rogers, Fredrick Albert, 10622A.
Abbitt, Charles Webb, 10623A.
McLaughlin, Burl William, 10624A.
×Feicht, Edward R., Jr., 10625A.
×Binks, William Porter, Jr., 10626A.
Hamilton, Charles Edward, Jr., 10627A.
×Cosel, Richard Morton, 10628A.
Hull, Joseph DuBarry, 10629A.
×Coe, Grover Krueger, 10630A.
×Copley, Robert Edgar, 10631A.
Waltman, William Smedley, 10632A.
Compton, William Benjamin, 10633A.
Ezekiel, Thomas Clark, 10635A.
Malmstrom, Donald Oscar, 10636A.
Acebedo, Adrian Wood, 10637A.
×Taylor, Gerald Othel, 10638A.
Hoke, DeAlbert Southerland, Jr., 10639A.
Prarat, Victor Henry, 10640A.
Gessner, Harlan William, 10641A.
×Treat, Mark Gilmour, 10642A.
Riley, Martin Eldrige, 10643A.
White, Harrison Gurney, 10644A.
Trimble, Harry Burt, 10645A.
Saltzman, Stephen Ginns, 10646A.
×Adams, Bill Russell, 10648A.
×Correll, Harold McCullough, 10649A.
Sampson, Allan Theodore, 10650A.
×McDill, James Nixon, 10651A.
Sanders, William Allie, Jr., 10652A.
×Manch, Jacob Earle, 10653A.
Zdanzukas, Vincent Raymond, 18076A.
Dees, Robert William, 10654A.
×Vitunac, Walter Charles, 10655A.
Baldwin, Allen Edward, 10656A.
Wood, Thomas Lucas, 10657A.
×Baldwin, Elwyn Seward, 10658A.
Northcutt, George Carl, 10659A.
Hopfenspirger, Thomas Warren, 10660A.
Lloyd, Marion Gene, 10661A.
×White, Oscar Edward, 10662A.
Lantz, Roy Frederick, 10663A.
McCormick, Kenneth James, 10666A.
×Smith, Earle Marshall, 10667A.
Hunter, James Edward, 10668A.
Schaffer, Glenn Joseph, 10669A.
×Sims, John Wendell, 10670A.
Baldwin, Irl Edgar, 10671A.
×Martin, John Gordon, Jr., 10674A.
×Maier, Oscar Lee Walter, 10675A.
×Harris, Walter Raymond, Jr., 10677A.
×Tannen, Martin Robert, 10678A.
×Finton, James Robert, 10679A.
Edwards, John Lee, 10680A.
Sears, Aubrew Chester, 10681A.
×Harless, Leonard Jackson, 10682A.
Taylor, Oliver DeForst, 10683A.
×Holmes, Besby Frank, 10685A.
Standifer, Lee Roy, Jr., 10686A.
×Wilson, Carl Woodrow, 10687A.
×Morhous, William Reed, 10688A.
×Umpleby, Arthur Norman, 10689A.
×Davis, George Harrison, 10690A.
Bounds, William Fay, 10691A.
Vaughan, William Rolland, 10692A.
Bastian, Earl Lehne, 10693A.
DeBord, Robert Louis, 10694A.
×Peirson, Jean Saxton, 10695A.
×Story, James Benjamen, 10697A.
Knofczynski, Joseph John, 10697A.
Grimwood, Don Milford, 10698A.
×Sorenson, John Maxwell, 10699A.
Johnson, Raymond Fredric, 10700A.
Marshall, Henry Curtis, Jr., 10701A.
×Fassmann, LeRoy John, 10702A.
Doolittle, James Harold, Jr., 10703A.
×Burtnette, Claude Sidle, Jr., 10704A.
×Sage, Wayne Philip, 10705A.
×Harris, Jack Hamilton, 10706A.
Fleming, William Harry, Jr., 10707A.
Newton, Dalton Francis, 10708A.
Firestone, Clinton Dewitt, Jr., 10709A.
Voyles, James Homer, Jr., 10710A.
Lewis, George Dewey, 10711A.
Bennett, Warren Allen, 10712A.
Jackson, Larkin LeRoy, 10713A.
Spiller, William Lacy, 10714A.
×Stephens, William Hoyt, 10715A.
Staples, George Madison, 10717A.
×Herbold, Robert Vernon, 10718A.
McDowell, Bert, Jr., 10719A.
Mackey, John Joseph, 10720A.
Menczkowski, John Marion, 10721A.
×Williams, Daniel Boone, 10722A.
×Meyer, Erwin Adolph, Jr., 10723A.
Hargis, Troy Alvis, 10724A.
Philips, Verne Douglas Joseph, 10725A.
Matthews, Thomas, 10726A.
×Johnson, Perry Guess, 10728A.
×Jacoby, Joseph Harry, 10729A.
Lichte, Martin Edgar, 10730A.
×Simmons, Albert Durant, 10731A.
×Brundydge, Henry Harold, 10732A.
×Lake, Donald Jackson, 10733A.
×Knauf, Albert Sledge, 10734A.
Garfinkel, Bernard, 10735A.
Johnston, Kingsley Maxwell, 10736A.
Senecal, Robert Percy, 10737A.
×Tullock, Willard Donald, 10738A.
×Graham, H. Allen, 10739A.
Milner, Robert Stanley, 10740A.
×Hessey, Francis Dodson, 10741A.
LeGwin, John Hardy, 10742A.
×Paige, Harold William, 10743A.
×Barker, Arthur Forbes, 10744A.
Sill, Leo Glenn, 10745A.
Fuerst, Robert Edward, 10746A.
McColl, James Quentin, 10747A.
×Rood, Ralph Winton, 10748A.
French, Joseph Elmer, 10749A.
×Foss, Joseph Aldridge, 10750A.
×Price, Edward Carson, 10751A.
Scanlan, John Francis, 10752A.
Rudolph, James Otto, 10753A.
×Crutcher, Robert Bryan, 10754A.
Keene, Thomas James, 10755A.
×Powell, William Howard, 10756A.
Fisher, Norman Decatur, 10757A.
Redden, George Alfred, 10758A.
×Neelly, Dale, 10759A.
Work, Byron Russell, 10760A.
×Goodwin, Dexter Beven, 10761A.
×Wolters, Elmer Henry, 10762A.
×Box, Francis Marion, 10764A.
Bryant, Donald Daniel, 10767A.
Walsh, John Joseph, 10768A.
×Mink, Wesley Stiles, 10769A.
Waldmire, Henry William, 10770A.
Eckley, Paul Witherspoon, Jr., 10771A.
×Glyer, John Robert, 10772A.
×Cummings, Claude Harold, Jr., 10773A.
Gaston, Arthur Dale, 10774A.
×Ellis, Sherman Edward, 10775A.
×Dabolt, Robert Lewis, 10776A.
Bauers, Frank William, Jr., 10777A.
Bowen, Lewis Love, 10778A.
Decker, John Allen, 10779A.
×Stewart, Harrie Lloyd, Jr., 10780A.
King, Joseph Henry, 10781A.
Kelso, John Malier, 10782A.
×Swanson, John William, 10783A.
Harms, Warden Dana, 10784A.
Harb, Wallace Sylvester, 10785A.
Lindquist, David Max Wadsworth, 10786A.
Rogers, Gerald Talbot, 10787A.
Oppelt, Alexander Leslie, 10788A.
Craven, Charles Waller, 10789A.
×Turner, Charles Sheridan, 10791A.
×Hilliard, Ray Lewis, 10729A.
×Morrison, Marvis Charles, 10793A.
Palmer, James Morton, 10795A.
Martin, Ewell, 10797A.
×Redfield, Tyler Adams, 10798A.
×Clair, William Alonzo, 10799A.
×Ballweg, Lawrence Henry, 10800A.
×Hollingsworth, Dal Oliver, 10801A.
×Ellis, Samuel Wayne, 10802A.
Burke, Billy, 10805A.
Gorgol, George Frank, 10806A.
Sheldon, John Warren, 10807A.
×Lowrance, Joseph Butler, Jr., 10808A.
Ingram, Sidney Oscar, Jr., 10809A.
Moore, James Merton, Jr., 10810A.
×Jones, Elmer Douglass, Jr., 10811A.
White, Foster Lee, 10812A.
×Brown, John Harrington, 10813A.
×Goodson, Walter Cass, 10814A.
×Hickey, Rolet V., 10816A.
×Guy, Carroll Wilson, 10818A.

Hayes, Burgain Garfield, 10819A.
×Stevenson, Dudley Waddell, 10820A.
Fowler, J. Riley, 10821A.
Robinson, James Bushfield, 3d, 10822A.
Stevens, Vaughan Orvis, 10823A.
×Gentry, M. D., 10824A.
×Goodbread, Jonah Eugene, 10825A.
×Harrison, Charles Dean, 10826A.
×Larson, Leon Hubert, Jr., 10827A.
×Glickman, Emanuel, 10828A.
×James, Paul Carr, 10829A.
Brown, Kimbrough Stone, 10830A.
×Roberts, Edward Theo, 10831A.
×Brooks, Clarence Rolland, 10832A.
Gilpin, John Ashbrook, 10833A.
×Kesler, Joseph, Jr., 10835A.
Cross, George Edward, Jr., 10836A.
×Williamson, George Austin, 10837A.
McClellan, John Markle, 10838A.
×Decker, Harold Raymond, 10839A.
×Ballard, Herbert LaRoy, 10840A.
×Johnson, Ferol William, 10841A.
Behrens, John Nevin, 10842.
×Roth, Myron Alfred, 10843.
×Murphy, Lloyd Joseph, 10845A.
Bruce, Avery Creedon, Jr., 10847A.
Fuchs, William Robert, 10848A.
×Hart, Gordon Lamar, 10849A.
Stribling, Robert Arris, 10851A.
Harchalk, George, 10852A.
Barr, Robert Ray, 10854A.
×Collie, Robert Lucius, 10855A.
Hamblen, William, 10856A.
Keller, Howard Wesley, 10857A.
Garrett, William Alton, 10858A.
Beaven, William Morris, 10859A.
×Guyer, Loren Ezra, 10860A.
×Martin, Frank Herbert, 10861A.
×Windsor, Leon Joseph, 10862A.
×Lindahl, Thomas Burdick, 10863A.
×Horton, Harold Everett, 10864A.
×Wood, William Penn, 10865A.
Tiffany, Robert Samuel, Jr., 10866A.
×Satterfield, John Robert, 10867A.
Krebs, John Louis, 10868A.
×Cushman, George Hawley, 10870A.
Heiman, Grover George, Jr., 10871A.
Chesmore, Emery Richard, 10872A.
Cook, Eugene Harry, 10873A.
Benner, Ralph Warren, 10874A.
×Shofner, Floyd Kelly, 10875A.
Thompson, Raymond Gail, 10876A.
×Baker, Marvin Earl, 10877A.
McQueen, Verden, 10878A.
Hoff, Burton Marvin, 10879A.
Britton, Wilbur Randall, 10880A.
Hardison, John David, 10881A.
George, Arthur Franklin, 10883A.
Lewis, Stanley Coryell, 10884A.
Walsh, Francis Robert, 10885A.
Brush, Elvin Watson, 10886A.
Byrnes, Conley Henderson, 10887A.
Hill, William Harris, 10888A.
Magness, Ped G., 10889A.
Saliba, Ernest John, 10890A.
Keating, Walter Franklin, 10891A.
×King, Max James, 10892A.
×Jones, Lewis Carriker, 10893A.
×Mitchell, Max Oliver, 10894A.
Carr, George Theron, 10895A.
Meyers, William Christopher, 10896A.
Rodden, Jasper Aaron, 10897A.
McClure, Frank Leslie, 10898A.
×Miller, Victor Norman, Jr., 10899A.
Tanassy, Emil George, 10900A.
×Zimmer, Robert William, 10901A.
×Maucher, Robert Allen, 10902A.
Young, John Newton, 10904A.
×Hammer, Kenneth Merle, 10905A.
Bock, Harry, 10906A.
Stemme, Robert Bolton, 10907A.
×Witsell, Edward Fuller, Jr., 10908A.
×Dibble, George Arthur, 2d, 10910A.

Medical

×Kellsey, David Canfield, 19348A.
×Shirer, Ralph Francis, Jr., 19351A.
×Schear, Evan Weible, 19352A.
×Hansen, Carl Ludwig, Jr., 19353A.
×Midgley, Elwin Wilmer, 19354A.
×Wiedershine, Leonard Jack, 19355A.
Van Vranken, Eugene Edward, 19356A.
×Koonce, Duval Holtzclaw, 19989A.

Dental

×Rock, George Washington, 18953A.
×Leonard, Leo John, 18954A.
×Jameson, John Rock, 18955A.
×Bienvenu, Patrick Xavier, 18956A.

Veterinary

×Snider, Charles Henry, 19009A.

Medical Service

×Pomphrey, Patrick James, 19485A.
×Hall, Auston Sylvester, 19486A.
×Merritt, William Freeman, 19487A.
×Holmes, Warren Harding, 19488A.
×O'Malley, Robert Joseph, 19593A.
×Geary, John Maurice, 19489A.
Maybell, Robert Edward, 19490A.
×Swanson, Fred Hans, 19491A.
×Force, Ronald Clarence, 19492A.

Chaplain

×Whitlock, Harold Thomas, 18797A.
×McHugh, Thomas Patrick, 18798A.

FIRST LIEUTENANT TO CAPTAIN

Air Force

Yates, John Hanley, 20041A.
Burkett, Daniel Lee, 17571A.
Roy, Carl William, 17572A.
×Packer, William Henry, 21788A.
Robinson, Leroy Buddie, 17573A.
Blanton, William Jennings, 17553A.
×Maurer, Lyle Eugene, 17554A.
×Rhoads, William Clarence, 17555A.
×McCurdy, Norman Roy, 17556A.
Frizzie, Bernard Emil, 21442A.
Marquardt, Elden George, 24262A.
Bullard, James Thomas, 22996A.
×Bunn, DeWitt Relyea, 17557A.
×Frazier, Eugene Claude, 21443A.
Smith, Walter Aloyusius, Jr., 17574A.
×Knapik, Delores Marie, 21359W.
×Hamblen, J. Fred, 21789A.
Logan, James William, 22997A.
×Vickers Robert Lehman, 21790A.
Dixon, Jack Charles, Jr., 24263A.
×Birdsong, Samuel Ernest, Jr., 21791A.
×Keough, James John, 21792A.
Berthelsen, Alvin Lang, 20046A.
Schulte, George August, 20044A.
Craft, William Cecil, 20043A.
Fink, Donald Laroy, 22998A.
×Cooper, Willie Lee, Jr., 22999A.

Medical

Hibben, Herbert Arthur, 23069A.
Sturr, Robert Porch, Jr., 23171A.
Bryan, Richard Stephen, 24664A.
Bralliar, Max Burton, 25468A.
×Good, Raphael Simeon, 22969A.
×McClain, Roland Eugene, 21691A.
×Ellswood, William Harry, 24207A.
Bosley, Robert Johnson, 25653A.
×McChesney, John Allen, 24127A.
×Wuesthoff, Hubert Ernest, 24665A.
Deuel, James Thayer, 23588A.
Collins, Frederick Gene, 21737A.
Grimmer, Billy, 22562A.
Neely, Samuel Eugene, 21767A.
×Reed, Josiah Frederick, Jr., 22563A.
×Patrick, Theodore Emil, 21738A.
×Drummy, William Wallace, Jr., 21736A.
×Staudinger, Leonard Singleton, Jr., 22564A.
×Parapid, Nicholas Vladimir, 24666A.
Weimer, John Russell, 22409A.
Sanford, William Gordon, 23107A.
Watson, Arthur Charles, Jr., 23589A.
×Krumbach, Ronald William, 22410A.
Tucker, Andrew Lewis, 22970A.
×Ainsworth, George Edward, 23212A.
Schroering, Gerard Bernard, Jr., 22971A.
Smartt, Walter Haines, 23213A.
×Murphy, Paul Daniel, 22565A.
Smith, Luther Jerome, 2d, 24208A.
×Relyea, William Volk, 23121A.
Reed, Joel Earl, 23590A.
×Caris, Timothy Nick, 21854A.
×Ferguson, Richard Harding, 21853A.
Roads, Wesley Alfred, 24667A.
Giles, Upton Wright, 24209A.
Coles, John Edmond, 24129A.
Boyd, Joe Whitfield, 24128A.
Orth, John Stambaugh, 24668A.
Moffatt, Keith, 24210A.
×Gabby, Samuel Lee, Jr., 22413A.
×Turpin, William Richard, 24130A.
×Nolan, Paul Vernon, 22567A.
×Ring, Dean Merrill, 24670A.
Berry, Charles Alden, 22414A.
×Easter, Stratton Robert, 23070A.
White, Stanley C., 23173A.

Dental

Parson, Ray Elton, 22975A.
×Wyatt, James Leslie, Jr., 19847A.
×Turk, Roy Stanley, 22988A.
×Grant, Ambrose Gaines, 24675A.
×Ayres, William Edward, 22976A.
×Weaver, Robert Norman, 24140A.
×Julius, Loy Luvern, 23071A.
Shuttee, Thomas Smith, 23594A.
×Roy, Edward Wallace, 24676A.
×Mueller, Roy Louis, 21428A.
×Dirlam, James Horace, 21765A.
Schrader, George Watts, 21851A.
×Morris, Charles Robert, 21852A.
McCall, Clarence Milton, Jr., 22408A.
×Salentine, Russell James, 22407A.
×Armstrong, Harold Leverne, 22989A.
×Woodward, Hubert Walton, 22977A.
Varrin, Rene Douglas, 25481A.
×Dohoney, William Parkhill, 21739A.
×Steiner, William Wayne, 21740A.
×Dickson, Edward Etzell, 22978A.
×Knoll, Oliver J., 19969A.
Hill, Robert Edwin, 19971A.
Jackson, Hiram Madison, 20850A.
×Schwatka, Charles Taylor, Jr., 21768A.
×Jordan, David Robert, 21742A.
×Ryan, Robert Leroy, 20061A.

Chaplain

×Levitan, Kalman Lionel, 23204A.
Jellico, Thomas Michael, 24681A.

SECOND LIEUTENANT TO FIRST LIEUTENANT

Air Force

×Anderson, Robert Haralson, 24448A.
×Kidner, John Powell, 21656A.
×Shipley, Dan Spears, 21662A.
Curtis, Edward Harold, 21655A.
Petrie, James Waite, 21659A.
Wayne, John William, 3d, 21658A.
×Mullins, Jack Colvard, 21660A.
Wall, James Smith, 24450A.
Bates, Randolph Clark, Jr., 23874A.
Pasko, Joseph John, 23875A.
Gaskins, Calvin Coolidge, 24796A.
Rodriguez, Rigoberto, 24797A.
Yurgel, Albert, 21696A.
Schropp, George Edward, 21695A.
Glasgow, Joseph Magoffin, Jr., 21697A.
Jenista, Charles Otto, Jr., 23876A.
Egbert, Darrell Howard, 24453A.
Schneider, Calvin Chris, 24452A.
Andrew, Hugh Samuel, 23877A.
King, Bruce Francis, 24454A.
×Smith, Kenneth Richard, 21671A.
×Edwards, Boyd Hunt, 21669A.
Krekelberg, Donald Leo, 21672A.
Ambrose, Robert Fred, 21666A.
Christensen, Grant S., 21673A.
Dowdy, Derrell Coolidge, 21667A.
×Mills, Edward Kenneth, Jr., 21670A.
DuBois, Joseph Mortimer, 24455A.
Wellinghurst, Jack Moreman, 24799A.
Clinger, Bordean Wardell, 23878A.
Barker, William Robert, 23880A.
McCracken, Frank Searcy, 23047A.
Erdmann, Robert Lewis, 24800A.
Mauro, Louis Salvatore, 24802A.
Robinson, Victor Russell, Jr., 24801A.
Blodgett, Dolphus Ernest, 21698A.
Webber, Byron Lewis, 21701A.
Carey, Carl Henry, Jr., 21702A.
Pitts, Earl Wayne, 21703A.
×Heyde, Richard Reimers, 21704A.
Beyer, Richard Scott, 21699A.
Koernig, Robert Walter, 21700A.
Voigt, William Frederick, 21705A.
Vastine, John Edward, 24458A.

Asseo, Sam, 24803A.
Ryan, Thomas Martin, Jr., 24804A.
Kovacich, George Joseph, 21675A.
Kirsch, Donald David, 24459A.
Matthews, George Dale, 21676A.
Newsom, Thomas Louis, 23882A.
×Chapman, Milton Charles, Jr., 21677A.
Yerg, Kenneth Gideon, 21708A.
×Bahl, James Frederick, 21706A.
Huggins, Earl Leroy, 21707A.
Martin, Francis Thomas, Jr., 21709A.
Runnels, Charles C., Jr., 25552A.
×Coy, Edwin Alexander, 21679A.
Bolvig, Christoffer Peter, 21678A.
Lamont, James Nicholson, 24806A.
Hill, Ployer Peter, 24807A.
Schifferdecker, Charles Ray, 25553A.
Downing, Dale Edwin, 25554A.
×Nelson, James Toy, Jr., 24460A.
×Innis, John Woodson, 21770A.
Matthews, Harry Hargan, 24461A.
Meux, William Leigh, Jr., 23883A.
×Mitchell, Robert Fred, 21774A.
Rader, Norvin Elwood, 23884A.
Jordon, Harold Kenneth, 24462A.
×McEachron, Edward Harvey, 23885A.
×O'Brien, William Claude, 21820A.
×Galvin, Donald William, 23886A.
×Hackett, James W., 24808A.
Cox, George Rogers, 21744A.
×Bigelow, Robert Berle, 21745A.
Polhemus, William Leroy, 24463A.
×Bunker, Gerald Byron, 21824A.
×Stephens, William Richard, 23887A.
×Kincaid, William Leo, 24464A.
Wade, Thomas Dell, 24809A.
Clarke, Roderick William, 24810A.
Bayer, Edwin Ralph, 24811A.
×Gordon, Paul Kelly, 24812A.
×Kuchta, Daniel John, 24465A.
×Lucia, Norman Rowland, 24813A.
×Simpson, Charles James, Jr., 23085A.
×Wagner, Richard Edwin, 23088A.
×Reichardt, Delbert Dale, 23084A.
×McCargar, Lolare, 23082W.
Thomas, John Joseph, 23086A.
×Julian, Elton, 2308A.
×Prescott, Lester Albert, 23083A.
Turregano, John Edwin, 23087A.
Sayers, Merl Edward, 24815A.
×Hays, Robert Earl, Jr., 24814A.
Mianecke, Ernest Aloysious, 24816A.
Rathburn, Virginia Ransom, 25556W.
×Leatherby, Harold Franklin, 25555A.
Pollock, William John, 21813A.
Clark, Lynwood Edgerton, 21812A.
Starke, Eugene Raleigh, 21814A.
Kirk, Leland Richard, 21810A.
Carter, Vernon Henry, Jr., 21815A.
Swim, Virgil Paul, 21807A.
×Allen, Alfred Stanley, 21805A.
Dudley, William Ewart, Jr., 21809A.
Yary, William Whytle, 21806A.
Darlington, Robert Edwin, 21811A.
Diaz, Robert, Jr., 24468A.
Weber, Lawrence Wayne, 24467A.
Thomas, Maurice Charles, 24817A.
Vancleave, Walter Shelby, 24818A.
Rundle, David Bradford, 23889A.
×Johnson, Robert Edward, Jr., 23890A.
×Sprankle, Robert Lafayette, 23891A.
×Borders, Robert Henderson, 3d, 23892A.
×Brown, Allan Lee, 21905A.
Heard, Robert Jewel, Jr., 24469A.
Jones, Henry Lewis, 25557A.
×Sturmthal, Emil, 21825A.
Kelly, Victor Clayton, 23893A.
Bright, Charles Delotter, 23888A.
Stodghill, Clifford Alexander, 24481A.
Hunerwadel, Hugh Pat, 24470A.
Messmore, Jack Winston, 24472A.
Jubber, George Ferris, 24471A.
Jefferis, Joseph Denny, 25558A.
Clark, Edward Brown, 25559A.
Zaroban, Richard Herman, 24475A.
Morrell, Bruce Elliott, 24473A.
Waters, Ralph R., 24474A.
Cox, Harold Morris, 24819A.
Feero, Urban Austin, Jr., 24820A.
Corrigan, Robert Calvin, 24821A.
Vavrinek, Raymond Harding, 23894A.
Ebersole, Howard Royal, 24476A.
×Alexander, William Tipton, 24477A.
Luchsinger, Vincent Peter, Jr., 21817A.
Raunikar, Eugene, 21816A.
Schutt, Carlton Edward, 23895A.
Watkins, Eugene Conrad, 24480A.
Bouton, Arthur Franklyn, Jr., 24478A.
Webb, James Arnold, Jr., 24822A.
Fagan, James Francis, 21748A.
Murley, Kenneth Earl, 21749A.
Cisco, Guy Cleveland, Jr., 21747A.
Lorenz, Bernard Charles, 21750A.
Cooke, Gerald Edward, 25560A.
Decima, Eleo, 23896A.
Shipman, Frank Wilson, Jr., 24823A.
Elliott, Robert George, 25561A.
Hansen, Richard Earl, 23898A.
Miller, George Richard, 24483A.
Brandom, Thomas Martin, Jr., 24482A.
McDowell, Dwight Calvin, 24825A.
Nolan, James Albert, 24484A.
Stewart, Gerald William, 24826A.
Leverett, Sidney Duncan, Jr., 24827A.
Muterspaw, Emmett Edgar, Jr., 24485A.
Koons, Burt Stanley, 24486A.
Ward, Billy Ray, 24487A.
×Madigan, Albert Whittier, 21752A.
Thornton, James Henry, 23897A.
Runyan, Charles Curtis, Jr., 25562A.
Miller, Donald Edwin, 24489A.
Kokoszka, Florian Theodore, 24828A.
Cole, Arthur Scott, 25563A.
Marsters, Thomas Charles, 24492A.
Murray, Jack Godfrey, 24490A.
Shivley, Robert Wendell, 24491A.
Patterson, Glenn Alden, Jr., 23899A.
Cottle, Joe Irvin, 24495A.
Babcock, Bernard Roland, 24496A.
Roll, Frederick August, Jr., 24494A.
Andrews, Richard Thomas, 24829A.
Wolf, Earl John, Jr., 23900A.
Foster, Jack Richard, 24497A.
Timm, William Machamer, 24832A.
Bodie, Donald Edward, 21755A.
Dennis, Robert, 23901A.
Scovell, Rolf Sanford, 21756A.
Golden, William George, Jr., 23902A.
Dunn, Mathew Thomas, 24498A.
×Williamson, Donald Stroup, 24505A.
×Waterbury, David Eugene, 24833A.
Nunemaker, John Jacob, 24499A.
Marymee, Hubert Eugene, 23905A.
Lane, Gerald Richard, 23903A.
Gamm, Thomas Joseph, 24500A.
Martin, William Hubert, 21818A.
Lebaron, Allen Dee, 21819A.
×Wasson, Glenn Everett, 21904A.
Grimes, Charles Kenneth, 24501A.
Purser, Henry William, 24503A.
Brewer, Lee Allen, 24502A.
Skillman, Tom Mike, 22441A.
Davis, Philip Carroll, Jr., 22436A.
Baker, Kenneth Grant, 22434A.
Sleep, Otis Arnold, 22442A.
Snodgress, Paul Edward, 22443A.
Odom, James Riley, Jr., 22440A.
Bennett, Frank Everett, 22435A.
Gyulavics, Joseph James, 22437A.
Warren, William Jerry, 22444A.
McGehee, Frank Boaz, 22439A.
Hostetter, Henry Glenn, 24504A.
Brown, Richard Shaw, 24506A.
Whitehurst, Elbert Wyma, 24834A.
Joppa, Jacob Anthony, Jr., 25457A.
Dahl, Gerald Raymond, 25565A.
×Anderson, Jesse Jack, 25564A.
Trueheart, James Lawrence, 24509A.
Yeager, George Gordon, Jr., 25566A.
Friss, Raymond James, Jr. 23907A.
Johnson Grant Wallace, 21772A.
×Barnes Warren Samuel, 21773A.
Stotts, John Hunter, 21775A.
Perham, Guy Dorman, 21776A.
McDonald, David Richard 21771A.
Savage, Robert Louis, 24511A.
Davis Cecil, 24513A.
Williams, Reuben Edward, 24835A.
Tackwell Joseph Jerry, 23908A.
Krause, William Guy, 24515A.
Colvin, Marc Jay, Jr., 24516A.
Renz, Robert Edward, 24514A.
Hall, Harold Cleo, 25567A.
Longanecker, Walter Ridgely, Jr., 23909A.
Rayner, Robert Vance, 24836A.
×Pallouras, James Louis, 23910A.
Harpster, John Wilbur, 24517A.
Dietz, Frederick Chester, 25569A.
Welsh, Mark Anthony, Jr., 25568A.
Bertic, Samuel Lawrence, 25570A.
×Caruso, Charles Peter, 21822A.
MacLaren, William George, Jr., 21823A.
×Van Dusen, John Nash, 21821A.
Carey, William Ellis, 24519A.
Munn, James Stanley, 24518A.
Hughes, William Virgil, 25571A.
Omley, George Edward, 25572A.
Bartalsky, Steven Louis, 24536A.
Stringer, William Lawrence, 24837A.
Cobb, Tommy, 23912A.
Cotter, John Abner, 24520A.
McIntire, Robert Henry, 25574A.
Matsen, Ralph Stephen, 22857A.
Wood, Raymond Brooks, 23913A.
Watson, James Milton, Jr., 24521A.
Christman, Fred John, Jr., 24524A.
Nielsen, Jessie Patricia, 24838W.
Cresap, Edward Robert, 24839A.
McMillan, John Aubrey, 25575A.
Webb, Herbert Godfrey, 24525A.
Palmer, Wallace Jackson, 24526A.
×Rule, John Henry, 21827A.
Smith, Chadwick Boyd, 21832A.
Driessnack, Hans Helmuth, 21831A.
Dudley, Charles Herbert, 21830A.
Broussard, James Harold, 21826A.
×Henslee, Robert Young, 21829A.
×Winders, Voy Arthur, 22856A.
Divall, Robert Harold, 23915A.
Slayton, Donald Kent, 23914A.
Scharling, Stanley Victor, 24532A.
Cooney, Lloyd Irving, 24531A.
Wallace, Neil Warren, 24530A.
Berg, Robert Leonard, 24527A.
Archuleta, Harry Manuel, 25577A.
Abbey, Charles Earl, 23917A.
Denton, Irving LaRue, 23916A.
Voseipka, George Kenneth, 23918A.
Rossel, Robert Louis, 24840A.
Magdich, Joseph, Jr., 23919A.
×Koehler, Frederick George, 21835A.
×Stanton, Richard Robert, 21833A.
Davis, Thomas Holman, 23920A.
Mullen, Maurice Leland, 24535A.
Prior, James Clark, 24534A.
Custer, Gerald Boyce, 25578A.
Hutchison, Curtis Roland, 23129A.
Powell, James Virden, 23134A.
×Myers, Ralph Harvard, 23132A.
×Olsen, William Pross, 23133A.
Bosstick, Charles Dale, 23127A.
Wurthmann, Henry St. Clair, Jr., 23136A.
×Rieder, Henry Robert, 23135A.
×Call, Edward Fleming, 23128A.
×Lauderdale, Carl Joseph, Jr., 23131A.
×Landon, Robert Melville, 23130A.
Barwin, Richard Otto, 23126A.
×Barnes, Jack Lyle, 23125A.
Woods, David Andy, Jr., 24540A.
Hagen, William Stanley, 24537A.
Lorey, Willis Edward, 24539A.
Appleby, Phillip Edward, 24842A.
Williams, Walter Alexander, 24844A.
Harris, Armond Edgbert, 24843A.
English, Robert Bryan, 22466A.
Dingwell, Cyril Howard, 22447A.
Anderson, Charles Douglas, 22445A.
Kottas, William Max, 22446A.
Dickerson, Lewis Hayes, 23921A.
Zippel, Irving, 24542A.
Woldt, Robert Conrad, 24541A.
Enslen, Allen Taylor, 24845A.
Watson, Wilbur Charles, 25579A.
Davis, Charlie Brown, Jr., 25580A.
Martinet, Pierre Warren, Jr., 23922A.
Rickard, Ernest Hughes, 23923A.
Johnson, William Thomas, Jr., 22423A.
Kieckhaefer, Robert Victor, 24543A.
Brown, Jack Ferrell, 24544A.
Hooten, Donald Hugh, 24545A.
Myers, Charlie Clement, 24547A.
Garrison, Charles Evens, 24846A.
×Knowles, John Stevenson, Jr., 21836A.

Halbert, Billy Gene, 25581A.
Bedford, James Reuben, Jr., 24549A.
Brown, Floyd Blaine, Jr., 24848A.
Baltzell, Leonard Earl, 25582A.
×Renfro, Charles Ralph, 22493A.
Murray, Robert Blaine, 22492A.
Walters, George Samuel, 24849A.
Algeo, John Burton, 23925A.
Couvillion, Richard Wilson, 21834A.
Mease, Harry Vernon, 23926A.
Eden, Douglas Scott, 24568A.
Stillwagon, Edwin Andrew, 24850A.
×Hunter, Robert Bruce, Jr., 22452A.
Graham, Bruce Edward, 22449A.
Grissom, Virgil Ivan, 22450A.
×Hadley, Thomas Erie, 2d, 22451A.
Stephens, Dallas Kirkpatrick, 22455A.
Meeker, James Irwin, 22454A.
King, Robert Partner, 22453A.
Ward, Albert Highert, Jr., 22457A.
Fremont, John Charles, 22448A.
Kasler, James Helms, 24551A.
Schiffer, John Thompson, 23092A.
Grubaugh, Kenneth Wayne, 21906A.
Danyliw, Bohdan, 24553A.
Lua, Royal Chester, 24554A.
Young, Everett Oliver, 24552A.
Mercer, Roger Neal, 24555A.
Isaac, Alfred Eugene, 23927A.
Farry, Stephen Francis, 24556A.
Leonard, Thomas Joseph, 24557A.
Erbschloe, Richard Ross, 24851A.
Bensing, Robert Goddard, 24558A.
McNamara, Francis Joseph, Jr., 24559A.
×Morrison, Lawrence David, 24852A.
×Strand, John Henry, Jr., 22858A.
Gaffey, John Tracy, 2d, 22859A.
Tolle, Frederick Francis, 23928A.
Hanjian, Jerry, 24562A.
Grasher, Howard K., 24563A.
Weiler, Jerome Conrad, 24561A.
Koeninger, Charles Edwin, 25583A.
Fippen, John William, 24564A.
×Drain, Edgar Lee, 23024A.
×Hall, John Rolin, 24853A.
×Allison, Jack G., 24565A.
Miller, Alfred Leslie, Jr., 24566A.
×Scofield, Lansing Guion, 22458A.
×Bushboom, Wendal Lee, 24567A.
Parker, Alan Leslie, 24569A.
×Hallgren, John Fridolph, 24570A.
O'Leary, William Simon, 25584A.
Brown, Julius Warren, Jr., 25585A.
×Loftis, George Roland, 22087A.
Rauchenstein, Henry David, 25586A.
Kinnard, Dennett Hixon, 22389A.
×Pickett, Donald Edward, 23929A.
×Skaggs, Alvin Douglas, 23931A.
×Yale, George Edward, Jr., 24571A.
×Stevens, David Boyette, 24572A.
×Forster, Francis Xavier, 24573A.
Drake, Raynolds, 24857A.
Heard, Richard Adrian, 25587A.
×Greene, Carl Kennedy, 22494A.
Garvey, Joseph John, 23932A.
×Risteen, William Hardy, 22938A.
Wilson, Charles Lowry, 25588A.
Wagner, William Louis, 24574A.
Farris, Harold Daws, 25589A.
Rew, Thomas Frederick, 23933A.
McKeever, William Lawrence, 24576A.
×Feeney, Edward Marquis, 23934A.
×Horne, Joseph Allen, Jr., 24577A.
McVay, William David, 23806A.
×Traendly, Eugene William, 24578A.
Miller, Edward Longanecker, 24855A.

Medical Service

Gray, Hollis Burdette, 25335A.
×Spaur, Carl Leroy, 23228A.
×Dibona, Joseph, 23229A.
×Quenk, Joseph John, 23230A.
×Schofield, James Bernie, Jr., 23231A.
×Covell, Donald Edward, 23232A.
Bitzko, Joseph Thomas, 23233A.
×Krakauer, Hans Anatol, 23235A.
×Martin, Robert Peter, 23234A.
Perkins, Arthur Hewett, 25336A.
×Harper, Oliver Franklin, Jr., 23237A.
Kirkel, Hubert Paul, 23238A.
Berlow, Leonard, 23239A.
Glenn, Sam David, 23240A.
Bissett, Daulton Edwards, 23241A.
Griffith, Llewellyn Brooks, 24238A.
Colon, Howard, 25337A.
Briley, James Russell, 24239A.
Murphy, James Donald, 25674A.
Clay, John Lloyd, 23242A.
×Jones, Bruce, 24240A.
Braden, Robert William, 25339A.

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Air Force under the provisions of section 107 of the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947, as amended. Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (×) are subject to physical examination required by law. All others have been examined and found physically qualified for promotion.

MAJOR TO LIEUTENANT COLONEL

Nurse

Kehoe, Doris Angela, 20906W.
×Wimberly, Edith Marie, 20909W.
×Hogan, Rosemary, 20977W.

Women's medical specialist

Perry, Miriam Esther, 21185W.

CAPTAIN TO MAJOR

Nurse

×Daniel, Margaret Elizabeth, 21919W.
×Spearnak, Pearl, 20914W.
×Evans, Claretta, 20918W.
×Schmidt, Sabina Christina, 21023W.
×Darden, Elizabeth Ann, 20925W.
×Thorp, Frances P., 20902W.
Hall, Sara Caroline, 20985W.
×Bryant, Frances Lucia, 20945W.
Lay, Frances I., 20946W.

Women's medical specialist

×Laughlin, Mary Margaret, 22058W.
×Horr, Frances Mary, 21195W.

FIRST LIEUTENANT TO CAPTAIN

Women's medical specialist

×Paynter, Elizabeth Nichols, 20899W.

SECOND LIEUTENANT TO FIRST LIEUTENANT

Nurse

×Cooney, Patricia Ann, 21886W.
×Danowski, Dorothy Dolores, 21890W.
×Chandler, Glenna Loving, 21884W.
×Elser, Florence Frances, 21887W.
×Zila, Mildred Anna, 21891W.
×Calm, Helen Elizabeth, 22088W.

Women's medical specialist

Fusco, Filomena Roberta, 21894W.
×Lacy, Barbara Lee Funk, 21892W.
×Hodgkins, Barbara Merle, 21895W.

NOTE.—Dates of rank of all officers nominated for promotion will be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

Maj. Gen. William P. T. Hill, United States Marine Corps, to be Quartermaster General of the Marine Corps, with the rank of major general, for a period of 1 year from February 1, 1954.

IN THE COAST GUARD

Rear Adm. Alfred C. Richmond to be Assistant Commandant of the United States Coast Guard, with the rank of rear admiral, for a term of 4 years. (Reappointment.)

IN THE 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

Glenn W. Moore

To be commissioned lieutenant

Steven L. Hollis, Jr.

To be commissioned lieutenant (junior grade)

John B. Watkins, Jr. Bruce E. Greene
Jack E. Guth Robert E. Williams
James D. Hodges

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JANUARY 11, 1954

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. John Caskey, of Trinity Episcopal Church, Galveston, Tex., offered the following prayer:

Most gracious God, we humbly beseech Thee, as for the people of these United States in general, so especially for their Representatives in Congress assembled; that Thou wouldst be pleased to direct and prosper all their consultations, to the advancement of Thy glory, the good of Thy Nation, the safety, honor, and welfare of Thy whole people; that all things may be so ordered and settled by their endeavors, upon the best and surest foundations, that peace and happiness, truth and justice, religion and piety, may be established among us for all generations. These and all other necessaries, for them, for us, and Thy whole Nation, we humbly beg in the name and mediation of our most blessed Lord and Saviour. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, January 7, 1954, was read and approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Hawks, one of his secretaries.

LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 291)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Education and Labor and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I submit herewith for the consideration of the Congress a number of legislative recommendations affecting labor-management relations. These recommendations are in the interests both of working men and women, and our business and industrial community. In a broader sense, they are in the interests of all our people, whose prosperity is in so great a degree dependent on the existence of genuine mutual respect and good feeling between employers and employees.

This field of legislation has had a long, contentious history. It has taken time for objective principles to emerge which can command mutual acceptance of the fundamentals which govern the complex labor-management relationship. Although the process is not and perhaps never will be complete, we have now achieved a measure of practical experience and emotional maturity in this field which, I do not doubt, is responsible for the relatively peaceful character of recent industrial relations. No drastic legislative innovations in this field are therefore desirable or required at this time.

Federal labor-management legislation at best can provide only the framework in which free collective bargaining may be conducted. It should impose neither arbitrary restrictions nor heavy-handedness upon a relationship in which good will and sympathetic understanding should be the predominant characteristics.

The National Labor Relations Act—known as the Wagner Act and adopted in 1935 by bipartisan majorities—came into being because American working men and women needed the protection of law in order to guarantee them the free exercise of their right to organize into unions and to bargain collectively through representatives of their own choosing. As unions became strong, a need arose to protect the legitimate rights of employees and employers and to protect the general public from the consequences of unresolved labor disputes that created emergencies endangering the health or safety of the Nation. To meet this need the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, commonly known as the Taft-Hartley Act, was adopted by bipartisan majorities.

In enacting labor-management legislation, the Congress has always built upon the legislation which preceded it. We have never turned backward. The Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, was no exception. It built upon the National Labor Relations Act, and not only reaffirmed, but reinforced the right of working men and women to organize into unions and to bargain collectively with their employer. The protection of this right is firmly fixed in our law and should remain a permanent policy of our Government.

The Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, is sound legislation. Experience gained in the operation of the act, however, indicates that changes can be made to reinforce its basic objectives.

In the area of employer-employee relations the injunction has always been a controversial process. It is apparent, however, that where irreparable damage threatens, the restraining effect of an injunction is required in the interest of simple justice. Nevertheless, where a collective-bargaining relationship exists, the issuance of an injunction often has the effect of making settlement of the dispute which led to the injunction more difficult.

Therefore, I recommend that whenever an injunction is issued under the National Labor Relations Act where a collective bargaining relationship exists between the parties, the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service shall impanel a special local board to meet with the parties in an effort to seek a settlement of their dispute. I further recommend that in secondary boycott cases, the application for an injunction be discretionary.

The prohibitions in the act against secondary boycotts are designed to protect innocent third parties from being injured in labor disputes that are not their concern. The true secondary boycott is indefensible and must not be permitted. The act must not, however, prohibit legitimate concerted activities against other than innocent parties. I recommend that the act be clarified by making it explicit that concerted action against (1) an employer who is performing farmed-out work for the account of another employer whose employees are on strike or (2) an employer on a construction project who, together with other employers, is engaged in work on the site of the project, will not be treated as a secondary boycott.

As the act is now written, employees who are engaged in an economic strike are prohibited from voting in representation elections. In order to make it impossible for an employer to use this provision to destroy a union of his employees, I recommend that, in the event of an economic strike, the National Labor Relations Board be prohibited from considering a petition on the part of the employer which challenges the representation rights of the striking union. I further recommend that for a period of 4 months after the commencement of the strike, the Board be prohibited from considering a petition on the part of any other union which claims to represent the employees. The prohibition against considering a petition by the employer should continue as long as the strike continues, provided, however, that a reasonable limit of time, which I suggest be 1 year, be stipulated.

The act has been interpreted to mean that even though a collective bargaining contract is in force, either party may insist that the contract be reopened for the purpose of bargaining about matters that were not the subject of negotiations when the contract was made. Thus stabilization of the relationship between the parties for the period of the contract can be completely frustrated. I recommend that the law be amended so as to protect both parties to a valid collective bargaining agreement from being required to negotiate during its term unless the contract so authorizes or both parties mutually consent.

The national emergency provisions of the act are essential to the protection of the national health and safety. As the act is now written, the board of inquiry established to inquire into the facts of the dispute causing the emergency must report the facts to the President without recommendations. In order that the President may have the authority to require the board's recommendations, I recommend that after he has received and made available to the public the last report of the board of inquiry—if the dispute has not then been settled—he be empowered to reconvene the board and direct it to make recommendations to him for settlement of the dispute. Although the recommendations of the board would not be binding upon the parties, yet there is real value in obtaining the recommendations of informed and impartial men for the settlement of a dispute which imperils the national health and safety.

Employees engaged in the construction, amusement, and maritime industries have unique problems because their employment is usually casual, temporary, or intermittent. I recommend that in these industries the employer be permitted to enter into a prehire contract with a union under which the union will be treated initially as the employees' representative for collective bargaining. I also recommend that in these industries the employer and the union be permitted to make a union-shop contract under which an employee, within 7 days after the beginning of his employment, shall become a member of the union.

Under the act as presently written, both unions and employers are made responsible for the actions of their agents. In order to make it clear that a union cannot be held responsible for an act of an individual member solely because of his membership in the union, I recommend that the act be amended to make the traditional common-law rules of agency applicable.

The act presently provides that the facilities of the National Labor Relations Board are available only to those unions whose officials execute affidavits disclaiming membership in Communist organizations. The Communist disclaimer provisions are not presently applicable to employers. I recommend that they be made applicable. Specific proposals for legislation dealing with Communist infiltration generally are now under study. If such legislation is enacted, making the Communist disclaimer provisions of the act unnecessary, I then will recommend that they be entirely eliminated.

The right of free speech is fundamental. Congress should make clear that the right of free speech, as now defined in the act, applies equally to labor and management in every aspect of their relationship.

The act presently prohibits an employer from making payments to a union to assist in the financing of union welfare funds unless the fund meets certain standards. These standards are not adequate to protect and conserve these funds that are held in trust for the welfare of individual union members. It is my recommendation that Congress initiate a thorough study of welfare and pension funds covered by collective-bargaining agreements, with a view of enacting such legislation as will protect and conserve these funds for the millions of working men and women who are the beneficiaries.

The act should make clear that the several States and Territories, when confronted with emergencies endangering the health or safety of their citizens, are not, through any conflict with the Federal law, actual or implied, deprived of the right to deal with such emergencies. The need for clarification of jurisdiction between the Federal and the State and Territorial governments in the labor-management field has lately been emphasized by the broad implications of the most recent decision of the Supreme Court dealing with this subject. The department and agency heads concerned are, at my request, presently examining the various areas in which conflicts of jurisdiction occur. When such examination is completed, I shall make my recommendations to the Congress for corrective legislation.

In the employer-employee relationship there is nothing which so vitally affects the individual employee as the

loss of his pay when he is called on strike. In such an important decision he should have an opportunity to express his free choice by secret ballot held under Government auspices.

There are two other changes in the law that I recommend. The authorization which an individual employee gives to his employer for the checkoff of the employee's union dues should be made valid until the termination of the collective bargaining contract which provides for such checkoff, unless the employee sooner revokes such authorization. The provisions of the act which require reports from unions concerning their organizations and finances should be simplified so as to eliminate duplication in the information required by such reports.

I hope that the foregoing changes will be enacted by Congress promptly, for they will more firmly establish the basic principles of the law. The appropriate committees of the Congress will, I am certain, wish to keep the law under continuous study and in the light of experience under it propose further amendments to implement its objectives and constantly improve its administration.

Government should continue to search diligently for sound measures to improve the lot of the working man and woman. mindful that conditions and standards of employment change as the products, habits, and needs of men and women change. It will be continually a challenge to Government to sense the aspirations of the working people of our country, that all may have the opportunity to fairly share in the results of the productive genius of our time, from which comes the material blessings of the present and a greater promise for the future.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 11, 1954.*

AGRICULTURE—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 292)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I submit herewith for the consideration of the Congress a number of recommendations affecting the Nation's agriculture.

PART I

The agricultural problem today is as serious and complex as any with which the Congress will deal in this session. Immediate action is needed to arrest the growing threat to our present agricultural program and to prevent the subsequent economic distress that could follow in our farming areas.

I have given assurances to the American farmer that support of existing agricultural laws, including continuance through 1954 of price supports on basic commodities at 90 percent of parity, was a moral and legal commitment that must be upheld. Along with the fulfillment of this commitment, an unending effort has proceeded in the past 12 months to provide the American farmer his full share of the income produced by a stable, prosperous country. This effort requires for success a new farm program adjusted to existing conditions in the Nation's agriculture.

This message presents to the Congress that new program. It is designed to achieve the stability and growth in income over the years to which our farmers are entitled and which the Nation must assure in the interest of all 160 million of our people.

STUDIES OF THE PROBLEM

In constructing its program, this administration resolved to get the benefit of the best thinking of the Nation's farmers, as well as that of its farm experts. Over 60 different survey groups, and more than 500 of the most eminent farm leaders in the country, have participated in these studies. Agricultural colleges and research institutions contributed their work and thought. Scores of producer, processor, and trade groups, as well as national farm organizations, gave their findings and proposals. Mail from thousands of individual farmers, and opinion polls among farmers, have been analyzed and weighed. The bipartisan, broadly representative National Agricultural Advisory Commission has steadily worked and consulted on the problem for the past 12 months. Numerous commodity organizations have been consulted. Many Members of the Congress have shared their own rich experience in this effort. Accordingly, as promised a year ago, the most thorough and comprehensive study ever made of the farm problem and of governmental farm programs has been completed.

RECOMMENDATIONS BY COMMODITY

The recommendations which have been reaped from all this inquiry are in the best traditions of bipartisan approach to the Nation's agricultural legislation. They recognize that each farm crop has its own problems and that these problems require specific treatment. Accordingly part II of this message presents detailed proposals for the treatment of 16 commodities or commodity groups. I here confine myself to those aspects of the farm program in which all farmers and all citizens are equally concerned.

SOME FUNDAMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS

In its approach to this problem, the administration has held to the following fundamentals:

First. A stable, prosperous and free agriculture is essential to the welfare of the United States.

Second. A farm program must fairly represent the interests of both producers and consumers.

Third. However large surpluses may be, food once produced must not be destroyed. Excessive stocks can be removed from commercial channels for constructive purposes that will benefit the people of the United States and our friends abroad.

Fourth. For many reasons farm products are subject to wider price fluctuations than are most other commodities. Moreover, the individual farmer or rancher has less control over the prices he receives than do producers in most other industries. Government price supports must, therefore, be provided in order to bring needed stability to farm income and farm production.

Fifth. A farm program first of all should assist agriculture to earn its proportionate share of the national income. It must likewise aim at stability in farm income. There should therefore be no wide year-to-year fluctuation in the level of price support.

Sixth. No single program can apply uniformly to the whole farm industry. Some farm products are perishable, some are not; some farms consume the products of other farms; some foods and fibers we export, some we import. A comprehensive farm program must be adaptable to these and other differences, and yet not penalize one group of farmers in order to benefit another.

Seventh. A workable farm program must give the administration sufficient leeway to make timely changes in policies and methods, including price-support levels, within limits established by law. This will enable the administration to foresee and forestall new difficulties in our agriculture, rather than to attempt their legislative cure after they have arisen.

Eighth. Adjustment to a new farm program must be accomplished gradually in the interest of the Nation's farming population and in the interest of the economy of the Nation as a whole.

Ninth. Research and education, basic functions of the Department of Agriculture since its beginning, are still indispensable if our farmers are to improve their productivity and enlarge their markets.

Tenth. The soil, water, range, and forest resources of the United States are the natural foundation of our national economy. From them come our food, most of our clothing, much of our shelter. How well we protect and improve these resources will have a direct bearing on the future standard of living of the whole Nation.

THE PRESENT AGRICULTURAL SITUATION

Present laws discourage increased consumption of wheat, corn, cotton, and vegetable oils and encourage their excessive production. The huge and growing surpluses held by the Government act as a constant threat to normal markets for these products. Thus, present law produces results which in turn are hurtful to those whom the laws are intended to help. Partly because of these excessive stocks, farm income has fallen steadily over the past 3 years.

The urgency in this situation may be illustrated by a few basic facts. During the past year, the investment of the Commodity Credit Corporation in farm commodities more than doubled, increasing by about $2,500,000,000. As a result, the financial obligations of the Corporation are pressing hard against the $6,750,000,000 limitation on its bor-

rowing authority. In order to assure that present price-support commitments on 1953 and 1954 crops will be covered, I shall request the Congress to take early action to restore the Corporation's capital losses as of June 30, 1953, and to increase its borrowing authority to $8,500,000,000, effective July 1, 1954.

The Government's commodity holdings are enormous. It has investments in more than $2 billion worth of wheat alone. This includes 440 million bushels owned outright. About 400 million additional bushels are under loan, the greater share of which the Government can expect to acquire. This is more than the domestic wheat requirements of the entire Nation for a full year.

The cotton carryover will amount to about 9,600,000 bales. Here again the carryover is approximately equal to the domestic needs of the entire Nation for a full year.

The carryover of vegetable oils may be about 1,500,000,000 pounds, roughly double the carryover that should normally be maintained.

Because such tremendous supplies are already in hand, acreage allotments and marketing quotas have had to be applied to wheat and cotton. An appeal by the Government for sharp acreage reductions for corn appears unavoidable. These allotments are expected to reduce the acreage planted to these crops in 1954 by the following amounts: Wheat, 16.5 million acres; corn, between five and six million acres; cotton, 3.5 million acres. Without the most careful handling, a diversion within a single year of 25 million acres of productive cropland—about 8 percent of the total—from their accustomed use could have the most unfortunate impact on the total economy.

Even these reductions probably will not appreciably lower the surpluses of wheat and cotton because of the likelihood of increased yields that will be sought from the reduced acreage, and because markets will continue to shrink as a consequence of rigid price supports. As for corn, it is estimated that enough diverted land will be used for oats, barley, and sorghums to hold total supplies of feed grains at present levels, thus largely offsetting the purpose of the corn acreage reduction. It is also expected that some 3 million diverted acres may be planted to soybeans, thus aggravating the tremendous oversupply of vegetable oils. The likely production from other diverted acres threatens producers of potatoes, sugar beets, rice, alfalfa, flaxseed, vegetables, and many other crops. Therefore, we must move without further delay to treat the fundamental causes of our present excess supplies of farm commodities.

The Nation's agricultural problem is not one of general overproduction: Consumer demand continues at or near record high levels; the average prices of farm products that lack direct price supports have been as high in recent years as those of price-supported products. The problem is rather one of unbalanced farm production, resulting in specific surpluses which are unavoidable under the present rigid price supports. The problem is complicated by the continuing loss of some of those foreign markets on which American agriculture has depended for a large part of its prosperity.

MAJOR FEATURES OF FARM PROGRAM

The new farm program here proposed is consistent with all the foregoing conditions and fundamental considerations. It has five major features:

First. The new program should first be given an opportunity to start operating without the handicap of such large accumulated surpluses. This is to be done by setting aside certain quantities of our surplus commodities, eliminating them from price-support computations.

Second. The 1948 and 1949 Agricultural Acts were soundly conceived and received bipartisan support. The principles on which they were based are particularly applicable to the agricultural industry today. Although based generally upon those principles, the proposed agricultural legislation of 1954 contains certain new features, improvements and modifications.

Third. The amendment to the 1949 Agricultural Act providing for mandatory rigid supports, attuned to war needs and demonstrably unworkable in peacetime, will be permitted to expire. After the 1954 crops the level of price supports for the basic commodities will be gradually related to supply, promising farmers greater stability of income.

Fourth. Modernized parity is to become effective for all commodities on January 1, 1956, as scheduled by law. Provision should be made for moving from the old to modernized parity in steps of five percentage points of the old parity per year until the change from old to modernized parity has been accomplished.

Fifth. The key element of the new program is a gradual adjustment to new circumstances and conditions. Application of modernized parity and the relation of basic crops to supply levels require a transition period to assure a stable farm economy. This transition should be accomplished in a prudent and careful manner to avoid sharp adjustments which would threaten the dislocation of the program.

Sixth. In keeping with the policy of gradual transition, the Secretary of Agriculture will use his authority under the Agricultural Act of 1949 to insure that year-to-year variations in price-support levels will be limited.

Seventh. The authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to apply price supports at more than 90 percent of parity when the national welfare or national security requires should be continued.

PARITY AND PRICE SUPPORTS

Under the provisions of the Agricultural Acts of 1948 and 1949 the Government will—

First. Support the prices of basic crops of those farmers who cooperate with acreage allotments and marketing quotas when such are in effect;

Second. Announce the price-support level for various crops before those crops are planted, insofar as practicable;

Third. Support price levels at up to 90 percent of parity. For some products a schedule of price floors will also be provided as authorized by the 1949 act, ranging from 75 to 90 percent of parity, according to the relationship of total to normal supply; and

Fourth. Vary the price-support level one percentage point for every two percentage points of variation in the total supply. If the supply is short, higher support levels will encourage production. If the supply is overabundant, a lowered price will stimulate consumption. Thus, not only will a floor be placed under all basic crop prices, but variations in price and supply will tend to offset each other, and thus stabilize the income of the farmer.

MODERNIZED PARITY

Parity calculations for most commodities under the old formula are based upon price relationships and buying habits of 40 years ago. Because methods of farm production have changed markedly, the Congress has wisely brought the parity concept up to date. Modernized parity takes account of price relationships during the most recent 10 years. It permits changes in farm technology and in consumer demand to express themselves in the level of price support and restores proper relationships among commodities.

For the basic commodities, the law provides that until January 1, 1956, the old or modernized parity, whichever is higher, shall be used. For all commodities except wheat, corn, cotton, and peanuts, modernized parity is already in use.

Equitable treatment of the various commodities requires that we should use modernized parity for all farm products as now provided by law, beginning January 1, 1956.

INSULATION OF SURPLUSES FROM MARKETS

Removal of the threat of huge surpluses of farm commodities from current markets is an essential part of the program here presented. Destruction of surplus commodities cannot be countenanced under any circumstances. They can be insulated from the commercial markets and used in constructive ways. Such uses will include school-lunch programs, disaster relief, aid to the people of other countries, and stockpiled reserves at home for use in war or national emergency.

I recommend that authority be provided to set aside reserves up to the value of $2,500,000,000 from the stocks presently held by the Commodity Credit Corporation. Broad discretionary authority should be provided to manage these frozen reserves. This authority should be coupled with legislative safeguards to prevent the return of these stocks to domestic or foreign markets so as to cause disturbance in normal trade. Perishable stocks should, of course, be rotated. Stocks of wheat, cotton, vegetable oils, and possibly some dairy products should be set aside after this program takes effect.

The special circumstances relating to the crop and the date of initiating the

proposed new program should govern the time for establishing each such commodity reserve. This reserve program will be effective only if it is carefully integrated with the new program as a whole. The insulation of our excess reserves of food and fiber is an essential first step in launching this new program.

EXPANSION OF FARM MARKETS ABROAD

One of our largest potential outlets for present surpluses is in friendly countries. Much impetus can be given to the use of a substantial volume of these commodities by substituting to the maximum extent food and fiber surpluses in foreign economic assistance and disaster relief. I shall request a continuation of the authority to use agricultural surpluses for this purpose.

It is not enough, however, to rely solely on these measures to move surpluses into consumption. No farm program should overlook continued economic growth and expansion. By revolutionary increases in farm productivity during and since World War II, American farmers have prepared our Nation to supply an ever-greater proportion of the food needs of the world. Developing commercial markets for this expanded production is part of the larger problem of organizing a freer system of trade and payments throughout the free world. Because our farmers depend to a considerable degree on foreign markets, their interests will be particularly served by strengthening of the work of the Department of Agriculture in developing market outlets, both at home and abroad. In my budget message I shall recommend that sufficient funds be appropriated for this purpose.

Meanwhile, a series of trade missions, working in cooperation with our representation overseas, will be sent from the United States, 1 to Europe, 1 to Asia, 1 to South America, to explore the immediate possibilities of expanding international trade in food and fiber. Moreover, the Secretary of Agriculture, in cooperation with the Secretary of State, is organizing discussions for the exchange of views with foreign ministers of agriculture on subjects affecting the use of agricultural surpluses and stockpiles.

USE OF DIVERTED ACRES

In addition to the removal of surpluses and the expansion of markets, special measures must be taken to deal with the use of acreages diverted from crops under allotment. To avoid these difficulties, the number of diverted acres must be reduced to a minimum. The proposed program accomplishes this by increasing the utilization of commodities, thereby reducing the need for acreage restrictions.

When land must be diverted from production, it is essential that its use be related to the basic objectives of soil conservation—to protect and to improve that land. Wherever acreage adjustments are especially difficult, agricultural conservation program funds will be used to help farmers make these adjustments in a manner that will advance soil conservation and long-term efficiency.

SMALL FARMS

The chief beneficiaries of our price-support policies have been the 2,000,000 larger, highly mechanized farming units which produce about 85 percent of our agricultural output. The individual production of the remaining farms, numbering about 3,500,000, is so small that the farmer derives little benefit from price supports. During 1954 the Secretary of Agriculture, in cooperation with the National Agricultural Advisory Commission, will give further special attention to the problems peculiar to small farmers.

CONCLUSION

The agricultural program proposed in this section, and in part II which follows, will open new market outlets both at home and abroad, not only for current supplies but for future production. It will provide a firm floor on which our farmers can rely while making long-term plans for efficient production and marketing. Year in and year out, it will provide the best prospects for the stability and growth of farm income.

It will help the farmer attain full parity in the market. It will avoid creating burdensome surpluses. It will curtail the regimentation of production planning, lessen the problem of diverted acreage, and yield farmers greater freedom of choice and action.

It will bring farm production into closer balance with consumer needs. It will promote agricultural interests, along with the public interest generally. It will avoid any sharp year-to-year change in prices and incomes.

The program will again stimulate and encourage good farm management. It will prevent arbitrary Government control and afford the greatest freedom to the individual farmer. It will provide added incentive to make wise use of all our agricultural resources, and promises the Nation's agriculture a more stable and reliable financial return than any alternative plan.

I urge its early approval by the Congress.

PART II

In this part of the special message the principles developed in part I are applied to specific commodities and commodity groups.

WHEAT

Wheat is a prime example of the results that ensue from a support program which fails to adjust to the level of demand. As of December 16, more than $2 billion of Commodity Credit Corporation funds were invested in wheat.

The export market, historically vital to our wheat farmers, was itself partly responsible for the expanded production of American wheat during the war and postwar years. To meet the food needs of devastated countries, our farmers continued their high level of production after the war and thus rendered a great service to humanity and to the cause of freedom throughout the world. These expanded outlets have since greatly diminished. Yet the support price has remained at the level associated with wartime needs. The result is that production has continued at wartime levels and, annually, more and more of this production has become surplus.

In foreign markets, the high rigid support program of the United States has become an umbrella for competitors. This has created an artificial competitive situation which has cost the American farmer a substantial part of his world wheat market. During the past 2 years our exports of wheat outside the International Wheat Agreement have fallen from 220 million bushels to 64 million, while Canada's free market sales have risen from one hundred and five to one hundred and sixty-one million bushels. Thus our price policy shrinks the very market that could otherwise help absorb our excess stocks of wheat.

Continuance of present price support levels for wheat would confront us with two undesirable alternatives:

First. Curtail production to the amount needed for domestic use and very limited exports. This would require a reduction in wheat acreage of about 40 percent—from the 79 million acres planted in 1953 to between forty-five and fifty million acres.

Second. Subsidize the consumption of wheat by increasingly severe burdens upon the taxpayer.

The foregoing alternatives make it increasingly clear that the Nation must depart from the high rigid support level for wheat.

It is, therefore, recommended that:

First. A substantial part of the present excessive wheat carryover be set aside as an emergency reserve and removed from the market.

Second. After the 1954 crop, the level of price support for wheat be related to supply. Because of the substantial set-aside, computations of the support level under the Agricultural Act of 1949 would insure that changes in support levels would be gradual. The Secretary of Agriculture will use his authority under the Agricultural Act of 1949 to insure that year-to-year variations in price support levels will be limited.

Third. Beginning January 1, 1956, a change be made at the rate of 5 percent a year from old to modernized parity;

Fourth. Acreage allotments and marketing quotas be continued, with the anticipation, however, that adjusted support levels will increase the incentive to employ some of the present wheatland for other purposes.

RICE

Price supports for rice at 90 percent of parity have had no recent application. Market prices have been at or above support levels; restraints on production have not been needed; stocks have not accumulated. Nevertheless, present price supports for rice can inhibit an adjustment, if one should be needed, in the same manner that they prevented the adjustment for wheat, when it was needed.

It is therefore recommended that mandatory price supports at 90 percent of parity for rice be allowed to expire after the 1954 crop.

CORN

Corn is a dominant factor in the feed grain-livestock economy. This economy is based on an interdependent process involving the production of feed, its conversion into livestock products, and its movement into consumption as meat, dairy products, and eggs. To hold this economy in balance, prices are a critical factor, encouraging and discouraging livestock production by turns, rationing feed when it is scarce and moving it into use when it is plentiful. For the efficient use of corn, some price freedom is indispensable.

A program of high rigid price supports for feed grains involves the danger of curtailing our livestock industries and limiting the quantity of their products to consumers. We have made great strides in improving the efficiency of corn production and in passing some of those gains on to consumers in the form of reasonably priced livestock products. Our corn support program should be designed to encourage those trends.

Corn is used in the same manner as pasture and hay on farms where grown. Seldom does more than 25 percent of our corn crop move through commercial channels, and the bulk of this is eventually used as feed by other farmers. Farmers, therefore, are the principal users of corn. It follows that a high support price for farmers who produce corn for sale aggravates the cost-price squeeze on other farmers who normally buy corn and competing feeds to produce livestock products.

To guide the corn price support program, the adjustable price and income-balancing features of the Agricultural Act of 1949 on the whole are well suited. The level of support specified is designed to move corn into use. Livestock producers are assured of a steady supply of feed at reasonable prices.

The old parity formula holds the support price for corn too high in relation to livestock prices. Use of modernized parity, scheduled by law to become effective on January 1, 1956, will help to balance these vital price relationships.

It is, therefore, recommended that—

First. Modernized parity for corn become effective on January 1, 1956, with modification limiting the rate of the transition to 5 percent in any single year;

Second. Except as provided in third and fourth, the provisions of the Agricultural Act of 1949 become effective for the corn crop of 1955 and subsequent crops;

Third. The act of 1949 be amended to provide a change, within the range of 75 to 90 percent of parity, of 1 percentage point in the support price for corn for each 1 percentage point of change in supply, thereby giving greater flexibility to corn support prices and tending to prevent the building up of excessive holdings by Government;

Fourth. Legislation be enacted to raise the normal carryover allowance for corn from 10 percent to 15 percent of domestic use plus exports, to become effective for 1955 and subsequent crops. This would help to assure more stable feed supplies and reduce the impact of current carryover stocks on future production controls and support levels;

Fifth. Upon adoption of the foregoing recommendation, the system of marketing quotas be abolished.

FEED GRAINS OTHER THAN CORN

The Agricultural Act of 1949 authorizes price support for such nonbasic crops as oats, barley, and grain sorghums at not to exceed 90 percent of the parity price. The amounts, terms, and conditions of price support operations and the extent to which these operations are carried out are determined or approved by the Secretary of Agriculture upon consideration of various factors specified in the law.

Inasmuch as this program has worked satisfactorily, it is recommended that these provisions be continued.

MEAT ANIMALS

The fact that mandatory price supports are ill adapted to meat animals has been recognized by Secretaries of Agriculture for years. The present law provides tools well adapted to deal with the problems peculiar to the livestock industry.

It is recommended, therefore, that the existing conditions with respect to meat animals be continued.

DAIRY PRODUCTS

The Agricultural Act of 1949 requires price support for dairy products at such levels between 75 and 90 percent of parity as are necessary to assure an adequate supply. Sufficient discretionary authority is provided to operate a satisfactory program.

It is recommended that these provisions of law be continued.

POULTRY AND EGGS

Price supports have not been generally desired by the poultry industry. Temporarily, and in special circumstances, price support can, however, be helpful.

It is recommended, therefore, that—

First. Provisions of the 1949 act be continued for poultry and eggs, with discretionary authority for the Secretary of Agriculture to support prices at not to exceed 90 percent of parity;

Second. Discretionary authority be continued to purchase poultry products for use in the school-lunch program in nonprofit institutions, and for certain other purposes.

COTTON

Cotton, like wheat, is an export crop whose price is currently supported above the world level. Carryover stocks in the United States have been accumulating rapidly in the past 2 years. These stocks, probably close to 9,600,000 bales by next August, will approximate a full year's domestic requirements.

Our high rigid price support program stimulates competition of foreign producers and reduces exports. During the twenties and early thirties our net exports of cotton generally exceeded domestic consumption. Current exports amount to hardly a third of our larger domestic requirements.

Our problem is to develop a program which will help growers adjust gradually to changing circumstances, including foreign and domestic competition of rising intensity.

The Agricultural Act of 1949 provides price supports for cotton at a level between 75 and 90 percent of parity, dependent on the supply. Thus changes in supply and price would tend to offset one another, giving a relatively stable income. This plan will allow limited price variation, thus affording growers reasonable market stability and yet offering added inducement for heavier use of cotton in years of abundant supplies.

Separate legislation has made the adjustable pricing provisions of the 1949 act ineffective for cotton. The Secretary of Agriculture is now required by law to set such marketing quotas and allotments that the required price-support level can seldom if ever fall below 90 percent of parity. Instead of relying in part on the schedule of price floors intended in the act of 1949, the law requires reliance almost entirely on production controls.

It is recommended, therefore, that—

First. A substantial part of the present large carryover of cotton now in prospect be set aside as an emergency reserve and removed from the market.

Second. After the 1954 crop, the level of price support for cotton be related to supply. Because of the substantial set-aside, computations of the support levels, under the Agricultural Act of 1949, would insure that changes in support levels would be gradual. The Secretary of Agriculture will use his authority under the Agricultural Act of 1949 to insure that year-to-year variations in price-support levels will be limited.

Third. Modernized parity becomes effective for cotton as scheduled on January 1, 1956.

Fourth. The Congress repeal the present provisions whereby the maximum use of production restrictions before there can be any reduction of the price-support level is required.

TOBACCO

Tobacco farmers have demonstrated their ability to hold production in line with demand at the supported price without loss to the Government. The relatively small acreage of tobacco and the limited areas to which it is adapted have made production control easier than for other crops.

The level of support to cooperators is 90 percent of the parity price in any year in which marketing quotas are in effect.

It is recommended that the tobacco program be continued in its present form.

PEANUTS

The law requires that mandatory 90 percent supports for peanuts continue through 1954 and that old parity remain in effect until the end of 1955.

This program, which has experienced some difficulties in adjusting supplies to demand at the supported price can operate successfully with certain changes.

It is recommended that—

First. The Agricultural Act of 1949 become effective for peanuts on January 1, 1955.

Second. The shift to modernized parity for peanuts begins as now provided by law on January 1, 1956.

Third. A transitional provision be provided to limit the change from the old to modernized parity to not more than 5 percent per year.

TUNG NUTS AND HONEY

Tung nuts and honey should be in the same category with other products for which price supports are permissive rather than required. It is recommended, therefore, that the mandatory price supports for these commodities be discontinued.

OIL SEEDS

Price support is authorized for soybeans, cottonseed, and flax at not to exceed 90 percent of the parity price. It is recommended that the provisions of the Agricultural Act of 1949 be continued for these commodities.

FRUITS AND VEGETABLES

Existing law authorizes the use of 30 percent of general tariff revenues to encourage the exportation and domestic consumption of agriculture commodities. In the event of market distress these funds may be used for limited purchases of market surpluses of such perishable commodities as fruits and vegetables. No purchases may be undertaken unless outlets are available.

It is recommended that—

First. Present provisions for the use of funds from tariff revenues be continued.

Second. Authorization for the use of marketing agreements be continued and liberalized to—

(a) provide for inclusion of additional commodities to which marketing agreements are adapted;

(b) enlarge and clarify the authorization for agencies established under marketing orders to engage in or finance, within reasonable limits, research work from funds collected pursuant to the marketing order;

(c) provide for the continuous operation of marketing agreements, despite short-term price variations, where necessary to assure orderly distribution throughout the marketing season; and

(d) enlarge and clarify the authorization for the use of marketing orders to promote marketing efficiency, including the regulation of containers and types of pack for fresh fruits and vegetables.

POTATOES

It is recommended that legislation be enacted to allow assistance to potato growers in the same manner as is available for producers of other vegetables and of fruits.

SUGAR

The sugar program, extended in 1951, is operating in a generally satisfactory manner. It is recommended that this program be continued in its present form.

WOOL

Price support for wool above the market level has resulted in heavy accumulations of wool—now nearly 100 million pounds—by the Commodity Credit Corporation and the substitution of imported for domestic wool in our home consumption. Two-thirds of the wool used in the United States is imported; yet our own wool piles up in storage.

A program is needed which will assure equitable returns to growers and encourage efficient production and marketing. It should require a minimum of governmental interference with both producers and processors, entail a minimum of cost to taxpayers and consumers, and aline itself compatibly with overall farm and international trade policies.

It is recommended that—

First. Prices of domestically produced wool be permitted to seek their level in the market, competing with other fibers and with imported wool, thus resulting in only one price for wool—the market price.

Second. Direct payments be made to domestic producers sufficient, when added to the average market price for the season, to raise the average return per pound to 90 percent of parity.

Third. Each producer receive the same support payment per pound of wool, rather than a variable rate depending upon the market price he had obtained. If each grower is allowed his rewards from the market, efficient production and marketing will be encouraged. This has the further advantage of avoiding the need for governmental loans, purchases, storage, or other regulation or interference with the market. Further, it imposes no need for periodic action to control imports in order to protect the domestic price-support program.

Fourth. Funds to meet wool payments be taken from general revenues within the amount of unobligated tariff receipts from wool.

Fifth. Similar methods of support be adopted for pulled wool and for mohair, with proper regard for the relationships of their prices to those of similar commodities.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 11, 1954.*

EXPERT TRANSCRIBERS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 401) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House, until otherwise provided by law, compensation for the employment of two additional expert transcribers, office of the official committee reporters, House of Representatives, to be appointed in the same manner, and to receive the same rate of compensation, as the other expert transcribers.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL THURSDAY NEXT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at noon on Thursday next.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will there be any special orders today?

The SPEAKER. There will be special orders.

Mr. HALLECK. I think one special order has already been granted.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Will there be opportunity for others to be granted?

The SPEAKER. Yes.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

SERGEANT AT ARMS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Republican conference of the House and by direction of that conference, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 402).

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That William R. Bonsell, of the State of Pennsylvania, be, and he is hereby, chosen Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives.

The resolution was agreed to and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. Bonsell appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

AMENDMENT TO IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to amend section 349 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act relating to the loss of nationality by native-born or naturalized citizens.

The purpose of the amendment is to forfeit the citizenship of those who are convicted of advocating or conspiring to overthrow the Government of the United States by the use of force or violence. This proposed legislation was recommended by President Eisenhower in his state of the Union message delivered to the joint session of Congress on last Thursday.

I trust the Committee on the Judiciary of the House, of which I am a member, will proceed expeditiously to consider this bill and that it will shortly be enacted by the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, too long traitors to this country have taken advantage of the many wonderful benefits provided citizens of the United States at the same time they are plotting to destroy the country.

FINANCIAL STATEMENT ON INVESTIGATING AND SELECT COMMITTEES, 83D CONGRESS

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a table.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I have had compiled and arranged in tabular form a statement showing the amount

of money authorized for expenditures by each of the several special and standing committees of the House, and also showing the amount that has actually been expended, and the balance that remains unexpended for the first year of the 83d Congress, the figures being brought up to January 1, 1954. The totals show that there was authorized out of the contingent fund of the House the sum of $1,879,550, of which slightly more than $1 million has been expended. There remains unexpended as of January 1, $871,742.69. This even includes some joint committees where the House participated on an equal basis with the other body. All committees are included in this compilation except, of course, the Committee on Appropriations, which handles its own funds.

Inasmuch as some obligations were contracted by committee chairmen and bills or statements had not been received by December 31, there may be a few additions, but the figures are substantially correct.

The Committee on House Administration checks and audits the expense accounts of all committees of the House.

The table referred to is as follows:

Investigating and select committees, 83d Cong., Jan. 3, 1953, to Dec. 31, 1953

Committees	Amount authorized	Amount expended to Dec. 31, 1953	Balance available, Jan. 1, 1954
Agriculture Committee (general) (Congressman Hope, Kansas, chairman) H. Res. 161, Apr. 15, 1953	$50,000	$29,458.51	$20,541.49
Armed Services Committee (general) (Congressman Short, Missouri, chairman) H. Res. 125, Feb. 24, 1953; H. Res. 156, Mar. 5, 1953	150,000	53,534.82	96,465.18
Baltic States (Nations) Investigations (Congressman Kersten, Wisconsin, chairman) H. Res. 346, July 27, 1953; H. Res. 356, approved July 31, 1953	30,000	14,909.68	15,090.32
Congressional salaries, Members of Congress, etc., Commission on Judicial and Congressional Salaries, Public Law 220, approved Aug. 7, 1953 (House share)	10,000		10,000.00
Defense Production (Joint Committee) (Senator Capehart, Indiana, chairman) Public Law 95, June 30, 1953—fiscal year 1954	50,000	19,939.67	30,060.33
District of Columbia Committee (Congressman Simpson, Illinois, chairman) H. Res. 270, June 11, 1953	2,000	56.22	1,943.78
Education and Labor Committee (Congressman McConnell, Jr., Pennsylvania, chairman) (general) H. Res. 115, Feb. 24, 1953; H. Res. 116, Mar. 5, 1953	50,000	12,697.10	37,302.90
Foreign Affairs Committee (general) (Congressman Chiperfield, Illinois, chairman), H. Res. 113, Feb. 24, 1953; H. Res. 145, Mar. 5, 1953	75,000	15,118.39	59,881.61
Foundations (tax exempt) (Congressman Reece, Tennessee, chairman), H. Res. 217, July 27, 1953; H. Res. 373, approved Aug. 1, 1953	50,000	24,141.07	25,858.93
Government Operations Committee, clause 8 of rule 11; H. Res. 150, Feb. 25, 1953, and H. Res. 339, July 29, 1953:			
(A) Full and Special Subcommittee (Congressman Hoffman, Michigan, chairman)	100,000	48,860.73	51,139.27
(B) International Operations Subcommittee (Congressman Brownson, Indiana, chairman)	66,000	46,223.22	19,776.78
(C) Military Operations Subcommittee (Congressman Riehlman, New York, chairman)	64,425	48,040.00	16,385.00
(D) Public Accounts Subcommittee (Congressman Bender, Ohio, chairman)	65,000	37,818.18	27,181.82
(E) Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee (Congresswoman Harden, Indiana, chairman)	59,625	20,888.39	38,736.61
Immigration and Nationality (Joint Committee) (Senator Watkins, Utah, chairman) (Congressman Graham, Pennsylvania, vice chairman), legislative appropriation, 1954	20,000		20,000.00
Interior and Insular Affairs Committee (general) (Congressman Miller, Nebraska, chairman), H. Res. 109, Mar. 5, 1953; H. Res. 117, Mar. 16, 1953	50,000	7,597.08	42,402.92
Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee (general) (Congressman Wolverton, chairman) also (Newsprint), H. Res. 126, Mar. 5, 1953; H. Res. 127, Mar. 5, 1953; H. Res. 128, Mar. 16, 1953	60,000	6,055.47	53,944.53
Judiciary Committee (general) (Congressman Reed, Illinois, chairman) H. Res. 50, Feb. 24, 1953; H. Res. 66, Mar. 5, 1953	110,000	82,627.48	27,372.52
Judiciary Committee (Congressman Reed, Illinois, chairman) privileges of the House in re *Michael Wilson et al.* v. *Loew's, Inc.*, H. Res. 190, Mar. 26, 1953	(1)		(1)
Kitty Hawk, N. C. (air flight) (Congressman Hinshaw, California, chairman), S. J. Res. 42, Public Law 32, May 22, 1953	(1)	377.13	(1)
Merchant Marine and Fisheries (general) (Congressman Weichel, Ohio, chairman), H. Res. 197, Aug. 3, 1953; H. Res. 198, Approved Aug. 3, 1953	50,000	18.45	49,981.55
Post Office and Civil Service Commission (general) (Congressman Rees, Kansas, chairman) H. Res. 32, Feb. 24, 1953; H. Res. 148, Mar. 5, 1953	50,000	17,447.05	32,552.95
Public Works (general) (Congressman Dondero, Michigan, chairman) H. Res. 366 approved Aug. 1, 1953; H. Res. 365, Aug. 1, 1953	30,000	17,323.86	12,676.14
Rotunda Frieze—United States Capitol (ceremonies—Joint Committee on the Library) S. Con. Res. 45 adopted July 31, 1953 (House share)	2,500		2,500.00
Small Business Committee (select committee) (Congressman Hill, Colorado, chairman) H. Res. 22, Feb. 3, 1953; H. Res. 131, Feb. 24, 1953	135,000	60,891.03	74,108.97
Un-American Activities Committee (general) (Congressman Velde, Illinois, chairman) sec. 17 of House Rule 11 (H. Res. 5) H. Res. 119, Feb. 24, 1953	300,000	267,932.76	32,067.24
Veterans' Affairs Committee (Congresswoman Rogers, Massachusetts, chairman) H. Res. 34, Mar 5, 1953; H. Res. 168, Mar. 16, 1953	50,000	10,547.27	39,452.73
Ways and Means Committee (general) (Congressman Reed, New York, chairman) H. Res. 91, Feb. 24, 1953; H. Res. 123, Mar. 5, 1953; H. Res. 243, May 27, 1953	200,000	165,680.88	34,319.12
Total	1,879,550	1,007,807.31	871,742.69

[1] Necessary expenses.

THANKS TO PRESIDENT EISENHOWER

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, as I entered the Capitol this morning I heard the new air-raid loudspeaker stating that this is a new warning to be used in case of an air raid. I could not help but have the deepest gratitude that we civilians do not wait in horror for an air-raid warning, and also, most of all, that our men in Korea are not being shot at all the time and being terribly mutilated. I have the deepest feeling of gratitude to our President, Dwight D. Eisenhower, for bringing about the cessation of fighting in Korea. He has kept his promise.

HIGHWAY PROGRAM IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, the President on Thursday, in his state of the Union message, recommended that Congress extend the Federal 2-cent-a-gallon gasoline tax beyond April 1 which is the date under existing law when the 2-cent rate is due to expire and the former rate of 1½ cents a gallon to be resumed.

In return for the continuation of the 2-cent gasoline tax, the President promised an expanded highway program. Most of the Nation's 53 million automobile and truck owners who pay this tax, I believe, will cheerfully accept the higher rate provided revenues from this Federal 2-cent gasoline tax are employed to provide this expanded highway program. The motor-vehicle owners, however, will have justifiable cause for complaint if the revenues of the higher gas tax rate are devoted to other than highway purposes.

The Federal Government, last year, collected almost $867 million from the existing Federal 2-cent-a-gallon gasoline tax. It provided to the States for the year starting next July 1 only $575 million for highway purposes. Thus, almost $300 million of the Federal gasoline taxes have been and are being diverted to purposes other than highway construction. This diversion, in my opinion, should be stopped and all Federal gasoline tax money go for road building.

I have introduced, today, a bill which would authorize an increase of 50 percent in the amount of money provided as Federal aid next year to the States for highway purposes. My arguments in favor of this increase will be found in a speech which I am inserting today in the RECORD.

I, also, am including with the speech a table showing the amount of Federal highway funds which have been allocated to each State for the year July 1, 1954, to June 30, 1955, and also the amount by which adoption of my bill will increase the allocation of each State.

FARM LEGISLATION

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. SCUDDER] may address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend his remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, the President is to be commended for recommending a program that appeals to all farm groups. The plan offers a way to dispose of present excess reserves and to prevent their accumulation in the future. At the same time, it meets the requirements of those Members of Congress who strongly favor high price supports.

Under the President's suggestions, there will be little change in the support level when the program is put into effect. This is because a sizable portion of our present reserves is to be frozen and removed from normal marketing channels. Also, contributing to an orderly transitional period is the limitation of a 5-percent drop in support prices in any one year on basic commodities.

What the farmer wants is an equitable price for his product. If natural economic forces are free to function, the farmer has a chance to obtain prices in excess of parity. If he sells to the Government under a rigid support plan as at present, the best he can possibly do is to receive 90 percent of parity.

All classes of Americans should recognize the wisdom of the President's suggestions. They represent a truly democratic answer to one of the Nation's knottiest problems.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. JONES of Missouri asked and was given permission to address the House today for 15 minutes, following any other special orders heretofore entered.

INCOME-TAX EXEMPTION FOR DEPENDENT UNDER AGE OF 21 YEARS

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill which provides that the head of a family may claim an exemption for a dependent who has not reached the age of 21 years, which dependent may earn an amount in excess of $600 or whatever the exemption allowance may be. Of course, any such dependent earning in excess of whatever the deductible amount may be, would be required to file an income-tax return. Many dependents are reluctant to earn in excess of $600 because the head of the family would be unable to claim the exemption, and if the dependent earned slightly in excess of the amount of the established exemption, the head of the family would be taxed in many instances, far in excess of the amount that the dependent earned in excess of the deductible allowance. Many heads of families of moderate means find it extremely difficult to rear and educate their children unless the children find employment to obtain funds to help defray their expenses in pursuit of their studies.

There are in my district, and in many other districts, large families of children, all under 21 years of age, where the head of the family is a person of modest means, and this bill would help these families to maintain a proper standard of living and at the same time enable the children of high school and college age to pursue their education.

I invite the study and support of all Members of Congress to this bill and I hope that this session of Congress will pass it.

BOONDOGGLING IN DEFENSE

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, with leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am glad to include with my full approval an editorial from the Wall Street Journal entitled "Boondoggle in Defense":

BOONDOGGLE IN DEFENSE

It is not hard to understand the administration's concern with unemployment, for the administration is concerned with the health of the Nation's economy. Thus President Eisenhower's order to divert some defense contracts to areas having jobless men will be viewed with some sympathy at first glance.

But a second look will show how glaringly wrong it is.

It is wrong because unemployment is one concern of the administration and defense is quite a different one. The tax dollars that the Congress appropriated for defense ought to go for defense, and the most defense that can be got from those dollars is the particular concern of the Defense Department. There is a catchy phrase around Washington to describe what the Defense Department is trying to do in this regard. They call it "more bang for a buck."

But one doesn't get more bang for a buck by saddling the Defense Department with directives which say that certain areas with labor surpluses ought to get preference in contracts over areas which have no labor surplus. And the buck loses some of its bang when faster tax writeoffs are granted certain distressed areas for erection or improvement of plants which other areas are denied.

At best, such a plan is only a shot in the arm which may for a time seem to ease the pain of unemployment in a particular locality. But it will not cure it, and conceivably it may help to spread it. For there are only a certain number of dollars which can be spent through these defense contracts. To give preferential treatment to one section because it has less people at work than another place could result in unemployment in the locality which lost the contract. What does the Government do then? Designate another area as distressed, give it preferential treatment over other areas and thus create more economic distress? But that would be spoonfeeding everyone on a merry-go-round.

A case can be made for Government concern about its jobless citizens, especially where it affects the national economy. But no case can be made for preferential treatment in defense contracts because of local unemployment. It is an expedient which contains no permanent cure for the troubled areas but which does contain potential danger for the Nation. A little boondoggling with defense can lead to a lot of boondoggling and no defense at all.

Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill which would prevent this boondoggling and trust that it will receive prompt action by the Congress.

THE LATE HONORABLE FRED M. VINSON

Mr. WATTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. WATTS. Mr. Speaker, seldom has this body had the opportunity, even though occasioned by a sad and tragic incident, to pay homage to a more honorable man; a better public servant than our late Chief Justice Fred M. Vinson.

Fred Vinson was kind and helpful by nature; he loved mankind; nothing gave him greater pleasure than to be of service to people.

It is my good fortune that I am permitted to represent in Congress a number of the Kentucky counties that he so ably represented in the House of Representatives. When I visit with the people in those counties, I find that love of Fred Vinson is deeply imbedded in their hearts and memories of his great services to them are indelibly inscribed on their minds. They like to recall their associations with him and are proud to speak of him as a friend.

Fred Vinson as a public servant had a long and brilliant record; he held practically every public position of trust and honor. He filled each position with honor and credit and was willing to undertake any task if its performance was of service to his country. He was the champion of right and freedom and a courageous opponent of evil and oppression.

Although I did not have the pleasure of serving with him in Congress, I did have the good fortune of knowing him as a friend and being able to discuss with him national problems. His keen intel-

lect and comprehensive knowledge of national affairs were unsurpassable. His death was a serious loss not only to his family and friends but to all people of our country. We have lost a great American; his family has lost a devoted husband and father; and Kentucky has lost a favorite son.

DIRECT LOANS TO VETERANS

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the Congress should during this session overhaul the veterans' loan program which is serving only a small percentage of the veterans the Congress intended to help by enactment of the veterans' loan program.

It is a deplorable fact that the Nation just does not have a workable veterans' loan program. Veterans seldom are able to borrow money to build homes or to establish themselves in business. This situation is not the intent of Congress. Legislation passed by Congress to help the veterans secure loans was intended to be one of the principal means by which veterans could reestablish themselves in private life. During this session we should determine that we shall rewrite the veterans' loan program in such clear, mandatory terms that the Government will have to carry out the true intent of Congress to the benefit of our veterans and to the credit of their Government. The present program not only has failed in its objectives, but it has made many veterans lose faith in the very Government that they served so well in time of war.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. ARENDS was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes today, following any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. PATMAN was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes on Monday, January 18, 1954, following any special orders heretofore entered and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts was given permission to address the House for 1 minute today, following any special orders heretofore entered.

THE PRESIDENT'S STATE OF THE UNION MESSAGE AND THE INABILITY OF THE PRESIDENT TO CARRY OUT HIS PROMISES

The SPEAKER. Under a special order heretofore entered, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, President Eisenhower made certain definite promises to the Congress, and to the people, in his state of the Union message last Thursday, January 7. It is not my purpose of criticize President Eisenhower or to criticize the proposals he made. That is not the object of my discussion. My object is to commend the President on his forthright statements and promises and to express the hope that those promises and statements are carefully considered by Congress.

I sympathize with the President. I know he has a difficult job. I know that he must depend upon advisers in order to do the difficult job that he has. I know, too, that he needs the support of the Members of the Congress from both sides of the aisle.

The major promises made by the President involve credit and money, debt management and budget. These promises cannot be carried out without the cooperation of the Federal Reserve System. The Federal Reserve System was enacted into law December 23, 1913, 40 years ago last December.

ACT COMPLETELY CHANGED

The Federal Reserve Act has been substantially changed. Many amendments have been made. Many of the most far-reaching amendments were made without any discussion on the floor of either House of the Congress or without any reference in committee reports to these changes. They were just made, a little amendment here and a little amendment there. If the Federal Reserve Act as amended over these 40 years were to be proposed to the Congress now and anew, it would not have a chance of enactment because these amendments have entirely changed the original purpose of the Federal Reserve Act.

Under the present act the Board of Governors and the Open Market Committee have all the power to shape the monetary and credit conditions of the country.

The officers and other officials of the 12 Federal Reserve banks have very little power, just choosing officers and personnel problems—the housekeeping part—and no power or authority in the economic field.

Prior to the act of 1935 the officers of the 12 banks had tremendous powers but this was all changed by the 1935 act.

The Board of Governors—seven—here in Washington, D. C., must have several million dollars a year to carry on their operations. They get this money by assessing each of the 12 Federal Reserve banks its pro rata part. The officers of the banks, to date, have never resisted the payment of an assessment.

The officers of the 12 banks also want something out of the Board occasionally. For instance, the Board must approve the salaries paid by the banks to its officers and employees. Up until a few years ago the highest salary paid was $25,000 a year. About 2 or 3 years ago the highest salary was raised to $40,000 and last year, although it has not yet been publicly announced, the salary of the President of the Federal Reserve bank of New York was raised to its present figure, $60,000 a year.

Possibly it will be of interest to mention some of the salaries paid by the System and compare them with other Government salaries.

They are as follows:

President of the United States	$100,000
President, Federal Reserve Bank, New York [1]	60,000
President, Federal Reserve Bank, Chicago [1]	40,000
Presidents, Federal Reserve Banks: Boston, Philadelphia, Richmond, Atlanta, St. Louis, Kansas City, and San Francisco [1]	30,000
Vice President of the United States	30,000
Speaker of the House of Representatives	30,000
Chief Justice of the Supreme Court	25,500
Associate Justices of the Supreme Court	25,000
Presidents, Federal Reserve Banks: Cleveland, Minneapolis, and Dallas [1]	25,000
Cabinet members	22,500
Deputy Secretary of Defense	20,000
Secretaries, Army, Navy, and Air Force	18,000
Judges, U. S. Courts of Appeal	17,500
Under Secretaries of executive departments	17,000
Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System	16,000
United States district judges	15,000
Senators and Representatives	12,500

[1] Salaries fixed by each Federal Reserve bank, with approval of the Board of Governers, under law passed by Congress. All other salaries listed fixed by Congress.

Where does the money come from to pay the salaries and expenses of the Federal Reserve banks and the Board of Governors? It comes from the taxpayers just like the money is obtained to pay other salaries of Government employees. There is one major difference. The Federal Reserve makes no accounting to Congress in a way that Congress can effectively veto any proposal. It gets no appropriation from Congress. It uses the Government's credit to obtain its funds to use for its purposes.

How does the System use the Government's credit to get such funds? It has traded about $25 billion worth of Federal Reserve notes—printed money—for about $25 billion worth of United States Government interest-bearing obligations—United States Government bonds. The 12 banks keep these interest-bearing obligations and continue to collect the interest from the United States Treasury. This gives the System an income of several hundred million dollars a year. They first pay their expenses and then turn over 10 percent of the remainder to the surplus funds of the 12 banks and the other 90 percent goes into the United States Treasury.

It will probably be of interest to some to point out that there is no reasonable limit on the amount of Federal Reserve notes that could be issued, and are being issued, and the debt limit does not apply to their issuance. They are obligations of the United States Government, just as much so as an interest-bearing obligation. In fact, each Federal Reserve note states right on its face, "the United States of America will pay to the bearer on demand $—."

The Federal Reserve System has the power to pay every depositor in a bank—over $170 billion—in Federal Reserve

notes without reference to the fact that such payment would increase our national debt to $445 billion and without raising the present limit of $275 billion.

President Wilson warned the Congress and the country at the time he signed the act in 1913 that the bankers should never be allowed to get control of the Federal Reserve System. He said that to permit the banks to control or influence the Federal Reserve System would be just as bad for the country as permitting the owners of the railroads to control the Interstate Commerce Commission. He warned the country against banker control.

BANKER CONTROL ADMITTED

I am inserting herewith an excerpt from a weekly publication—Washington Bank Trends—devoted to the interest of bankers from its issue of January 11, 1954. It is as follows:

MAKING BANKERS RESPONSIBLE FOR PROSPERITY

The Federal Reserve, through its open-market committee, controls the monetary and credit resources of the Nation. Even President Eisenhower cannot keep the Nation prosperous unless the Federal Reserve System cooperates. "The private commercial banking interests control the Federal Reserve System." So said Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, and who will deny his premise?

And, the argument could then follow, that the banking industry—possibly even influential bankers—are responsible for the maintenance of national prosperity.

Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, of Texas, who as chairman of a joint economic subcommittee investigated Treasury-Federal Reserve monetary policies about a year and a half ago, formally pointed out last week the necessity for Federal Reserve cooperation if President Eisenhower's promise of continuing national prosperity is to be kept.

Congressman PATMAN pointed out that the Reserve System is legally independent of the Chief Executive, yet all powerful in determining the availability of money and credit. The President must have the system's cooperation, "if he should lose it, the system will defy him," said Mr. PATMAN.

The Congressman's logic stopped just short of making the banking industry responsible for national prosperity. Yet, grant his premise, and it follows.

It is unfair, perhaps, to hold the bankers from Milpitas, Calif., to Great Neck, N. Y., responsible for national prosperity. On the other hand, Representative PATMAN's logic carries a warning, even though it may be politically colored.

First, the presumed influence of the banker-dominated Reserve System to maintain prosperity. Second, the influence of prominent banker personalities now high in the councils of the administration. Q. E. D., American bankers are responsible for national prosperity.

But, would the bankers within the administration let the private commercial bankers, which Mr. PATMAN says, "controls the Federal Reserve System" allow the latter to refuse to cooperate in the interests of national prosperity?

Obviously not. This is on the assumption that bankers think alike and form a cohesive group, which they do not, any more than do doctors, lawyers, carpenters, and plumbers.

While the logic of banker responsibility for prosperity is intriguing, although faulty, it remains true that they are very much in the political spotlight. The focus is on their credit and monetary policies. And the popular interpretation of these policies will be politically colored. Vividly.

FOURTH BRANCH OF GOVERNMENT

The bankers refer to the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System as the supreme court of finance.

The system is now for all intents and purposes a separate branch of the Government. It has declared its independence from the President. This was done in March 1951. It is now footloose and fancy free. It has charge of the Government's credit. The members of the Board are selected for 14 years and the President has no power over an appointee.

They will cooperate with the President as long as he is popular with the Congress and the people. They cooperated with Presidents Roosevelt and Truman as long as they were popular with the people. But when Mr. Truman became less popular the Board declared its independence and although Mr. Truman fought back in the public interest he was too weak as a President to prevent it.

How does this delegation of power work?

The 160 million people have, under the Constitution, delegated the money and credit powers of the Nation to 531 Members of the Senate and House of Representatives.

These 531 over the years, gradually—a little change here and there as legislation passed—delegated this enormous power to 12 men composing the Open Market Committee.

These 12 men, under a law passed by Congress, delegate this enormous power to an executive committee of 5 of their number.

These 5 turn this enormous power over to 1 of their number—the President of Federal Reserve Bank of New York—to execute. He is the selection of the private commercial banks.

The Federal Reserve System was 40 years old December 23, 1953. A Member of Congress has never seen an audit of the Board or of either one of the 12 banks. The Comptroller General has no power to audit the system. For 39 years the Board was never audited by an independent auditor. I complained about it. An audit was made, we are told, but no Member of Congress has been given an opportunity to see it. I do not believe there has ever been an independent audit of the 12 banks of the system or either of them or a proper audit of the Board of Governors.

I mention this to warn the Members of Congress that they have gone too far in amending the Federal Reserve Act. We have gone so far that the President of the United States is denied the power and the ability to carry out the promises that he makes for the economic security of our people. Furthermore, our national security and prosperity depend upon 12 men who have demonstrated their willingness to keep in mind the interests of the private banks, and who are not directly or indirectly obligated to the people or the Congress for the positions they hold that give them this power. The President cannot carry out his promises because he does not have the power. Congress has allowed the power to be taken away from him. I refer to March 1951, when the Open Market Committee of the Federal Reserve Board on March 4, 1951, declared its independence from the executive branch of the Government. It was on that date that they went contrary to the administration in power, defied the President, and commenced a policy of high-interest rates. It was then that farm prices commenced to decline, in March of 1951. That is when the Federal Reserve System declared its independence from the President of the United States. I am repeating some, but I believe these facts cannot be too strongly emphasized.

Now, they had never done that before. Under Mr. Roosevelt and under Mr. Truman, up until that time, they had never done it. They did not have the courage to do it. They had wanted to do it. They had been looking for an opportunity to do it. It was only when the popularity line of the then President had taken a considerable dip downward, and they believed he was so unpopular with the Congress and the country they could defy the President and get by with it that they had the courage to do it, and they did do it, and they declared their independence then from the President of the United States, and under no obligation to the President, so they claimed and contended.

All right. How is the President going to carry out his promises if he does not have that power? In order to corroborate what I have said about declaring their independence from the Executive I want to quote Dr. W. Randolph Burgess. He is the unconfirmed Deputy to the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States. He has not been confirmed by the United States Senate, but he has complete charge of everything, practically, concerning monetary matters that the Secretary of the Treasury can delegate to him. Dr. Randolph Burgess for 34 of the 40 years' existence of the Federal Reserve System has had a very close contact with it, and when he came down to Washington in the early part of this year he brought with him 5 directors, including himself, of the 9 directors of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York and placed them in bottleneck positions in this administration to carry on the monetary policy. So, Dr. Burgess speaks for this administration. In a speech he made December 29, 1953, before the American Economic Association and the American Finance Association here at the Statler Hotel in Washington, in referring to that declaration of independence that I mentioned of the Federal Reserve System, he said this in his speech. Let me read it to you:

Here in this country we have had in these years something of a miracle. You had a period in which the Federal Reserve System was under the dominance of the Treasury, and in a battle for its independence of existence I heard it said so many times when we discussed that battle over that period, that in a battle between the central bank and the Treasury—

In other words, a battle between the Federal Reserve and the administration in power—

the central bank never wins. In this case the Treasury had the backing of the President of the United States and the central bank won the battle.

I am quoting from Dr. Burgess, confirming the statement I made that the Federal Reserve System has declared itself separate and independent from the President of the United States and under no obligation whatsoever to carry out his wishes. That is what I am saying.

Further quoting Dr. Burgess, in which he is still referring to this declaration of independence by the Federal Reserve System from the Executive of the United States:

It is one of the dramatic instances in history where the central bank regained the right to exercise its essential powers.

Is not that just as plain as words can make anything?

The Federal Reserve System definitely withdrew or seceded from the President and the executive branch of our Government March 4, 1951. That being true, they consider themselves outside the power of the President of the United States. How is the President going to carry out these promises without their help and cooperation? As long as President Eisenhower is popular with the people and the Congress he will have no trouble, because they know that they are so vulnerable that any President that is popular can go before the Congress and wipe the law off the statute books or completely change it overnight. They know that. They are sensible men. So they are not going against the wishes and the will of the President of the United States as long as he is popular.

In bringing this up I am looking into the future, not only during President Eisenhower's administration but in other administrations, a Democratic administration or another Republican administration or another President. We do not want a President handicapped and handcuffed in any such way or manner as that. We want the President to have power, the kind of power contemplated in the Constitution of the United States.

The Open Market Committee absolutely shapes and controls the monetary and credit policies of the country. Who are they? They are 7 members of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and the presidents of 5 of the 12 Federal Reserve banks, who were selected and who were elected by the private commercial banks of the country. They represent the Open Market Committee. The have all this power. Of course, each member of the Board is selected for 14 years. He does not feel obligated to the President after his appointment is made. He feels that he is empowered to do anything he wants to do. The five presidents of these banks who are members of the Open Market Committee are certainly not obligated to the Congress or to the people. They were not selected by the Congress or the people. They were selected by the private commercial banks. That is the reason the private commercial banks have complete control today over the Federal Reserve System. That is the reason the President of the United States cannot carry out his wishes and his promises if he is opposed by this Open Market Committee.

If Mr. Eisenhower continues his popularity he will not have any trouble with them, but the very minute he becomes the least bit unpopular they will turn on him and defy him as they did his predecessor, because they claim that they are separate and distinct in their obligations to this country and to the people, and they can carry out their own powers in their own way and are under no obligation to the President of the United States.

DISCUSSION OF FEDERAL RESERVE IN LAST CONGRESS

At the end of the last session of Congress, the 1st session of the 83d, July 1953, I inserted remarks that appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 99, part 12, page 5276, in which I discussed the following:

First. Dr. Randolph Burgess, architect of the administration's hard-money, high-interest policy.

Second. Status of Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and the 12 Federal Reserve banks, showing that they are agencies of the Federal Government.

Third. That there is no free-money market for Government securities; that it is controlled by the Open Market Committee of the Federal Reserve System.

Fourth. That the Open Market Committee has tremendous powers—in fact, more power than the United States Congress—and determines whether we have good times or hard times.

Fifth. That the 12 members of the Open Market Committee—composed of the 7 members of the Board of Governors and 5 presidents of 5 of the 12 Federal Reserve banks—are not charged primarily with protecting the public interest but have demonstrated their desire to help, aid, and assist the private commercial banking interests instead.

Sixth. How the Open Market Committee was created under the act of 1935 and how its powers have been used and abused.

Seventh. Why Mr. Martin, a Democrat, is allowed to remain as Chairman of the Board of Governors by President Eisenhower, and how, under the arrangement, Mr. Martin is a captive of the present administration.

Eighth. The laws says the President shall fill a vacancy on the Board of Governors when one is created, yet there has remained a vacancy on the Board ever since—and before—the present administration came into power.

Ninth. Why long-term Government bonds should be supported at par. How it breaks faith with investors in these bonds to fail to support them and how they can be supported without any risk of inflation.

POLITICS IN THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HESELTON). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, with the dawn of a new year and with the reconvening of a new session of Congress let us hope that among the resolutions of this administration is one that in the future the public may expect the truth, even though at times it may hurt, and certainly will be a deviation from practices of the past year in some departments.

Since I have no desire to make broad charges which cannot be substantiated, Mr. Speaker, I will at this time merely recite an incident which took place on October 10, 1953, during the recent recess, when the House Committee on Agriculture was convened here in Washington for the purpose of hearing the Secretary of Agriculture explain the proposed reorganization in the Department of Agriculture.

While the detailed explanation of the proposed reorganization which was later implemented was given by Mr. Earle Coke, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, it was given in the presence of the Secretary, who presumably concurred in the explanation given by his assistant, and who later was specifically questioned with relation to the operation of certain agencies within the Department, specifically the Soil Conservation Service and the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Committees—formerly the PMA—at which time the Secretary stated emphatically that no partisan politics would be involved in filling appointive offices at the county level. It was explained at that time that the ASC would continue to function in a manner similar to the PMA in that the county committeemen would be elected by the farmers of their particular county and that the county committees would fill the appointive offices within the local setup, including that of the county office manager.

The Secretary was under no compulsion to make that statement, and he could have stated the intention of the Secretary and his Department in establishing the policy which was to be followed.

If the Secretary had stated that it was the intention of this administration to fill all such appointive offices with Republican politicians, I believe he would have enjoyed the respect of all of us, both Democrats and Republicans alike, for I know of no one who challenges his authority to make appointments which conform to standards of his own choosing.

But, Mr. Speaker, I respectfully call your attention and the attention of the other Members of this House to the fact that the Secretary denied that it was his intention to follow a policy of partisan political patronage in selecting the people who are to administer this farm program. I told Mr. Benson that it was my understanding that one of the purposes of the proposed reorganization plan was to bring about the wholesale discharge of competent employees who happened to vote the Democratic ticket, as a vast majority of the people living in the 10th Congressional District of Missouri do, and to replace these Democratic employees with Republicans. I was not challenging the Secretary's authority to do this and would much have preferred to have had the truth as to his intentions, rather than to have had a denial of

what appears to have been a well-laid plan in the face of events which have followed.

While numerous instances might be cited, I will give one example of the practice which is being followed. The county committee in Bollinger County—one of the few Republican counties in the 10th District—is composed of 2 Democrats and 1 Republican, since the farmers themselves do not feel that politics should have any part in this program. This committee recommended a qualified young man with a farm background and approximately 90 hours of college training to be the office manager. His selection was unanimous. The ASC fieldman informed the county committee that their selection could not be approved and that another selection would have to be made, and the fieldman's recommendation for the job was the Republican brother-in-law of one of the members of the committee.

When the county committee hesitated to retreat from its original recommendation, the politically chosen field man again appeared on the scene—this time with a typewritten directive:

From: W. E. Foster, State administrative officer, Missouri State PMA office.

Subject: Office manager rejection.

The State PMA committee after considering application of J. C. Wagner for office manager for Bollinger County has rejected him for this position. You shall consider other applications with the assistance of our farmer field man, Elmer Kincaid, and with his approval submit another application to the State committee.

This directive was not signed, but at end thereof appeared the initials W. E. F.

Although the directive upon which field man Kincaid was attempting to override the decision of the county committee, elected by and who have the confidence of the farmers of Bollinger County, stated that the State committee had rejected the application of Wagner, I personally talked with 2 of the 3 members of the State committee and learned that neither the chairman of the State committee nor one of the other members had ever heard any discussion of the application of Wagner and did not know that the directive had been prepared by the patronage-dispensing State administrative officer. A day or so later the chairman of the State committee told me over the telephone that while he was not acquainted with the case at the time he had talked to me—after the letter had been written—that the committee had delegated this authority to the State administrative officer and they were backing him up in this matter, although they never have told me why the application of the unanimous choice of the county committee had been rejected.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I would respectfully call your attention to the wording of the directive from the State office to the county committee ordering them to consider another application with the approval of the politically appointed field man who has urged the appointment of a brother-in-law of one of the members in direct conflict with regulations. Since having this called to their attention, the State committee now denies that it was attempting to have a brother-in-law of one of the members selected.

I realize Mr. Speaker, that this appointment in itself is a trivial matter, but the principle involved is not trivial, and I do say that it is typical and characteristic of the manner in which the Department of Agriculture is attempting to destroy the farm program which has been built up over the years.

If you will bear with me further, I would like to cite another example of how the farmers of my home county have avoided politics in the administration of this program. Dunklin County is one of the banner Democratic counties of Missouri, yet when we go to elect members of the county PMA committee, one never considers the partisan politics of the candidates. From the time that the program was started there have been Republican members of the county committee. In fact, the present office manager, Howard Hardin, a former chairman of the committee who has given years of service to the efficient administration of this program, and who is recognized as one of the best informed men in the State of Missouri on the farm program, is a Republican and everyone knows he is a Republican; but again I repeat, as long as a man does a good job in this program, we are not interested in his politics. And again I would remind you that on October 10, 1953, Assistant Secretary Coke, in the presence of Secretary Benson, assured me that partisan politics was not to have any part in the administration of the farm program, but it appears now that they have permitted the Republican State Committee in Missouri to take over the patronage down to and including the smallest county office.

But one thing about the Secretary of Agriculture, he knows how to delegate responsibility, for when I wired him on December 10 inquiring, "if the Secretary of Agriculture has renounced or reneged on policy announced by Assistant Secretary Coke before House Committee on Agriculture in your presence on October 10 when this Representative was assured there would be no partisan politics involved in filling appointive offices," and so forth, and after receiving no reply, again wired the Secretary on December 14, informing him that his "failure to reply leaves no alternative than to assume Republican State Committee in Missouri has been vested with authority to hire and fire personnel in PMA and ASC," I did receive a reply 5 days later on December 19 in a telegram signed by True D. Morse, Under Secretary of Agriculture, in which he attempted to explain that "selections by county committees are subject to review by State ASC committees prior to appointment to determine that approved standards have been met. County office managers do not hold Federal appointments. Employees holding positions under competitive civil service are given the benefit and protection which accompany such status. This is policy, Assistant Secretary explained, and no changes have been made. We have no information policy that is not being followed in Missouri or elsewhere."

As I wired Under Secretary Morse suggesting that he read the newspapers in Missouri which recognize the development of a public scandal in the handling of patronage by State ASC office, these violations of policy have been so flagrant that I am certain every Member of this Congress is cognizant of conditions and I am not going to take the time to point out other individual cases.

I am taking exception to the statement of Under Secretary Morse when he tried to tell me what Assistant Secretary Coke said. I was there. Mr. Morse was not. Other members of the House Committee on Agriculture were there and the Secretary of Agriculture—who incidentally had not planned on being present until he received a telegram from me that morning—was present. I think every person there heard Mr. Coke when he said that no partisan politics was to be involved in filling these positions, yet I must admit that few of us believed the statement when it was made, and I say now that it is my honest belief and was at the time that the statement was not made in good faith. The Secretary of Agriculture has not denied that Mr. Coke gave our committee that assurance, and he is the person to whom my telegram was sent. He could have signed the telegram sent by Mr. Morse or he could have referred my telegram to Mr. Coke for reply.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I hope that this administration adopts a resolution pledging itself to the truth and nothing but the truth in 1954.

It has been amusing to watch the operation of the handling of patronage through the ASC State committee in Missouri, with a representative of the chairman of the Republican State committee sitting in the office and drawing a salary as an employee of the State ASC committee, yet reporting direct to her boss. There is no wire tapping in that office. The representative of the Republican State committee merely listens in on an extension.

When directives go out to the "hatchet men" they are not signed. Someone might use them as evidence that political pressure is being applied, but like the egg-sucking dog who is never caught in the act, you can see the yolk stains on their chins and the remnants of shells on their whiskers.

But peanut politics is not the only kind of politics in which the Secretary of Agriculture and his associates are interested.

You will remember, Mr. Speaker, that in the closing days of the first session of the 83d Congress this House unanimously approved legislation which directed that the Secretary of Agriculture would establish a national cotton-acreage allotment of not less than 22½ million acres. This bill was passed in the House after certain compromises had been made in the House Committee on Agriculture, and differences of opinion among the various sections had been dissolved. This bill was not acted upon in the other body and as far as anyone could learn, the Department of Agriculture took no action and did not lend its support to the passage of this bill.

However, during the recess, the Secretary of Agriculture became very interested, or at least so it appeared as he made speeches expressing his concern over the very severe production adjustments which would be required of cotton producers in 1954 under the marketing quotas and acreage allotments which he contends are mandatory under present legislation.

The Secretary has gone so far as to say:

> These excessive adjustments—amounting to a cut of more than 7 million acres below 1953—would impose hardship on individual farmers, and upon the economy of the entire Cotton Belt.

In press release USDA 3042-52 under date of December 11, 1953, the Secretary is reported to have said:

> I have also said that I would urge the Congress to take prompt action in its next session to insure a reasonable increase in the national cotton-acreage allotment, in order to make it possible to correct substantially the more serious inequities in individual farm acreage allotments.

Now, Mr. Speaker, anyone with an ounce of intelligence knows that there was far more reason for the Secretary of Agriculture to have made such a statement in July 1953 when the cotton estimate indicated a crop between 1½ and 2 million bales less than the crop finally turned out, than there was to make this statement in December when the surplus had been increased by almost 2 million bales.

All of the Representatives from the Cotton Belt were pointing out to the Secretary in July the condition that was bound to exist, but which he apparently did not recognize until December.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I say there is a reason for this. Someone has the Secretary's ear, and perhaps they have a higher ear, which has prompted this administration to say that it believes there is a need for more acres to increase the national cotton-acreage allotment to approximately 21 million acres with the increase being apportioned to farms in such a way as to correct allotment inequities among individual farms to the fullest extent possible.

But, Mr. Speaker, we have been unable to learn from the Secretary or from the Department of Agriculture, specifically how this additional acreage is to be distributed. He has indicated that he is inclined to take his cue from and to follow the recommendations of the Farm Bureau which has stated that it would provide for the allocation of 374,000 additional acres on the basis of 216,500 acres to be held as a reserve and apportioned by the Secretary on the basis of need to establish certain minimum State allotments in States not mentioned above. The Bureau proposals also limit reduction in any States to 34 percent of its 1952 planted acreage. By tying this limitation to a single year's history would bring extra acreage to California and Arizona.

Frankly, Mr. Speaker, we are afraid of giving this leeway to an administration that has followed a give-away policy which has resulted in the loss to the United States of America of resources estimated in excess of $70 billion, and of course I am referring to the tidelands giveaway under the terms of which this administration has attempted to pay off its political debt. Frankly, I do not know if the administration considers that the debt has been paid in full, and I for one am not in favor of using cotton acreage that belongs to the South to be used in paying a political debt to California.

I have made repeated requests to the Secretary of Agriculture to furnish the public with figures showing how the additional acres would be distributed to all of the States. I insist that the Department has this information now, but for some unknown reason has declined to make it public. However, no later than Thursday morning, in a letter dated January 5, 1954, signed by the Under Secretary True D. Morse, I was informed that—

> We are currently compiling and analyzing farm allotment data as a basis for determining a Department position for distribution of additional national allotment so as to give equitable treatment to farms. Such analysis is not sufficiently final to determine a firm recommendation at this time.

The question I would like to ask is how can the Department know that 21 million acres is a proper figure unless they knew how much was needed in each State. The national total is arrived at by adding the totals for each of the respective States, and what I want to know is how many acres are slated to go to each State under the Department of Agriculture formula.

I may say also that since these remarks were prepared the other body has amended its cotton bill to give added acres to Florida in addition to those for California, Arizona, and New Mexico, and put in a potato amendment for Maine in the hope they can make a good political bill out of it and continue to take cotton acres from the South where it really belongs. If the Secretary is interested in all the cotton farmers of America, including those in the South, he had an opportunity last July and August which he did not exercise.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri asked and was given permission to address the House today for 10 minutes, following any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. WHITTEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes today, following any special orders heretofore entered.

ARMY, NAVY, AIR FORCE, AND MARINE CORPS

The SPEAKER. Under special order heretofore entered, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill which would establish limitations on the number of officers who may serve in the higher commissioned grades in the Army, Navy, Air Force, and the Marine Corps.

The purpose of this legislation is to impose restrictions on promotions in the Armed Forces and at the same time repeal that portion of present law appearing in the Defense Appropriation Act of 1954 which restricts the promotion of officers in the Armed Forces.

You will recall that last year the Congress adopted the so-called Davis amendment to prevent unlimited promotions, particularly temporary promotions, in the Armed Forces. Last year, a subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services conducted extensive hearings on this subject in an attempt to ascertain, particularly for the senior officers, whether there was justification for the present number of general officers and colonels serving on active duty in the Armed Forces.

While the subcommittee, of which I was chairman, did not issue a formal report, I think it is reasonable to say that we did individually conclude that there were some billets now occupied by senior officers that could be served adequately by more junior officers. We found instances in which officers awaiting retirement were serving on boards which could be considered unnecessary or overstaffed. We found staff organizations, particularly in Europe, imposed upon other staff organizations in a mumble-jumble that almost defies intelligent interpretation.

But in many instances we found that not a few of the billets now occupied by senior officers have been created as a result of unification. In other words, there are many officers today serving in staff organizations overseas or even in this country that are not performing duties directly related to their own service.

And of greater significance is the fact that we did not find a general overexaggerated rank structure in the armed services when all things are considered together.

I want to make this point clear. The Congress in 1947 enacted the Officer Personnel Act. This act set up a promotion system for regular officers based upon a 30-year career in the Armed Forces. It envisioned that every young officer entering the Armed Forces would have the opportunity, through diligence and perseverance, to attain promotion and eventual retirement unless sooner retired or separated for failure of selection. It established a fairly heavy attrition rate so that there was no guaranteed promotion, but at least it assured the more capable officer of an opportunity to advance up the ladder until he attained the rank of colonel, and perhaps in the case of a few officers, even the grade of general.

There seems to be no quarrel with the provisions of this law with respect to permanent promotion, but unfortunately the outbreak of war in Korea, which more than doubled the size of our Armed Forces, brought about the need for more officers and more higher ranking officers, and as a result the services made use of the temporary promotion provisions in order to keep pace with the expanding size of our Armed Forces.

It is this type of promotion to which the Congress has apparently objected and which has brought about, for 2 successive years, severe restrictions.

Now in connection with these promotions and these higher grades, I would

like to call the attention of the House to the fact that we cannot compare a World War I grade structure with a World War II grade structure, nor can we compare a World War II grade structure with present-day requirements.

The Armed Forces of today are much more technically advanced than anything this country has ever experienced in the past. And as a result we have more specialists, and more requirements for men with complicated technical knowledge. And just as the average civil service employee of today draws a much higher salary for comparable work performed 10 years ago, so today the armed services must promote men to keep pace with the increasing costs of living and the greater responsibilities brought about by the tremendous advances in the skill required of the operators of modern equipment of warfare.

All told, I am convinced that while there must be some restrictions on the promotions of officers in the Armed Forces, particularly in the higher grades, nevertheless those that are now in effect are too drastic and are having a very serious morale effect, particularly upon our junior officers.

I think the Congress would be startled to learn that under some circumstances a young second lieutenant entering one of our military services today, for example, has 1 chance in 300 of becoming a brigadier general, and under the present Davis amendment, that young officer would have to attain the age of 103 before qualifying for promotion to brigadier general. This could occur provided the present officer strength of the service concerned remains approximately constant, and that all the officers who enter that service remain for a career and do not become so disillusioned that they resign in large numbers. In other words, if the present promotion policies and restrictions are continued, the chance for a normal career for a young officer is extremely limited. This is a serious matter and one which deserves the attention of this House, even though it is one of the most complicated subjects I have ever attempted to unravel.

In an effort to impose reasonable restrictions, but at the same time allow promotions which will permit reasonable career planning and provide some incentive for making the service a career, I have introduced a bill which, for want of a better phrase, can be called a sliding scale system of promotion. It imposes limitations on the promotions of general officers, colonels, lieutenant colonels, and majors. In some cases the limitation is imposed by number and in other cases by a per centum. The theory of the bill is that as the Armed Forces increase in size, the proportion of higher ranking officers decreases. For example, under the proposed legislation the Army would be permitted to have 520 general officers, compared with the 500 that they are now permitted under the Davis amendment, based upon an officer strength of 120,000 officers. In the event that the officer strength in the Army should be reduced to 100,000, the number of general officers would be reduced to 495. In the event the size of the Army were decreased to 50,000 officers, the number of general officers would be reduced to 350. The Air Force, under the proposed bill, would be permitted 435 general officers based upon an estimated end strength of 130,880 officers at the end of this fiscal year. At present they are allowed 428. The Navy would be permitted 307 flag officers, as contrasted to the 290 now permitted under the Davis amendment. There would be no change of the general officers permitted in the Marine Corps.

Now this bill is merely the first attempt to solve an extremely complex, but highly important problem. We will conduct hearings on this proposal and it may be altered in many respects before it is reported to the House. But I did want the membership to know that we have made an effort to solve the problem.

I might mention one other feature of the proposed bill. That is, it repeals the so-called Van Zandt amendment, which imposes limitations on retirement. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT] himself has not favored the limitation for the past 2 years.

It seems to our subcommittee that it is rather inconsistent to place restrictions on promotions which drastically reduce career opportunities in the Armed Forces and at the same time preclude voluntary retirement which further reduces promotional opportunities. During the actual war in Korea there may have been justification for precluding voluntary retirement, but we have found, as I am sure many Members of this House have found, that the prohibition against voluntary retirement is one of the major reasons why young officers are not being attracted to the armed services for career planning. It has had a very serious effect upon morale and this bill will repeal the present limitation now contained in the Defense Appropriation Act.

I know that the Members of this House are very anxious to rebuild the morale of our Armed Forces, which, in my opinion, has over the past few years undergone serious deterioration, and I am confident that repealing the Davis amendment and the prohibition against voluntary retirement will go far toward attaining this objective.

AGRICULTURE

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I was somewhat amazed to listen to the speech of my colleague and good friend from Missouri representing what is called the Boothill cotton section, and his complaints about the patronage system in the State, and particularly in relation to the Department of Agriculture. I noticed that one of the main complaints, as he personalized it, was against the Under Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. True D. Morse, who is a resident of my congressional district and a Democrat. Inasmuch as the issue involved is the accusation of partisan politics, it is pretty hard for me to appreciate that Mr. True D. Morse, who is a Democrat, and acknowledged to be so, would be part and parcel of any Republican scheme along partisanship lines.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I was not accusing Mr. Morse. I was taking exception to Mr. Morse's answering a telegram about a situation that he knew nothing about, and was merely confirming and passing on someone else's word. I did not accuse Mr. Morse of anything.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I am sure Mr. Morse will stand behind anything that he states. Therefore, I say that the charge would be against him. The main thing that concerns me, however, is that the attack is one on motives rather than a free discussion of actual issues.

I was also a little concerned that after naming a couple of specific cases the gentleman from Missouri said he was not going to mention any others, but he had lots of them. I think the specific cases are the things that make a difference.

We are confronted with a situation in Missouri, as I see it, and this is my own personal view, where the previous administration under Mr. Brannan actually had moved into the PMA organizations in the State of Missouri to put partisans in those particular positions. I use the word "partisan" not so much from the angle of Republican and Democrat as I do to mean partisan in carrying forth a particular philosophy in farm matters.

We are all familiar with the fact that Mr. Brannan was a great advocate and partisan for his particular views on our overall agricultural program. To carry those out he felt that it was perfectly proper to put partisans in those positions.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Did the gentleman ever hear Mr. Brannan deny that he was using partisan politics in that?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I know that we had a congressional investigation on how he was using it. He denied it quite vociferously there. As a matter of fact, had we been able to establish it clearly, as I thought it was, incidentally, in investigating lobbying with Federal funds, that we had the case proven, and had a majority of this Congress been willing to take that record and do something about it, we would have been able to move ahead. I am glad to hear the gentleman say that he did not deny it.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I did not say that. The gentleman misunderstands me. I said, Did the gentleman ever hear Mr. Brannan deny it? I did not say that he denied it.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I do not know. I assumed when the gentleman asked me that that he was saying that he openly admitted he had done it.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I did not say that. The comparison was that the present Secretary of Agriculture was denying that there was any politics involved.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Yes. I think he can deny it in good faith, I might add. I base that on this looking at the other side of the picture, having received, as I have, and as the three other Republican Congressmen from Missouri have, constantly over a period of months, complaints from the Repub-

lican organizations about the fact that they are unable to do anything about changing some of these people in PMA. I know the standards which are being applied in Missouri. They are these:

No. 1, essentially those jobs must be filled with people who are qualified. Our position, and I say "our" because I am going to join with the other three Republican Congressmen from Missouri, is to get out of office these people who have been playing partisan politics with their positions. They are still in there.

I will bring this out specifically. When we had the Federal drought-relief program in Missouri being administered we were having difficulty in certain counties because of the interpretation of the laws there. Indeed, we have run down a few of the partisans holding these positions. Yes, I hope we do have an opportunity—I hope I personally have an opportunity—of screening any of these appointments in the PMA, and so forth, to be certain they are not partisans along the line I have outlined. And I do think it is perfectly proper, I might add, for an administration to not have men in office who will not try to carry out the philosophy and the program established by the Congress which is being attempted to be carried out by the Department of Agriculture under the laws passed by the Congress. If it were a situation of partisanship in the small sense, I could not agree more with the gentleman, but I completely disagree when we are looking at it in the larger political sense. Using the word "politician," I might state to my friend from southern Missouri, is using an honorable term. I resent anyone, at any time, particularly anyone who is in politics, using that as a term of degradation. The true test of whether a politician is good or bad is not the use of the term "politician," but, indeed, what sort of politics he uses and what sort of methods and technique he uses, and if those methods and techniques are bad then we should attack those methods and those techniques, but let us not use the word "politician" as a smear word. I think that is an honorable term.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Will the gentleman state to this House that the Republican State Committee has not been approving appointments in the county offices of the PMA or the ASC?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I do not know. I hope they have been, I will tell the gentleman that.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I can assure the gentleman that they have been doing that in direct conflict with what the Secretary of Agriculture said was going to happen.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I can assure you of this. That in many instances, in fact in the majority of instances, he has not, and that has been one of our objections because, I will say to the gentleman, the power of that Republican State chairman should be limited as it has been. He has not the power to name the person who should be in there, but he has the power to say whether or not that person or persons nominated has through his activities in the community, and so forth, exhibited a fairness and a broadmindedness, or whether the person has been motivated by questions of partisanship. We do not want to get other people in there who would try to carry out the Brannan theme and the Brannan philosophy as to what the agricultural program of this country should be. I do not want any more of those people in such positions. The Congress never voted for the Brannan plan. They repudiated it, yet in spite of that, there was a serious attempt on the part of the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Brannan, to propagandize, to implement and put into effect that plan, and we have people holding positions in the State of Missouri right now, who participated in this scheme. The gentleman is certainly correct in believing that I want those people out of office. I do not want anyone placed there who practices narrow partisanship either. I want someone in those positions who will actually carry out the laws as passed by the Congress of the United States.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I do not think the other gentleman from Missouri should get too perturbed about this. You know those of us who have been in the minority for a number of years have had to go through that very same experience, and we have had various of these individuals who have been okayed by the Democratic Party out campaigning against us vigorously and diligently even to the extent of giving money to help in the campaigns of our opponents. Do not get too disturbed about these things.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I am not criticizing the appointment of Republicans for the jobs. I would do it, but I would not have the Secretary of Agriculture denying that you have done it. That is the only criticism I have. I am criticizing the fact that he is denying that it is being done. I am not blaming you for doing it.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I personally believe that there again the Secretary is stating what his policy is. He insists only that the people who are appointed shall be people who are qualified to handle that particular job, and I would go one step further; of course, he wants someone with the philosophy of trying to carry out as best he can the laws written by the Congress to be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture. That is his high standard. When it comes to the patronage aspect of the matter, if these are patronage jobs, of course, in meeting those high standards, I would naturally hope that the Republicans will get some people into these offices, as I think they should. I have had too many of these other people who have been campaigning, I might say, against me to want to have a situation like that. But I will go one step further and say to the gentleman that I personally hope both parties will exercise the proper restraint in these times when there is a change of administration. I say that particularly about my own party although we have not had too much of an opportunity to exercise this restraint so far; but I hope we will always use the proper restraint.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I would point out to the gentleman that in my home county we have had a Republican office manager down there all these years during the Democratic administration. We did not play politics. That is what I am objecting to here.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I regret to say that is not true in the State of Missouri as a whole nor has it been true for the past 20 years.

THE FARM PROGRAM

The SPEAKER. Under special order heretofore granted, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, we have just had presented to us the President's message on agriculture.

After listening to the reading of that message it looks like the 5 years' victory we have had over the plans of Mr. Allen Kline and the American Farm Bureau Federation have not yet convinced him that the Congress is not going to approve his views in connection with agriculture. For 5 years he and the directors of his organization have been before our Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Department of Agriculture, and with relatively few exceptions, while advocating billions for foreign aid, they have advocated drastic reductions in practically every agricultural program that is so vital to the welfare of this country, including soil conservation, ACP payments, REA, and many other things. During those years we have been able to overcome his recommendations in our committee, and when he took his fight to the floor of the House we have been able to defeat him here. But apparently the Department and the President have been sold on his views, which also include the provisions of the law passed in the 80th Republican Congress, for sliding-scale support prices for basic commodities.

These sliding scales sound like they are good. They sound like they would stretch when you need them and would tighten up when you do not need them. May I say they are directly the opposite. If a farmer is in a plight and needs protection, it gives him less. If on the other hand you have a small supply and there is a shortage of a given farm commodity, they give you more. Of course if there is scarcity and there is a shortage there is a market, and you need none. Instead of a farm program to help farmers, it is geared to something else.

I made a speech to the Washington women correspondents early last year, with Senator AIKEN, in which I discussed this situation in an effort to give the administration the benefit of the experience which I had had, and on which most of our Republican Members from agricultural areas had agreed. I would like to repeat what I said before I finish for I said I thought we should continue farm price supports for basic commodities at least 26 years: the remaining 2 years of this administration, the 20 years

they will be out, and then their next 4 years.

The President says we have priced ourselves out of foreign markets. I differ with that statement. That is not the situation. We have had few foreign markets because we have been unwilling to take in payment things that other people had to give us. Not only that, but this administration has under the law now, and has had for the year they have been in power, the right to offer American commodities on the world market at prevailing world prices, for section 32 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act sets up funds which can be used to offer those commodities on the world market at the world price. The Department has refused to use that authority for many commodities. Why did they not use it? I will tell you. A trial run on offering such commodities at world prices would have shown that our problems in world trade are not primarily price but the fact that foreign countries cannot sell to us for we will not buy. That would have disproved the President's beliefs.

I have letters and correspondence to show that it is not a matter of pricing ourselves out of the world market at all.

I would like to point out in the message today, a conflict which clearly proves they are wrong. The administration says that because of pricing ourselves out of the world market, because we have learned we cannot control farm production by controls, they are making this change to the Farm Bureau bill of the Republican 80th Congress. I tell you that in the same message they say they are continuing the tobacco program as it is, because they have proven that you can handle the production problem by controls.

There is nothing in the President's message about sliding scales for wages. In fact, if you will wait a short time you will probably see the President's recommendation increasing minimum wage levels from 75 cents to $1 per hour.

There is nothing in the message about reducing tariffs, but it is said that the American farmer, under the law, should be given less protection when he needs it and more protection when he will have no use for it. It is as simple as that. My friends, once again farmers are coming out second best—if the Congress should follow the President who speaks the thoughts of Mr. KLINE.

May I present the message I gave the Women's Press Club last February. It becomes almost prophesy:

SPEECH OF HON. JAMIE L. WHITTEN, OF MISSISSIPPI, WOMEN'S NATIONAL PRESS CLUB, WASHINGTON, D. C., FEBRUARY 24, 1953

It is a real privilege to be with you on this occasion. I know the keen interest all of you have in agricultural matters, in the cost of living, and in the national welfare generally.

I hope that I may contribute some information on a subject which is primary in its importance. For 4 years I have served as chairman of the Appproriations Subcommittee for Agriculture. That group each year reviews the entire operations of the Department: price supports, soil conservation, rural electrification, research, farm credit extension, 4–H Club work, and the thousands of activities important to all of us. By our action on funds, we decrease, increase, or veto activities of the Department, provided, of course, the Congress approves our actions, which it has done for 4 years.

This year I am being succeeded by Congressman H. CARL ANDERSEN, of Minnesota, Republican, but one who is deeply interested in agriculture. I think the Nation is fortunate to have him head that committee.

I am glad to be on your program with Senator GEORGE AIKEN, of Vermont, who heads the Senate Committee on Agriculture. I know he is interested in agriculture, though I have differed with his viewpoints a number of times. He will largely write the new law.

He gave his name to the Agriculture Act of 1948, Public Law 897, 80th Congress. This law provided for 90 percent of parity support price when there was a shortage of a basic commodity—of course, if there was a shortage there would be a market and no need for any support. But if there was a surplus of as much as 30 percent—and, therefore, a need—then the support assured was much less.

Many Democrats in my section who supported Eisenhower are making discoveries.

Many thought that candidate Eisenhower gave assurances of firm 90-percent support prices for basic commodities. However, the Republicans are reading the fine print to us now.

As one Washington newspaper which supported General Eisenhower recently pointed out:

"The platform (of the Republican Party) on agriculture favored a farm program aimed at full parity prices in the market place." (The last four words were in italics.)

Of course, if the buyers would buy at that price you would need no price supports.

I wonder if the Republican Party has tried to determine why their ticket ran so far behind President Eisenhower? Could it be that the farmers remembered the Aiken bill, which gave complete assurance of help to the farmer when he did not need it and only two-thirds as much when he did need it?

Could it be that the American people were afraid of the advice of that great farm organization leader who was held out by the President as one of his chief advisers on farm matters? The people knew that leader was one, if not the chief advocate of the flexible-support program, which stretched when you didn't need it and was tight as Dick's hatband when the farmer needed help to get his breath. His farm advice to our subcommittee on cutting down and cutting out farm programs read so much like the recommendations of the National Manufacturers Association you would wonder which was writen first, if you did not already know. Of course, the Mississippi, Alabama, and Georgia farm organizations, which differed with their national leadership, practically saved our farm programs the last 2 years.

Now that the Republicans are reading the fine print to us and the new Secretary of Agriculture is making speeches, the general tone of which is that a little hardship and privation visited on some of us would be good for all of us, Democrats and farm-minded Republicans are almost falling over themselves introducing bills to extend firm price supports 2, 4, and 7 years.

I told a number of people that if the Republicans kept their present ideas on farm legislation, I thought I would offer a bill to extend firm supports for 26 years—for the remainder of this Republican term, the 20 years they would be out, and through their next term.

I note Secretary Benson says he doesn't see why they should find fault—that he is carrying out every order the late Secretary Brannan left behind. I thought he was going to improve on Brannan. Why, I made the closing argument in the House debate against the Brannan plan, so to me, a Democrat, Brannan's order is not the complete answer.

Another thing the Republicans were going to stop was "the dictation from Washington."

The first thing Secretary Benson did was to stop all construction programs which had been authorized and directed by Congress, in many instances where there was an outright obligation and local participation, including flood-prevention work. Unfortunately the rains did not obey his order.

The Secretary's overruling of the action of the Congress would be taken to be dictation in many countries of the world.

You can all see the calendar unfolding. There will be a study period this year, classes will be held, and new farm legislation will be passed late next year which will be claimed to be all things to all people. This legislation will be passed early enough to help in the November elections, but late enough so you can't tell just what it is.

That is probably the regular course around Washington. The disturbing factor is that most of President Eisenhower's major advisers on farm problems have proven records against much of present farm programs. They have known views which, in my judgment at least, if put into law will do the farmer no good and thereby pull the rest of our economy down, too.

I am sure the present farm program is far from perfect. I have several bills to revise it pending, myself. However, the present program has resulted from many years of experience. We want it improved; but what frightens us is that the new Secretary and others who are opposed to firm supports are chief advisers to the President. We are afraid that, since they are opposed to the farm program, if the matter is left to them, they may improve it to death.

Now I know all this might be taken as somewhat partisan. Nevertheless, you can't get away from these facts:

The Department of Agriculture is operating with 40 percent less people and on 30 percent less money than in 1940.

The remainder of the Federal Government (exclusive of national defense) shows an average of 360 percent increase.

The farm commodities on hand in 1941 saved the day for us and our allies. Today we are building ships, airplanes, guns, atomic bombs, H-bombs, trucks, tanks, storing up everything—not just to meet the Korean war—but as a margin of safety in the event of all-out war. This buildup far exceeds that for World War II. On each item of these hundreds of billions of dollars' worth of equipment, the Government paid cost plus a profit to the manufacturer and fixed pay to the worker. Yet there is great fear at a $1 billion or $2 billion reserves of food and fiber.

Are we in danger enough to spend hundreds of billions on the military? The military people say so. We have acted on that assumption. Then is our food and agricultural surplus too large?

In World War II we asked industry to expand. We paid the bill. We later gave them quick tax amortization. We asked labor to work—they did—we paid them.

We asked the farmer to expand his plant. We did not pay him. We gave him no firm contract. We promised only to support his production of basic commodities at 90 percent of the comparative gross purchasing power which he had in 1904–14, when his farm was 70 percent land, when out of his gross he did not have to buy expensive farm machinery and equipment, which is more than half the value of today's farm. And with those farmers who did not produce the six basic commodities, their support price, if any at all, was usually 60 percent of the comparative purchasing power the farmer had in 1909–14, when his house went unpainted, his boy or girl had to work their way through school, and the average farm family did not enjoy ordinary conveniences.

We spent $4 billion on consumer subsidies during the war. We paid out over $14 billion to get industry to convert and expand during World War II, and have spent much more since then. Shall we complain at the job the farmer has done at less than $2 billion expense, if we count the value of what we have on hand?

We are going to keep the minimum-wage law. They are not going to repeal the tariff. If these factors are to keep up the price which the farmer pays, don't you have to give him some protection, at least to the amount of 90 percent of his comparative gross purchasing power of 1909–14?

Farming today is a commercial operation. It costs money to farm. Now, is it not more sound, when there is a supply on hand of any commodity, over and above that needed for normal use, to either buy it and hold for a national reserve if needed, as we do other things, or, if that is not done, let the farmers vote limited production on themselves and at least save the money it takes to produce a crop, and the fertility such unneeded crop takes from the soil? Is it not better to do that than to let production go, and when it becomes too large try to force limited production by lowering the support to as little as 60 percent of the 1909–14 gross purchasing power?

There are taxes. There are fixed charges. The lower the price the farmer receives the more of the commodity he must produce to meet such taxes and fixed charges, his mortgage, and basic living expenses.

There is the basic difference in our views. We say let the farmer limit his production by vote, by his own free choice. To do otherwise is to push him into further trouble.

The action of the new Secretary of Agriculture in stopping the flood-prevention programs, which were authorized and directed by the Congress, certainly looks like dictation from Washington. Yet he says he is going to restore the freedoms to the farmer, who lived on that for years.

The farmer had a free market when the rest of our economy had some degree of protection under the law. During that period the farmers wore out 40 percent of our fertile lands—200 million acres out of 500 million—and used up to 80 percent of our timber. Thousands of acres are diseased, and insects are destroying our timber and our growing crops.

Today we spend on agricultural research only a little more than the cost of 12 B–30 bombers.

An entire new poultry industry has been built up at about 12 percent of the cost of one medium-sized tank.

We spend twice as much annually on handling our mail as we spend on all the activities of the Department of Agriculture. I know you are interested in the cost of groceries. So am I. I am a lawyer and a consumer. I, too, have housekeeping troubles.

An analysis of the situation, however, shows that prices received by farmers are 11 percent below a year ago. Prices paid at the grocery store are only 1 percent below a year ago. There have been 11 freight-rate increases since World War II and an almost annual round of wage increases.

I do not pass on the merits of those increases. Perhaps behind them there may have been increased wage contracts, and behind them there may have been the increased cost of living. I am saying you do have a cycle, and where other things keep costs up you cannot make it up by decreasing the cost of farm commodities and have the farmer make it up by depleting the soil.

The point I would make here is that when these other things are fixed by order of the Interstate Commerce Commission, by the courts, by legislation we pass, by protective tariffs, by minimum-wage laws, or by the bargaining power of labor unions, however they are fixed or whatever the merit of the change, if you do not put some floor under the price of the original raw material that goes into the price to the consumer, the high prices of these elements push the price of the raw material right into the ground. We will either pay for it now or in the future by further exhausting the natural resources on which we are all dependent.

Our high standard of living is largely based upon the ability of our land to produce food and fiber. We must see that such ability is maintained.

We must not let our country get like India, China, or Greece, and many other depleted nations.

If we are to feed our expected population by 1975 (190 million), we will have to add to our present milk supply an amount equal to that now produced in Wisconsin, Michigan, and New York.

In pork, add an amount equal to production of Nebraska and Iowa.

In beef, add the production of Minnesota, Texas, and Oklahoma.

In sheep and lambs, add an amount equal to production of Utah, Nevada, Montana, and Wyoming.

In eggs, we will have to add the production of California, Kansas, Missouri, Pennsylvania, and Illinois.

The peoples in the ancient cities of the Roman Empire, in Syria, and in Greece and those other great empires, bled the area of its natural resources to maintain for themselves the high standard of living which they enjoyed for a time. We must not continue to do likewise, for to this date we have been going down the same road.

For a few years farmers have been living a little bit like other segments of our population; for a few years farm prices have been sufficient to plow back into the land a fair share of what has been taken out. I like that situation. I believe it is necessary to maintain that standard, not only to avoid a depression, for a drastic break in farm prices has led off in every depression we have ever had, but to save the productivity of our country which is the real basis of all wealth.

As I said in a recent speech in the House of Representatives: "I am trying to point out these matters and things before mistakes are made. Now, I certainly am not being merely critical, but rather I view it as giving a very fine gentleman a chance to make good—to profit by experiences of the past, throw off the counsel of those leaders who would have wrecked us under the law passed in the 80th Congress.

"I hope he will accept the challenge and be the Secretary for Agriculture, for the welfare of agriculture is, and remains, the base for our general prosperity for today and the welfare of our children tomorrow, for how we treat the land will largely determine their well-being."

Mr. Speaker, may I say I am truly sorry that my speech of last February has proven to be so accurate.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. POAGE was given permission to address the House for 20 minutes on Monday, January 18, 1954, following the legislative program of the day and any other special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan (at the request of Mr. ARENDS) was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes on Thursday, January 14, 1954, following the legislative program of the day and any other special orders heretofore entered.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. BROYHILL and to include a statement.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois.

Mr. MASON.

Mr. MACK of Washington.

Mr. BYRD in two instances.

Mr. SIEMINSKI.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska on the subject of his new food and drug bill.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 6 minutes p. m.) the House, pursuant to its previous order, adjourned until Thursday, January 14, 1954, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1112. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a statement of the adjudications rendered during the year 1953, pursuant to the act of July 2, 1948 (50 U. S. C. Appx. ss — 1981–1987), amended by Public Law 116, 82d Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1113. A letter from the president, Gorgas Memorial Institute of Tropical and Preventive Medicine, Inc., transmitting the 26th annual report of the work and operation of the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1953, pursuant to Public Law 350, 70th Congress (H. Doc. No. 258); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

1114. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the annual report of the Federal Extension Service for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1953, pursuant to section 7 of Public Law 83, 83d Congress; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1115. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the report of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation for 1953, pursuant to the requirement of the Federal Crop Insurance Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1116. A letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a report of the activities of, funds used by, and donations to, the regional research laboratories established pursuant to section 202 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as requested by paragraph (e) of that section; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1117. A letter from the Director, Naval Petroleum Reserves, Department of the Navy, transmitting the annual report on all agreements entered into involving the Naval Petroleum Reserves, pursuant to the act of June 17, 1944 (58 Stat. 280); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1118. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report covering the professional and scientific positions established in the Department of Defense for the calendar year ending December 31, 1953, pursuant to Public Law 313, 80th Congress, as amended by Public Law 758, 80th Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1119. A letter from Steptoe and Johnson, attorneys at law, Washington, D. C., transmitting the annual report of the Georgetown Barge, Dock, Elevator & Railway Co. for the year ended December 31, 1953, pursuant to the act incorporating said company; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1120. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a

proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the act of December 23, 1944, to make permanent the authorization for certain transactions by disbursing officers of the United States"; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1121. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal and lists or schedules covering records proposed for disposal by certain Government agencies; to the Committee on House Administration.

1122. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to provide for the termination of Federal supervision over the property of certain tribes and bands of Indians located in western Oregon and the individual members thereof, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1123. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting copies of laws enacted by the Second Guam Legislature (first regular session), pursuant to section 19 of Public Law 630, 81st Congress, the Organic Act of Guam; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1124. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a bill entitled, "A bill to provide for the termination of Federal supervision over the property of the Klamath Tribe of Indians located in the State of Oregon and the individual members thereof, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1125. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled, "A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to transfer to Vernon F. Parry, the right, title, and interest of the United States in foreign countries in and to a certain invention"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1126. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Air, transmitting a draft of legislation entitled, "A bill to authorize certain property transactions in Cocoli, C. Z., and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DONDERO: Committee on Public Works. H. R. 3300. A bill to authorize the State of Illinois and the Sanitary District of Chicago, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, to help control the lake level of Lake Michigan by diverting water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois waterway; without amendment (Rept. No. 1100). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ABERNETHY:

H. R. 7102. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with States and local agencies in the planning and carrying out of works of improvement for soil conservation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ARENDS:

H. R. 7103. A bill to establish limitations on the numbers of officers who may serve in various commissioned grades in the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BENDER:

H. R. 7104. A bill to terminate the war tax rates applicable to the taxes on communications and those applicable to the taxes on transportation of persons; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H. R. 7105. A bill to amend subsection 216 (c) part II of the Interstate Commerce Act to require the establishment of motor carriers of reasonable through routes and joint rates, charges, and classifications; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BOLLING:

H. R. 7106. A bill to provide for the establishment of an American National War Memorial Arts Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CLARDY:

H. R. 7107. A bill to permit the use of certain evidence intercepted by Federal law-enforcement officers in the course of investigations in connection with the national security; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORBETT:

H. R. 7108. A bill to provide for a postal rate-making procedure by the establishment of a Joint Commission on Postal Rates; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. COUDERT:

H. R. 7109. A bill to make the Hunter College Library a public depository for Government publications; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. DAWSON of Utah:

H. R. 7110. A bill to provide that title to certain school lands shall vest in the States under the act of January 25, 1927, notwithstanding any Federal leases which may be outstanding on such lands at the time they are surveyed; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. R. 7111. A bill to authorize the grant or retrocession to a State of concurrent jurisdiction over certain land; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. R. 7112. A bill to provide greater security for veterans of the Spanish-American War, including the Boxer Rebellion and the Philippine Insurrection, in the granting of domiciliary care and medical and hospital treatment by the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 7113. A bill to assist the States in providing education and schooling for physically disabled individuals; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FEIGHAN:

H. R. 7114. A bill to amend section 25 (b) (1) (D) of the Internal Revenue Code so as to allow exemptions thereunder for dependent children whose gross incomes exceed $600; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HILLELSON:

H. R. 7115. A bill to authorize an emergency appropriation for the construction of a post office and building for Federal use in Rich Hill, Mo.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan:

H. R. 7116. A bill to encourage State supervision of labor union health and welfare funds, to promote the honest administration thereof, and to protect employees and employers from racketeering; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H. R. 7117. A bill to reduce the tax on champagnes and other effervescent wines; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 7118. A bill to punish the use of interstate commerce in furtherance of conspiracies to commit organized crime offenses against any of the several States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANHAM:

H. R. 7119. A bill to forfeit citizenship of conspirators against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 7120. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to authorize the United States and the District of Columbia to grant temporary employment for not more than 30 days in any calendar year to certain annuitants under such act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 7121. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 so as to increase the minimum hourly wage from 75 cents to $1.25; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 7122. A bill to permit and assist Federal personnel, including members of the Armed Forces, and their families, to exercise their voting franchise; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 7123. A bill to permit and assist Federal personnel, including members of the Armed Forces, and their families, to exercise their voting franchise; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MACK of Washington:

H. R. 7124. A bill to amend the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1952 so as to increase certain amounts authorized therein for highway purposes for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MILLER of Nebraska:

H. R. 7125. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to residues of pesticide chemicals in or on raw agricultural commodities; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota (by request):

H. R. 7126. A bill to regulate the sale of shell eggs in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 7127. A bill to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to sell certain property owned by the District of Columbia located in Montgomery County, Md., and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 7128. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide an immediate revision and equalization of real estate valued in the District of Columbia; also to provide an assessment of real estate in said District in the year 1896 and every third year thereafter, and for other purposes," approved August 14, 1894, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. REGAN:

H. R. 7129. A bill to provide for exemption from the land-limitation provisions of Federal reclamation laws as applied to supplemental water projects; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky:

H. R. 7130. A bill to provide for the forfeiture of the citizenship of persons convicted of advocating or conspiring to advocate the overthrow of the Government by force or violence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H. R. 7131. A bill to repeal a limitation on pay of certain officers of the Navy and Marine Corps; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 7132. A bill to exempt from taxation certain property of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. WILLIS:

H. R. 7133. A bill to repeal certain miscellaneous excise taxes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 7134. A bill to increase from $600 to $1,000 the income-tax exemption allowed a taxpayer for a dependent; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LAIRD:

H. R. 7135. A bill to provide for a per capita distribution of Menominee tribal funds and authorize the withdrawal of the Menominee Tribe from Federal jurisdiction; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MADDEN:

H. J. Res. 343. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1954, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. J. Res. 344. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1954, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of New York:

H. J. Res. 345. Joint resolution amending section 172, title 36, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SECREST:

H. J. Res. 346. Joint resolution making it unlawful for members of the Communist Party to be candidates for Federal elective office and to provide for the immediate deportation of aliens found to be members of the Communist Party; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. SELDEN:

H. J. Res. 347. Joint resolution giving the consent of Congress to an agreement between the State of Alabama and the State of Florida establishing a boundary between such States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOSMER (by request):

H. Con. Res. 194. Concurrent resolution proposing the erection of a monument substantially similar in inspiration to the Statue of Liberty on the west coast of the United States; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. Res. 403. Resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the hearing of the Committee on Public Works on the National Highway Study, Part II; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. ALBERT:

H. R. 7136. A bill for the relief of Karl Erik Blauberg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ALLEN of California:

H. R. 7137. A bill for the relief of George Petrossian Minassians, Albertouhi Petrossian Minassians, Eda Petrossian Minassians, Vahag Petrossian Minassians; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BAILEY:

H. R. 7138. A bill for the relief of Rosa Marie Adelheid Herok; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7139. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mounira E. Medlej; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H. R. 7140. A bill for the relief of Robert A. Duval; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H. R. 7141. A bill for the relief of Roberto Fantuzzi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. BUCHANAN:

H. R. 7142. A bill for the relief of Haseep Milhem Esper; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUSH:

H. R. 7143. A bill for the relief of Elizabeth Rotics Whitney; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 7144. A bill for the relief of Bejla Szwarobort, Mordechai, Uri, and Naftul Herc Swarobort; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin:

H. R. 7145. A bill for the relief of Anneliese Catalino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. D'EWART:

H. R. 7146. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to John McMeel No. 1; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DOYLE:

H. R. 7147. A bill for the relief of Ada M. Funk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7148. A bill for the relief of Buckley F. Norris and his father Charles Victor Jones (also known as Victor Lopez); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H. R. 7149. A bill for the relief of James Roland Christie; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H. R. 7150. A bill for the relief of Thora June Grumbles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JONAS of Illinois:

H. R. 7151. A bill for the relief of Mazal Kolman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7152. A bill for the relief of Jozef Van den Broeck; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 7153. A bill for the relief of Henryk Kaminski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACHROWICZ:

H. R. 7154. A bill for the relief of Alice Petrides or Alice Defotiou or Alice Mathews; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAILLIARD:

H. R. 7155. A bill for the relief of Patricia Bettine Tishler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOSS:

H. R. 7156. A bill for the relief of Karm Singh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NORBLAD:

H. R. 7157. A bill for the relief of Sang Won Liu and Yung T. Liu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAYBURN:

H. R. 7158. A bill authorizing the United States Government to reconvey certain lands to S. J. Carver; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. REECE of Tennessee:

H. R. 7159. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Soledad Tejera Suarez Herreros and her son, Rafael; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H. R. 7160. A bill for the relief of Stanislaw Gerner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SECREST:

H. R. 7161. A bill for the relief of Jean Valda Choma; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H. R. 7162. A bill for the relief of Jose Esteban Romero-Garcia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7163. A bill for the relief of Enrique R. Godinez, Enriqueta P. Godinez, and Lydia M. Godinez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VAN PELT:

H. R. 7164. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Gayton O. Larson (nee Eleonore Therese Utenreuther); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VURSELL:

H. R. 7165. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Evelyn Ursula Margarete Fuss Hamilton and her minor daughter, Marion Fuss Hamilton; 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:

456. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Frank Severa, New Jersey State Prison Farm, Rahway, N. J., relative to redress of grievance relating to his imprisonment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

457. Also, petition of V. K. Wellington Koo, Ambassador, Chinese Embassy, Washington, D. C., relative to a message from the Changhua District Council, the Nantou District Council, the Yunlin District Council, and the Tsutung Anti-Communist Resist Russia Cultural Activities Committee pertaining to the Ryukyu Island Group; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

A Proposal for Obtaining More, Better, and Safer Highways

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUSSELL V. MACK

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 11, 1954

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I today introduced a bill to authorize an increase of 50 percent in the highway matching funds provided by the Federal Government to the States for the Federal fiscal year which starts next July 1.

Under an appropriation bill passed by Congress last year, $575 million has been allocated to the States for highway purposes for the year July 1, 1954, to June 30, 1955. My bill would authorize an immediate increase of this amount by $287,500,000.

Since every dollar of this additional $287,500,000 must be matched by the States before any State can obtain it, the enactment of my bill will result in a more than half-billion-dollar increase in the amount of Federal-State highway construction undertaken in the year which starts next July.

This additional highway work will provide jobs for many thousands of construction workers. Also, it will stimulate the demand for steel, cement, asphalt, lumber, plywood, and other construction materials, thereby adding to employment in the industries which produce these goods. Railroad and transportation workers will be benefited by the increased freight such an expanded highway program will generate.

Officials of the Bureau of Public Roads, repeatedly, have warned that our highways have been wearing out, during the past 10 to 15 years, much faster than old roads have been reconstructed or new ones built.

The Nation needs more and better roads. It needs them now. The program to provide these desperately needed, better, and safer highways

should be started at the earliest possible time, not postponed and delayed.

EISENHOWER ON ROADS

President Eisenhower, in his state of the Union speech last Thursday, said:

To protect the vital interest of every citizen in a safe and adequate highway system, the Federal Government is continuing its central role in the Federal-aid highway program. So that maximum progress can be made to overcome present inadequacies in the interstate highway system, we must continue the Federal gasoline tax at 2 cents per gallon. This will require cancellation of the one-half-cent decrease which otherwise will become effective April 1, and will maintain revenues so that an expanded highway program can be undertaken.

The President, in his message, urged that the present 2-cent-a-gallon gasoline taxe be kept in effect after April, when it is due to expire. In return for keeping this 2-cent-a-gallon tax in effect, and not allowing it to return to the 1½-cent former rate, the President promised an expanded highway program.

If the 2-cent-a-gallon Federal gasoline tax is continued after April 1, the expanded highway program promised by the President should be put into effect at the earliest possible date after April 1. The start of that expanded highway program should not be delayed until July 1, 1955, which will be the case if Congress waits until the regular road appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1955 is enacted.

Unless a highway bill, such as the one I today introduced, is enacted promptly, America's 53 million automobile and truckowners will continue paying the Federal Government 2-cent-a-gallon gasoline tax, instead of 1½ cents a gallon, without obtaining any benefits in the form of the promised improved highways for this extra one-half-cent-a-gallon payment until July 1955.

GASOLINE-TAX COLLECTIONS

The Federal Government last year, from its 2-cent-a-gallon gas tax and diesel-oil tax, collected $867,200,856. All of this money came out of the pockets of American automobile and truckowners. It was a special tax on this group, and this group alone.

All of this Federal gas-tax money ought to be spent in building highways that serve the motorists who pay this special tax. None of it should be diverted to other Federal uses, as long as the present great deficiency in needed highways exists. The diversion, by both the Federal Government and the States, of gas-tax revenues to other purposes than roadbuilding should be stopped.

While the Federal Government last year collected $867,200,856 from the Federal gasoline tax and its tax on diesel oil, it will use only $575,000,000 of this money for highway purposes. It will divert almost $300 million of it to other than highway purposes, to such purposes as foreign aid.

My bill, by granting a 50-percent increase, or $267,500,000 of additional funds, effective July 1 next, to States for highway and bridge construction will bring the total amount of Federal highway funds available to the States for that year to $862,500,000. This total is substantially less than that now being collected from the Federal taxes on gasoline and diesel oil.

It will be most unfair to motorists to continue to collect the 2-cent-a-gallon gasoline tax unless the promised expanded highway program is initiated at the earliest possible moment.

On the other hand, the more than 53 million motorists who now pay this gasoline tax, I am sure, will make no complaint against continuing the 2-cent rate after April 1, provided all, or practically all, of these added gasoline tax revenues are devoted to an expanded highway program. These motorists, however, will have justifiable cause for complaint if the start of the program for more, better, and safer highways is delayed until July 1955.

OUR HIGHWAY DEFICIENCY

The failure, during the past two decades, of the Nation's highway program to keep pace with its growth in population and motor vehicles has created one of the greatest deficiencies in our national economy.

In 1940, less than 35 million motor vehicles were licensed in the United States. In 1952, more than 53 million motor vehicles were licensed. This was an increase of 50 percent in the number of automobiles and trucks on our highways. The traffic-load increase probably was even greater, for the average car owner today drives more miles a day than he ever has.

Despite this more than 50-percent increase in the traffic load, the mileage of new roads constructed and old ones replaced in the last few years was not much greater than during the thirties. We have been making little or no gain in providing better or safer highways for those who by increased gasoline taxes are providing the money to build roads. More money, it is true, has been spent on highways in recent years than in the thirties, but due to the depreciated dollar, or to state it another way, due to higher construction costs, we have not obtained any material increase in better highways.

During 1953, the highway directors of the 48 States, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia made estimates of the number of miles of highways in each of the States or Territories that were in need of improvement. These men, probably, are in closer touch and know the Nation's highway problems better than any others. Their combined estimate was that 429,282 miles of highways in the Nation are in need of improvement. Their combined estimate on the cost of this needed highway work was that $34,951,312,000, say $35 billion, was required to do this job adequately.

TOLL ROADS

There are those who think, or profess to think, that toll roads, financed by private interests or the States, can go a long way toward solving our highway deficiency. This, in my opinion, is an overly optimistic view. Toll roads are all right. Toll roads should be encouraged wherever feasible. Toll roads will help. However, toll roads will fall far short of solving the traffic problem.

Today, only 641 miles of toll roads are in operation in the United States. Another 1,172 miles of toll roads are under construction which will require at least 3 years to complete. An additional 818 miles of toll roads have been proposed and are in early planning study stages. Altogether, completed, under construction, and proposed there are only about 2,600 miles of toll roads. These toll roads represent only about one-tenth of 1 percent of the 3 million miles of roads on the Federal highway system and only about one-half of 1 percent of the 429,282 miles of highways in the several States and Territories which the State highway directors say are in need of improvement.

The one and only complete answer to solving the Nation's $35 billion highway deficiency is larger appropriations by the Federal Congress and by the State legislatures for road and bridge-building purposes. One of the most effective steps toward obtaining the additional money required would be for both the Federal Government and the States to stop diverting gasoline tax revenues to other purposes than road building.

The Federal Government should spend on highways every dollar it obtains from motorists in Federal gasoline and diesel oil taxes at least until the present highway deficiency is materially lessened. Let Congress, if it wishes, spend on other than highway purposes the approximately billion and a quarter dollars it collects annually from excise taxes on new automobiles, trucks, tires, tubes, and auto accessories. It should not, however, dip into Federal gasoline-tax revenues and use them for other purposes than roads.

When the Congress or the State legislatures make appropriations for highways, members should not look upon these appropriations as expenditures but rather as investments.

Many of our great railway corporations are heavily in debt. Often their profits are not as large as in former years. Still the directors of these railroads borrow additional funds to modernize their lines and equipment in order to make their railroads more efficient. These directors, all hardheaded businessmen, regard the money put into these improvements as good business investments that will be returned to the railroads through savings.

The same sound business principle should cause legislators who, in fact, are the directors of the Nation and of the States, to provide funds for better highways, in order to make the Nation's motor transportation more efficient and less costly.

The money invested in highways will be returned in savings to those who use these roads and to the national economy.

Studies made by the Automobile Manufacturers' Association reveal that if this Nation, today, had an adequate interstate highway system, that the savings to motorists would total more than $2 billion a year, which sum is the equivalent to a 6 percent return on the $35 billion investment which the Nation's State highway directors say will be required to place all of the Nation's highways in first class condition.

The Automobile Manufacturers' Association survey figures show adequate highways would produce these savings: $550 million to motorists from a saving

on gasoline, brakes, and tires, $725 million to motorists through traffic accident reduction, and $825 million to commercial vehicle owners in time savings.

The Nation cannot, due to financial limitations, overcome its highway deficiency in a year or just a few years. It should, however, move as soon and as fast as possible to overcome it.

The American people are going to pay for more, better, and safer highways whether these are built or not. If these highways are built the people will pay for them in taxes. If these highways are not built, motorists will pay for them just the same through increased medical and hospital bills, in costlier automobile repair bills, in added wear and tear on their tires and cars and in higher automobile insurances rates.

Appended to this address is a table showing the present sums allocated to each State for the year July 1, 1954 to June 30, 1955, under the $575 million appropriation bill passed last year and also, the amounts by which the money available to each State will be increased if my bill is enacted by Congress during the next few months.

Chart showing the present apportionment by States of Federal-aid highway funds for fiscal year beginning July 1, 1954, and the additional funds each State would receive under the bill introduced by Representative Mack, Republican, of Washington

	Present apportionment	Increase proposed by Representative MACK [1]	1954–55 total under Mack bill [1]
Alabama	$11, 699, 238	$5, 814, 619	$17, 443, 857
Arizona	7, 090, 267	3, 545, 133	10, 635, 400
Arkansas	8, 552, 216	4, 276, 108	12. 828. 324
California	30, 269, 263	15, 134, 631	45. 403, 894
Colorado	8, 962, 425	4, 481. 212	13, 443, 637
Connecticut	5, 177, 072	2, 588, 536	7, 765, 608
Delaware	2. 409, 449	1, 204, 724	3. 614, 173
Florida	9, 442, 291	4. 721, 145	14, 163, 436
Georgia	13. 335, 300	6, 667, 650	20, 002, 950
Idaho	5, 738, 448	2, 869, 224	8, 607, 672
Illinois	25, 055, 311	12, 527, 655	37, 582, 966
Indiana	13, 697. 571	6, 848, 785	20, 546, 356
Iowa	12, 505, 287	6, 252, 643	18, 757, 930
Kansas	12, 035, 698	6. 017, 849	18. 053, 547
Kentucky	10, 170, 437	5, 085, 218	15, 255, 655
Louisiana	8, 983, 105	4, 491, 552	13, 474, 657
Maine	4, 318. 722	2, 159, 361	6, 478, 083
Maryland	5, 998, 746	2, 888, 373	8, 887, 119
Massachusetts	10. 224, 769	5, 112, 384	15. 337, 153
Michigan	19. 363, 779	9, 681, 889	29, 045, 668
Minnesota	13, 741, 435	6, 870, 717	20, 612, 152
Mississippi	9, 264, 239	4, 632, 119	13, 896, 358
Missouri	16, 087, 259	8, 043, 629	24, 130, 888
Montana	9, 167, 781	4, 583, 890	13, 751, 671
Nebraska	9, 485, 200	4, 742, 600	14, 227, 800
Nevada	5, 730, 198	2, 865, 099	8, 595, 297
New Hampshire	2, 532, 280	1, 266, 140	3, 798, 420
New Jersey	10, 486, 958	5, 243, 479	15, 730, 437
New Mexico	7, 602, 745	3, 801, 372	11, 404, 117
New York	35, 428, 657	17. 714. 328	53, 142, 985
North Carolina	13, 669. 505	6, 834. 752	20, 404. 257
North Dakota	6, 757, 350	3, 378, 675	10, 136, 025
Ohio	22, 493, 115	11. 246. 557	33. 739, 672
Oklahoma	11, 052, 688	5. 526, 344	16. 579. 032
Oregon	8. 661, 811	4, 330. 905	12, 992, 716
Pennsylvania	26, 616, 706	13, 308. 353	39, 925, 059
Rhode Island	3, 097, 079	1, 548. 539	4, 645. 618
South Carolina	7, 326, 960	3, 663, 480	10, 990, 440
South Dakota	7, 245, 354	3, 622, 677	10, 868, 031
Tennessee	11, 989, 709	5, 994, 854	17, 983, 553
Texas	34, 757, 747	17, 378, 873	52, 136, 620
Utah	5, 563, 341	2, 781, 670	8, 345, 011
Vermont	2, 342, 840	1, 171, 420	3, 514, 260
Virginia	10, 892, 628	5, 446, 324	16, 338, 952
Washington	9, 240, 247	4, 620, 123	13, 860, 370
West Virginia	6, 174, 811	3, 087, 405	9, 262, 216
Wisconsin	13, 110, 327	6, 555, 163	19, 665, 490
Wyoming	5, 610, 550	2, 805, 275	8, 415, 825
Hawaii	2, 464, 524	1, 232, 262	3, 696, 786
District of Columbia	3, 298, 123	1, 649, 061	4, 947, 184
Puerto Rico	3, 773, 439	1, 886, 719	5, 660, 158

[1] Approximate.

Parcel-Post Size and Weight Limitations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 11, 1954

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by me before the Subcommittee on Postal Operations of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service on January 11, 1954:

Madam Chairman and members of the committee, I am grateful for this opportunity to appear before you to give certain facts and conclusions of mine concerning this controversial issue of parcel-post size and weight limitations.

I want to say at the outset that I bear no ill will toward the Railway Express Agency or anyone else who may hold opinions contrary to mine. I trust their position will be set forth fully in this record. There are some facts on both sides of this question that can best be had from those who have a direct interest in the matter. That is why I deem it appropriate for this hearing to be held on this subject—to give both sides an opportunity to present their views thoroughly.

Of course, we who serve on the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee have an important responsibility to decide not only as between the direct antagonists on this issue, but also on behalf of the general public whom we represent in Congress. The parcel-post system is a service of the post office department that reaches the entire population of this country. This issue, therefore, must be decided primarily on the basis of what is best for 160 million fellow-countrymen; and secondarily to meet the desires of special interests, whether they be on this side or that side of the issue.

It is appropriate that hearings be held at this time, because we now have had 2 full years experience with Public Law 199, which was passed in the preceding Democratic Congress. Based on 2 years' experience, I believe the present Congress should have an adequate basis on which to make a proper judgment for future policy. The facts properly assembled on this subject, should speak for themselves. There is no purpose served in resorting to cliches, name-calling, or partisan argument.

I introduced my bill to repeal Public Law 199 almost a year ago. I thought the facts were clear then that Congress had made a mistake—an honest mistake, wherein sympathy for the Express Agency outweighed a realistic appraisal of the damage which would be done to the Post Office Department and the general public. Events of the past year have confirmed my previous conclusion.

In my statement today I want to try to shed light on some questions which I believe go to the heart of this controversy. These questions are:

What has been the effect of this legislation?

Is there justification for curtailing parcel post service for the general public with the avowed purpose of aiding a special group?

Is there justification for discriminating against parcel post users on the basis of the area in which they live?

What were the arguments in favor of the passage of Public Law 199—and how have these arguments stood up, after 2 years' experience with the law?

Is parcel post a threat to "private enterprise"?

What results or consequences can be anticipated from the repeal of Public Law 199?

First, what has been the effect of this legislation? What about the general public, the Post Office Department, the express agency, the railroads and the employees of these agencies?

As far as the general public is concerned, there obviously is substantial dissatisfaction with the present size and weight limits. The amount of protest mail which all of us in Congress have received is one indication. Similarly, the Post Office Department has received numerous complaints. In fact, official mention of the criticism and dissatisfaction of the public toward the present law was noted in the last annual report of the Department.

Perhaps those best qualified to judge how the public feels are the postal clerks who are assigned to the windows for the acceptance of parcels in first-class post offices. A type measure is a much-used implement of their task. A reference book listing first-class post offices must constantly be referred to. I am told that these clerks are almost unanimous in their dislike for the new limitations—because of the abuse they get from patrons who dislike or cannot understand the differences and complexities which presently govern the acceptance of parcels. Some incidents were reported to me in the recent Christmas-mailing season where parcel post clerks were simply worn down by the strenuous objections raised by some mailers. The clerks accepted oversize and overweight packages, notwithstanding the law, because they were hopelessly unable to explain the logic of the situation to some abusive objectors. The clerks had to deal with too many who persisted in mailing parcels formerly acceptable which are now oversize or overweight.

An unusual twist to this situation is the fact that the Express Agency has wisely sought to capitalize directly on this public dissatisfaction with parcel post service. In its advertisements, the agency blandly proclaims that express service (in contrast to parcel post) has no size and weight limitations.

Public dislike of something is not always a final gage of what is proper. No one likes taxes—yet we have to have them. In the case of parcel post size and weight limits, however, I think the general public is justified in their dissatisfaction. For more than 20 years prior to January 1, 1952, the Post Office Department provided a parcel-post service which permitted 70 pounds and 100 inches per parcel. The general public cannot understand the reasons why, or the justification for, the limitations imposed in 1952.

What about the effect of Public Law 199 on the Post Office Department? The Department originally opposed this law because of administrative difficulties which they foresaw—nevertheless, they have endeavored to give it a fair test. I do not want to presume to speak for the Department, but I do want to summarize some of the effects on the Department, insofar as I know them.

When I introduced my bill last February, I estimated that the size and weight limitations had caused a net loss of revenue to the Department of some $60 million—that it had been impossible by that margain to cut costs to keep pace with the reductions in revenues resulting from barring the high-revenue parcels from the mails. Sometime later, the Department made an official estimate in the parcel post rate case before the Interstate Commerce Commission that the net revenue loss resulting from the size and weight limitation was $52,400,000. Undoubtedly, since that time, the Department has made further studies which will be reported on in this hearing. Taking into account the 37-percent rate increase which became applicable for parcel post last October 1,

1953, it is obvious that the net revenue loss at present rates is in excess of $75 million.

In other words, in round figures, about $100 million worth of parcel business at present rate levels has been barred from the mails by Public Law 199 and the Department has been able to cut costs only $25 million as a result of the lesser parcel volume. In fact, I understand that in certain handling operations postal costs are actually higher now, with a lesser poundage of parcel post—because the splitting of shipments makes for higher handling costs, in the Department as well as for the mailer.

Concerning the subject of parcel-post rates, I want to make my position clear: I am opposed to a subsidized parcel-post system. I believe parcel post should pay its own way. Too often, the separate questions of rates and service are confused. Making the service available is one thing; placing the proper charge on the service is another matter. I think the facts are entirely clear that it was the rate equation—not the service equation—which caused the Express Agency problem in the immediate postwar years. The Express Agency had some of its most profitable years prior to that, and, I emphasize, the prosperity was under the old size and weight limits of parcel post.

Getting back to the effects of this law on the Post Office Department, let me point out one far-reaching effect of curtailed service that has ominous implications. The Post Office Department is committed to a universal service throughout the length and breadth of the land. That means that it must average out the high traffic costs of sparse-volume areas with the low costs of high-volume areas. It probably costs the Department several dollars to deliver a 3-cent letter in certain areas of Alaska. On the other hand, there is a good margin of profit in handling a heavy first-class letter locally or between metropolitan areas. The same situation applies, in general, to the movement of parcel post. A volume shipment between first-class post offices is much less expensive to handle proportionately than a single parcel on an R. F. D. route. In the case of first-class mail, Congress has given the Department a monopoly in handling all first-class mail so that no one can come in and skim off the profitable business while leaving the Department with the dregs. Public Law 199 did exactly the opposite in the case of parcel post: It prohibited the Department from handling the profitable end of the business. Again, what is the effect of this? Obviously, the general level of parcel-post rates must rise accordingly. The farmer, who previously got a break because of volume shipments elsewhere in the parcel-post system, will necessarily have to pay higher rates in the future, if the restrictions of this law are retained. In fact, in the recent parcel-post rate-increase case, it was acknowledged by the Post Office Department that approximately one-third of the rate increase that was imposed, which was made effective last October 1, was due solely to the effects of the parcel-post size and weight curtailment.

Let me add one further comment about parcel-post rates and express rates. Some people assume that the service and costs are the same and that hence the rates should be the same. Actually, the express service has always been a specialized deluxe service with certain features that parcel post has never had (insurance, pickup service, shipment records, expedited service, etc.). That this deluxe service is desired by many is attested by the large number of shipments that Railway Express has in the weight range of 1 to 20 pounds, where it might be anticipated that parcel post would be used almost exclusively. According to express company statistics about 43 percent of l. c. l. (less-than-carload lots) express shipments are in that weight range, or almost 40 million shipments in 1952.

Because of this de luxe service and because the Express Agency does not have the advantage of density traffic and the sharing of overhead such as parcel post enjoys, the Express Agency says it needs a minimum of $2.30 per shipment, even on the 1- to 20-pound parcels, although the ICC recently rejected this proposed minimum charge. The Express Agency can make a good case for substantially increased express rates, because the analyses of the Interstate Commerce Commission show that express revenues pay for less than half of the costs of the service to the railroads. In other words, the freight traffic of the railroads is subsidizing the express and other "head-end" passenger traffic by a very substantial amount.

As compared with the minimum of $2.30 which the Express Agency says it needs, for any parcel the Post Office Department can provide a lesser, "streamlined" package delivery service at a much lower cost. The Post Office Department can make money handling parcels on which the Express Agency loses money—and that is no reflection on the efficiency of the Express Agency, but a simple statement of economic fact.

When treated as a unit and when permitted to handle the normal volume between metropolitan centers, the Post Office Department has operating advantages which cannot be matched by an individual private enterprise—unless the enterprise were to take over the entire function of the Post Office Department as an entity. This basic operating advantage which the Post Office Department enjoys is the fundamental reason why the parcel post system exists. In my opinion, Public Law 199 is doing a serious injustice to patrons of first-class post offices in not permitting them to have the full advantages of this system—and at the same time the law is undermining for the future the ability of the service to provide what it is now providing for the rural patrons of parcel post.

So much for the effects of this law on the Post Office Department and the parcel post system. Let me turn now to the effects of this law on the Express Agency, the railroads, their employes, etc.

The available statistics show that the transportation revenues of the Express Agency did increase somewhat in 1952 and 1953 as compared with the immediate preceding years. Total revenues for 1952 were reported by the Interstate Commerce Commission to be $402 million, as against $326 million in 1951. It appears, however, that about $40 million of the $76 million increase was due to rate increases which became effective on November 15, 1951, and February 28, 1952. Of the $36 million due to increased traffic, it must be remembered that this includes carload traffic, and also LCL traffic over 70 pounds and under 20 pounds—none of which was affected by Public Law 199. On the basis of Express Agency figures about 45 percent of the LCL traffic and, of course, none of the carload traffic fall within the 20–70-pound range affected by Public Law 199.

In other words, it appears that of the $100 million of traffic driven out of the Post Office Department, the Express Agency has been able to attract less than $20 million of it. What happened to the rest? It has gone to trucks, private carriage, split parcel-post shipments, or just has not moved at all.

It seems obvious to me that the railroads and railroad workers have fared badly as a result of this law. I am particularly conscious of the plight of railroad employees because I happen to have many railroad workers in my district and only recently the railroads have made severe layoffs due to a general decline in traffic.

Traditionally, almost all of parcel post moves by rail. What is more, the payments of the Post Office Department for this transportation are much more compensatory to the railroads than Express Agency payments to the railroads for the same service. It all adds up to this: The railroads have lost business and revenues as a result of this law; and that in turn is reflected in railroad jobs—because roughly half of all railroad revenues are paid out to employees in wages and salaries.

Statistics of the ICC show that average employment for the Express Agency increased from 44,546 in 1951 to 46,487 in 1952, or an increase of 1,941 jobs. I am glad that these additional jobs exist in the express organization. Nineteen hundred jobs, however, is a substantial difference from the 40,000 jobs which were claimed to have been lost to parcel-post diversion, when the size and weight bill was under consideration in 1951. As a matter of fact even in 1951, the Express Agency had almost exactly the same number of employees as in prewar 1940.

Members of the committee, I venture the assertion that as a result of this size and weight law there has been a net decrease in railroad employment which exceeds the nominal increase in jobs which the express agency has had.

What about the discriminatory aspects of Public Law 199? Can a justification be made for withholding from the patrons of first-class post offices a postal service which is provided to the remainder of the population? I am not competent to pass on the legal aspects of the question, but I am told that actually there is a substantial constitutional question involved, that the postal service of the Government has been judged to be an essential service which cannot be withheld without good reason. Regardless of the legal aspects, I think it is wrong that patrons of first-class post offices are discriminated against. I am well aware of the argument that was used at the time the law was passed: that there was no discrimination involved because most first-class post-office areas had express service or alternative shipping facilities to send packages.

The plain fact is that there is no comparable service to parcel post. The first and foremost difference is that of rates. If the mailer of a package in a first-class post office city does not want to have the frills of express service, why should he be forced to use that service? And why is he not entitled, the same as his rural or small city neighbor, to the economical rates which are inherent to a parcel post type of operation? Express service, while a de luxe service, actually has some disadvantages too: it does not reach into many areas where postal service is had, and delivery of packages can not normally be had on Saturdays. In short, it seems to me that there is unwarranted discrimination against patrons of first-class post offices under this law.

The free-enterprise argument is the one most often cited in support of Public Law 199. No one is a firmer believer in free enterprise than I. I have been engaged actively in free enterprise for many years before I was elected to Congress. I believe I know something about it. Just who is free enterprise? Is it the Railway Express Agency or is it approximately 6 million farms, 640,000 service establishments, 250,000 manufacturers, 1,700,000 retail merchants, and 240,000 wholesalers serving 160 million Americans, all of whom use the mails?

I don't think many people can be sold the bill of goods that the Post Office Department is a threat to free enterprise. I don't think that very many people believe that the parcel-post system is a socialistic scheme or is tinged with red. We Republicans think that there were some things in Washington that tended in that direction during the last 20 years, but the parcel-post system and the former size and weight limitations are and were respected parts of our economy, long before that. No; the parcel-post system and

the old size and weight limitations bear the full stamp of approval that the test of time can give. Furthermore, it should not be overlooked that the Post Office Department is a substantial support for free enterprise, in the large volume of goods and services which it buys from transportation agencies, contractors, landlords, etc., coast to coast, and in the transportation wherewithal, it provides for small business or any business to grow and prosper.

What can be expected with the repeal of Public Law 199? In my opinion, repeal of this law can be of substantial help to the Postmaster General by (1) increasing fourth-class postal revenues, (2) reducing unit costs in parcel-post operations, and (3) making possible reduction in parcel-post rates in the near future. Also $75 million of net revenue, which I believe will result, can be of substantial help in making readjustments in postal salaries which I believe are overdue. Most important of all, I believe that reversion to the old size and weight limits will restore an economic balance to the parcel-post system and remove the unwarranted discrimination which presently exists against certain mail users.

A 5 Percent Flat National Manufacturer's Excise Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NOAH M. MASON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 11, 1954

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, consistent with my public statements over the past months, I have introduced a bill to transform the Federal excise system from a hodge-podge of selective and discriminatory levies into a sound and fair tax instrument. My bill would apply a uniform rate of tax to all end products of manufacture and would repeal all existing excises except those levied on alcoholic beverages and tobacco. The excises to be repealed include all those levied for revenue purposes at the retail level, all levied on communication and transportation, all admission taxes, as well as all those now levied on manufactured products.

The exemptions from the uniform tax would be all foods, whether for human or animal consumption, seeds, fertilizers, insecticides, fungicides, defoliants, drugs, printed material used exclusively for and by the blind, and religious articles.

The exceptions to repeal of all existing excises, other than those on alcoholic beverages and tobacco, are confined to imposts which are levied for regulatory instead of revenue purposes.

My intent is to maintain the existing level of excise revenues, not to increase them. Hence, I have set the rate of uniform tax at 5 percent on the basis of estimates that this would yield revenue equivalent to the $5½ billion now derived from the excises to be replaced.

Mr. Speaker, in introducing this bill for initial consideration of the House Ways and Means Committee, I do so with the conviction that it offers the only way to end the bitterness and resentment against the present excises. In their selectivity, these imposts are harmful and unfair to the companies and industries involved, to their employees, and to the communities and areas in which they are located. My interest in and long study of this situation has convinced me that adoption of a uniform replacement tax is the only way by which the existing revenue can be maintained and the irritation and controversy caused by selective excises can be ended.

I understand the Treasury has suggestions for moderating some of the most flagrant abuses of the present system, making up for the lost revenue by extending the list of taxable items. While this approach would be better than nothing for those industries which would receive some relief from present high rates, it would not eliminate the basic objection of being subject to arbitrary and selective taxation, and would create new sources of bitterness and opposition from the industries whose products would be subject to tax for the first time. We simply cannot cure the inequities of selective taxation by makeshifts of this kind.

Mr. Speaker, I call upon the members of both major political parties to give my proposal their most objective and sympathetic consideration. In doing so, I am acutely aware of the misunderstandings and misinformation which have existed in regard to this proposal. I hope all concerned will recognize the truth of these points:

First. A uniform excise would not be a new tax—it would simply be the fair use of a tax method which goes back to the beginnings of the Republic. As a replacement tax, it would impose no additional tax burden on the public at large, nor upon any segment thereof.

Second. This tax would not shift tax burdens from the higher incomes to the lower incomes. Items now taxed at rates up to 20 percent are used universally throughout the economy without regard to income levels. The replacement of these rates by the low uniform rate of 5 percent, and elimination of excises on services, would fully offset the burden on the consumers of applying the tax across the board on manufactured end products. Lower income groups would have special advantage from the exemption of food and drug products. With these exemptions, careful studies have shown that there should be no shift in tax burdens at all.

Third. A uniform excise will not be hidden. As compared to existing excises, it would be more open and aboveboard. Actually, it would be impossible to hide the fact of a uniform tax from our well-informed citizens, whereas today even a tax expert cannot always be sure what is and what is not taxed under the present hodgepodge.

Fourth. The tax would not pyramid any more than present excise and other business taxes pyramid.

Fifth. Because of the uniformity and low rate of tax, the effect on industries—and their employees and communities in which located—whose products were being taxed for the first time would be minimized. In competing for the consumers' dollar, these industries would be at no greater disadvantage than all other industries.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to providing an equitable and defensible means of excise taxation, my bill would eliminate many of the administrative and compliance problems which characterize the present system and are inevitable under any selective system. In preparing this bill, I have sought and received the advice and counsel of leading tax experts from American industry, mostly men who are in intimate touch with day-to-day operation of the present system. Wherever possible, trouble points of the present system have been avoided, and provisions have been inserted which should assure the maximum amount of revenue to the Government at the least cost and inconvenience to the taxpayers. The burdens of tax collection and payment are always onerous, but I am certain that this bill as drafted will prove to be one of the most workable and least controversial pieces of major tax legislation ever enacted. However, despite the accumulated knowledge and judgment which has gone into the drafting of this bill, I have no illusions that it is perfect. I urge every affected industry, through individual companies or their trade groups, to give it the most careful study, and to submit suggestions for amendment on any aspect in regard to which they believe improvement can be made.

In a future statement I will outline the major provisions of the bill and explain in some detail how they would work.

My final plea for understanding at this time is directed to the various segments of industry and business, and to taxpayers at large. The bill offers a bold and new concept in Federal tax policy—fairness for all and discrimination against none. The issues involved transcend political, business, and group interest. I solicit the support of all good citizens.

Action Needed To Save the Coal Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT C. BYRD
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 11, 1954

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Speaker, in his evening radio and television address to the American people last week President Eisenhower stated that "'help' is the keyword of the administration," and that "this administration believes that no American—no one group of Americans—can truly prosper unless all Americans prosper." In his state of the Union message on Thursday Mr. Eisenhower stated as one of the great purposes of government recognized by this administration "concern for the human problems of our citizens," and he placed emphasis upon the American economy as "one of the wonders of the world." The President expressed a determination upon the part of the present administration to "keep

our economy strong and to keep it growing."

I am glad that this administration is taking the position that no American can truly prosper unless all Americans prosper, because the deduction naturally follows that America cannot truly prosper when one of its component parts is suffering such adverse economic disturbances as are presently being suffered by the people of West Virginia. This administration, in the light of the foregoing quotations from the President's speech, must surely take cognizance of the disturbing problems which confront the coal industry, and the administration must certainly assume the responsibility for finding a solution to those problems.

Upon leaving Beckley, the largest city of my county, on Monday of last week, I saw hundreds of men standing in line awaiting their turn to make application for unemployment compensation. The same sight is becoming a common one throughout the coal-mining areas of southern West Virginia. These lines of hungry, unemployed coal miners are reminiscent of an earlier day. Whether the situation may be termed a recession or a depression is beside the point. Hunger and privation are fully as terrible in the one case as in the other.

This past weekend, the West Virginia Department of Employment Security supplied me with a report depicting unemployment conditions currently existing in West Virginia. A study of this report reveals a very discouraging picture. At the end of December 1953, there were 31,930 applications for work on file at the 23 State employment security offices. This was an increase of 44 percent over the number on file at the end of December 1952. There were 8,837 applications for work on file in the three offices which serve the Sixth West Virgina District which I represent. This was an increase of 51 percent over the number on file at the end of December 1952.

During December 1953, there were 17,352 initial claims filed for unemployment compensation. This was an 80-percent increase over the number filed in December 1952. There were 4,674 initial claims filed in the Sixth Congressional District during the month of December 1953, and this was more than twice the 2,041 filed in December 1952—an increase of 129 percent. This substantial rise in the level of initial claims over a year is again indicative of the continuing rise in new unemployment in the State.

The 56,349 continued claims filed for unemployment compensation this past December was 54 percent more than were filed during December 1952. There were 12,949 continued claims filed in the Sixth Congressional District, an 82-percent increase over the number filed in December 1952. This increase in continued claims not only indicates the upturn in unemployment, but it is also indicative of the longer duration of unemployment.

Claims activities so far this January indicate a continuing rise in the already high level of unemployment in West Virginia.

Information received last week from the West Virginia Department of Mines indicates that 170 commercial mines have closed in West Virginia during the year of 1953 out of a total number of 800 mines which were operating at the beginning of that year. In addition to the 170 which have been shut down completely, 64 other mines reported no production in 1953. Overall employment in the coal-mining industry, I am further advised by this source, has receded from a total number of 125,669 miners employed in 1948 to 85,490 as of the 31st day of December 1953. In other words, 40,179—or 1 out of every 3—coal miners have lost their jobs over the past 5 years. In most cases, these discharged men are too old to gain employment elsewhere, and they lack the necessary training for employment in other industrial fields. What is going to become of these men and their families? The administration must supplement its kind words with positive action. Action, not words, is the order of the day, so far as unemployed men are concerned. What kind of action is necessary?

The answer to this question is obvious. Last year, 132,000,0000 barrels of residual oil were imported into this country from South America. This figure constitutes the most sizable importation of residual oil ever to be brought into the country in any 1 year, and it approximates three times the amount of residual oil which was imported in 1946—the figure that year being 45,000,000 barrels. Last year's importation of oil displaced about 32,000,000 tons of coal. This was a loss in coal tonnage large enough to account for much of the unemployment presently existing in the finest coal fields of our Nation. Such a loss is largely responsible for the difficulties which confront not only those people directly employed in the coal industry, but also those who are engaged in business and in the professions.

I maintain that the answer to the problem lies in legislative action by the Congress. I sincerely hope that the administration and the President will lend support to legislation limiting the importation of residual oil into the country. With the passage of such legislation, coal markets can be regained; those people who depend upon a healthy and thriving coal industry for a living can be given new hope in its future; and, stability and confidence will be restored in this vital segment of our economy.

Facts and Figures Point Up Outlook for Normal Prosperity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDGAR A. JONAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 11, 1954

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to point out that of late some politically inspired prophets of economic doom have seized upon figures relating to employment throughout the United States as the basis for predicting depression and disaster.

We are told that unemployment in this country rose to a total of about 1,850,000 last December, and that it approximates 2,000,000 today. This is cited as evidence that depression is just around the corner. Yet Government figures show that no more, and probably fewer, lack jobs now than lacked them a year ago. And 1953 marked the period of highest employment in the Nation's history.

It is generally conceded that the 8 years since World War II—from 1945 through 1953—were years of continuous prosperity. Highest employment was reached only 2 months ago. The period of lowest employment was in February 1950.

Now it is true, Mr. Speaker, that unemployment increased during December by 422,000, and by a lesser number in the first week of this month. But why is this true?

Well, winter is the off season for agricultural employment. In December many of the great automotive industrial plants were retooling for the new motor-car models, which have been unveiled to the public since the first of the year. And a tremendous number of industrial and commercial establishments closed for inventory at the end of the year.

In spite of the rise in unemployment over the last few weeks, the number of jobless still is small. It is small, indeed, in comparison with the total of more than sixty-one million now gainfully employed in the United States.

The number of unemployed looks smaller than ever, when it is considered that even at the top—2 months ago—there were 1,162,000 workers without jobs.

This number represented then, as it does now, approximately the total falling into three major classifications—those out of work temporarily, while changing jobs; those at home because of illness; and those voluntarily ceasing to work, although remaining on the employment rolls.

Therefore, it follows, Mr. Speaker, that the number of unemployed, as of today, is no more significant than was the number of unemployed a year ago today.

The number without jobs on any day, or in any month, is not a cause. It is an effect. It can serve as no basis on which to forecast the economic future. The true basis for prediction exists rather in the outlook and the planning of business and industrial management.

Announcements by American industrial managers indicate that this year industry will spend just about as much for expansion of plant and equipment as it did in the banner year of 1953.

The amount of building-construction work now on the boards indicates that this year substantially the same number of new homes will be built as were put up during the banner year of 1953. And commercial construction appears certain to keep pace.

Mr. Speaker, to me at least, all of this does not look like economic recession. It looks more like continued prosperity, and perhaps more of it. It looks like more jobs, instead of fewer. With the leveling off of war production, it seems

to me, the Nation is safely converting to a peacetime economy.

We are not moving from a period of great prosperity into a period of lesser prosperity. We are moving, I believe, from a "phony," Korean war-based prosperity into a sound and lasting prosperity, based upon the enjoyment of more things of pleasure and necessity by every American.

Herein, I believe, lies the real answer to the dismal forebodings of the politically inspired prophets of economic disaster.

Protecting the Public Health

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 11, 1954

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, since the end of World War II, the use of new chemicals in the production of pesticides has increased at such a rate that the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of 1938 has, for all intent and purposes relative to pesticides, become obsolete. During the last session of this Congress, I introduced legislation, H. R. 4277, to amend the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act so that officials of the Food and Drug Administration could more easily cope with the present situation.

Many have become quite fearful of any or all pesticide chemicals—some of these fears are based on fact, but the vast majority have arisen from vicious propaganda designed to provoke hysteria. The very nature of the existing laws tends to foster rather than eliminate these fears. Under present conditions, the manufacturer of a new pesticide chemical need only to apply to the Secretary of Agriculture and get his approval under the Federal Insecticide, Rodenticide, and Fungicide Act of 1947 in order to place his product on the market. A tolerance need not be established and, therefore, it was possible that a dangerous product could be placed on the market.

I believe it is proper to point out at this time that industry has been quite careful to insure that the products they place on the market are not dangerous to public health. Recently, one manufacturer withdrew his product voluntarily from the market just as soon as he found out it might be dangerous to public health. This was done before his product was investigated by Food and Drug. Had this individual been without scruples and cared only for economic gains, he could have let his product remain on the market until such time as Federal authorities confiscated it as poisonous or deleterious.

Under the provisions of the bill which I have introduced today, no product could be placed on the market unless a tolerance is first established.

When I introduced the first pesticide residue bill, I said that it was the culmination of many hours of conferences with interested groups and was the common ground of thinking for all concerned. There were some differences of thinking in respect to some of the provisions and language. Hearings were held by a subcommittee of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee headed by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER], and it was determined that further study should be made with the hopes that the differences could be ironed out. It was agreed that the counsel for the committee along with representatives of the Food and Drug Administration, the Department of Agriculture, the farming industry, the manufacturing industry, and myself should meet and recommend any changes which might be necessary.

The meetings have been held. Officials of Food and Drug, Agriculture, land-grant colleges, farm organizations, chemical industry, and myself have held several conferences and have agreed on all major issues in question with the result being the clean bill which I introduced today.

PRESENT LAW

Under the provisions of the 1938 act, a food is considered adulterated if it bears or contains any poisonous or deleterious substance which is unnecessary or which exceeds an amount specified by regulations of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. Pesticide chemicals used in agriculture are generally considered to be poisonous or deleterious substances, and, as such, are subject to the provisions of the act limiting the amount which may remain in or on food. The amount which may remain in or on food, which is determined by secretarial regulations, is generally referred to as a tolerance.

The present procedure for establishing tolerances involves the holding of public hearings at which time evidence must be presented to show: First, the use of the pesticide chemical is necessary in the production of food; second, the amount of residues remaining in or on the food; and, third, toxicity data upon which tolerances adequate to protect the public health may be established.

This procedure has been in effect for over 15 years. I might point out that at the time this procedure was established, it was not anticipated that such tremendous gains would be made by industry. Many thought then as others did during the early 1800's in regard to the United States Patent Office when legislation was introduced to close that office because some felt that everything that was to be invented had been invented already. It would be folly, or the words of a person destitute of imagination, if he were to say nothing more could be invented and the Patent Office should be closed.

Mr. Speaker, it would border on the same today if someone were to say every new chemical pesticide had been discovered. Government and industry are just beginning to clear the way for new and better pesticides to curb, and perhaps some day completely eliminate, the staggering losses incurred by agriculture due to fungi and pests. These losses have cost not only agriculture, but the consumer as well, billions of dollars.

Industry has been faced with an almost insurmountable handicap in this field. This handicap has been the cumbersome and impracticable procedure to establish tolerances under existing laws. Since 1938, a tolerance has been established for only one pesticide chemical. In 1950 lengthy public hearings at a cost of nearly a half a million dollars to Government, to industry, to agricultural organizations, and to the various land-grant colleges were held. These hearings, despite the extensive hours of testimony, failed to produce the establishing of a single tolerance of any degree.

The bill which I introduced is designed to remedy this defect by providing a simple, more appropriate procedure to establish tolerances for pesticide chemicals and to prevent the use of the new pesticide chemical until such a tolerance as needed has been established.

SUMMARY OF PROCEDURE

Under my bill, the process for establishing a tolerance on a pesticide chemical used on raw agricultural commodities would be initiated by the manufacturer of the chemical, or by one similarly situated, or by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare initiative. Such person would file a petition with the Secretary requesting a tolerance with scientific data and reasons in support thereof, and would request the Secretary of Agriculture to certify to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare that the pesticide chemical was useful for its intended purpose, and that the requested tolerance was in line with the amount of residue likely to result when the pesticide chemical was used as proposed.

Within 90 days after this was done, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare would make public a regulation establishing a tolerance. If within this period the person petitioning for the tolerance requested, or the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare deemed it desirable, the matter would be submitted to an advisory committee of scientific experts familiar with the problems involved. Members of the advisory committee would be appointed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare from a list submitted by the National Academy of Sciences. The advisory committee, after studying the data before it, would make a report and recommendations of an advisory nature to the Secretary, who would consider the report in establishing a tolerance.

The bill also provides that anyone adversely affected by a tolerance issued under the foregoing procedure could request a public hearing on the tolerance or portions thereof deemed objectionable upon a showing of reasonable grounds. A public hearing would then be held on the controversial issue of the proposed tolerance. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare would then publish an order affirming or modifying the original tolerance upon the basis of evidence produced at the hearing. This order would be subject to court review in the manner generally prescribed in other regulatory statutes.

CONCLUSION

All in all, I believe the procedure specified in this bill would enable the prompt and efficient establishment of appropriate tolerances for pesticide chemicals used in or on raw agricultural commodities. This would definitely be to the advantage of all concerned with the use of pesticide chemicals. The food consumer for the first time would be assured that a tolerance assuring safety has been established for every pesticide chemical used in the production and storage of the raw agricultural commodity. At the same time, chemical manufacturers would have standards upon which to base recommendations to the grower in the use of these chemicals, and the grower would not have his products confiscated because he did not know the tolerance for the various chemicals.

The grower would be assured that he would be in compliance with the law if he followed the recommendations of these agencies and of the manufacturer. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare would have a definite standard to carry on their enforcement responsibilities as regards to a safe food supply under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act.

In view of the urgency of this legislation and the expressed need for it, as well as the complete agreement, I sincerely hope early action will be given this bill.

The Need for Increasing the Salaries of Postal Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT C. BYRD
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 11, 1954

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Speaker, I honestly feel that the time has come when Congress should reappraise the schedule of salary payments made to postal employees with a view to adjusting these salaries so that they will be more in line with increases in the cost of living, continuing heavy tax burdens, and those other factors which have eroded the substance of postal employees' take-home pay.

In my opinion, no other group of Federal employees enjoys as long a history of service to our nation as the United States postal workers. There is no group of employees in or out of the Federal employees enjoys as long a history with greater pride to its record of steadfast, loyal, and efficient service to our nation. Unfortunately, too many people seem to take the loyalty and devotion to duty of our postal carriers for granted, just as they do so many other important factors that join to make the American way of life. I have been impressed deeply by the famous words so often used to personalize the postal service:

Neither snow, nor rain, nor heat, nor gloom of night stays these carriers from the swift completion of their appointed rounds.

How many people have considered just what these words mean to us and to our country? Because of this loyalty and devotion, I feel that it is our responsibility in Congress to demonstrate to these employees that we recognize and appreciate their efforts and that every attempt will be made to see that they are treated as fairly as is possible.

I do not feel that it is necessary to discuss at length increases in the cost of living, increased taxes, reduced purchasing power of the dollar, or increased deductions for retirement; all of these facts are well known to us. But it is for other reasons also that I think an increase in salaries of postal employees is urgently required at this time.

Let us take, for example, the situation with regard to the increased productivity per worker in the Post Office Department. The type of activities engaged in by most of these employees is not too conducive to mechanization; because in sorting and handling mails and packages, it is still necessary for the human eye to differentiate between various names and addresses in order to assure that packages and letters are forwarded to their eventual destination with a minimum of delay. For this reason, any increase in the output per man-hour in the Post Office Department is largely the result of increased productivity on the part of these employees. During fiscal 1952, 49,740,510,000 pieces of mail were handled by the Post Office Department—the largest volume in any year of postal history. This was an increase of 6 per cent over the 1951 volume, and an increase of 32.9 per cent during the past 5-year period. While the volume of mail was increasing by over 30 per cent, the number of postal employees increased by slightly over 11 per cent in the years from 1947 through 1952, indicating that the output per man-hour must have increased considerably.

It should be remembered that production in a purely service institution of this kind is not as controllable as in many lines of business. The postal service does not choose its customers; it does not control the extent, time, or place that the patrons may hire its services. It cannot allow demands for its services to accumulate awaiting a time when facilities and personnel may render performance of duties under the most economical circumstances; neither can it stockpile productive effort to meet future increased or unusual demands. It must perform, with all possible speed and dispatch, when, where, and in whatever quantity the public chooses.

Among many little known facts about employees of the postal service, one is that it is necessary for them to study long hours at home on their own time in order that they may do their job more efficiently for the general benefit of everybody in our country. They must study changing schemes and transportation routing and destinations so that your mail may arrive more quickly at its appointed destination.

It would be possible to go into many more reasons for increasing postal salaries, but, unfortunately, our time here is limited. So, may I simply state my honest opinion on this matter. It is imperative that we in Congress enact pay raise legislation for postal employees as rapidly as possible to prove our trust in them; to reward them for their loyalty and devotion; to help them recoup a part of their losses resulting from increased prices and taxes, and decreased purchasing power of their take-home pay; to compensate their improved productivity; in short, because of the justice of the case made for such an increase in salary.

The Man Who Sentenced Beria

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 11, 1954

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, can the man who sentenced Beria give us a clue to what might happen in Russia? Liquidation of the Bolshevik clique by the professional military?

Reports indicate Beria was sentenced to death by the man he made eat crow in 1945–46, General Konev, Soviet opposite number to Gen. Mark Clark, on the allied commission in Austria. Konev, proud, oldtime professional, took his orders from Zheltov, bullnecked Beria hatchetman in Vienna.

Konev, short, well liked by his troops, was friendly to the West. He didn't last long in Vienna. Zheltov saw to that. Then, the tables turned. Stalin died (?), Beria is tried. Konev sentences him. Where's Zheltov?

Does this mean that the professional military of Russia has had its fill of the crum-bums in the Kremlin? Does it spell a better break for the Russian, his wife and family—for all the men and women whose kin spilled blood in the hopes of a better tomorrow? One wonders. One hopes. One prays.

SENATE

TUESDAY, JANUARY 12, 1954

(Legislative day of Thursday, January 7, 1954)

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

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

Almighty God, who knowest our frame and the frailties of our dust, we turn to Thee who alone canst fill our life with holy purpose. In the stillness of this hallowed moment we would bring to Thy altar the ancient sacrifice of an humble and a contrite heart. Breathe upon us, breath of God, with Thy quickening power restoring our souls, that we may feel a renewed sense of privilege as we enter upon the duties of yet another day.

We thank Thee for this new day, with all its precious possibilities, for its fleet-