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

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

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

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

MEMORIALS

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

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

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

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BOLAND:

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

By Mr. BURDICK:

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

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

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

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

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

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

SENATE

MONDAY, JUNE 15, 1953

(Legislative day of Monday, June 8, 1953)

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

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

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

Grant discernment that arises out of integrity of character.

The measured judgment born of mental maturity.

The prophetic insights arising out of spiritual awareness.

May the responsibility of office be borne with humility.

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

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

"Take from our souls the strain and stress.
And let our ordered lives confess
The beauty of Thy peace."

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF JOINT RESOLUTION

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on June 13, 1953, the President had approved and signed the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 76) designating the week beginning June 14, 1953, as "Theodore Roosevelt Week."

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

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

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

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

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4730) to provide for the conveyance by the United States to the city of Cincinnati, Ohio, of certain lands formerly owned by that city.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

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

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES SUBMITTED DURING RECESS

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

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

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

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

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

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

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

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

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

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

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

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

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

CALL OF THE ROLL

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

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

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

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

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

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

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

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

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

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

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

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

TRANSFER OF CERTAIN LAND TO STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA

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

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

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

REPORT ON CREATION OF OBLIGATION IN EXCESS OF APPROPRIATIONS

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

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS—WITHDRAWAL OF NAMES

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, withdrawing the names of sundry aliens from reports relating to aliens whose deportation had been suspended, heretofore transmitted to the Senate (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXPENSES OF CERTAIN UNITED STATES COMMISSIONERS

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

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

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

"Senate Joint Resolution 45

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

A resolution adopted by the Oklahoma Cattlemen's Association, relating to the purchase and distribution of certain beef by the Federal Government; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

By Mr. BUSH:

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

"House Joint Resolution 14

"Joint resolution urging repeal of Federal tax on motor fuel

"*Resolved by this assembly:*

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

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

"Whereas many of the States are in need of additional revenue for the construction and maintenance of their highways, but are experiencing extreme difficulty in their efforts to obtain additional revenues for highway purposes because of the magnitude of the existing overall tax burden now imposed upon the motor-using public; and

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

IVOR P. MUZZEY, D. M. D.,
President, Massachusetts Dental Society.
HAROLD E. TINGLEY, D. M. D.,
Secretary, Massachusetts Dental Society.

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

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

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

THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL
DIOCESE OF MASSACHUSETTS,
Boston, May 18, 1953.

The Honorable JOHN F. KENNEDY,
The United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

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

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

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

Faithfully yours,
PHILIP H. STAFFORD,
Secretary.

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

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

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

THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL
DIOCESE OF MASSACHUSETTS,
Boston, May 12, 1953.

The Honorable JOHN F. KENNEDY,
The United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

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

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

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

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

Faithfully yours,
PHILIP H. STAFFORD,
Secretary.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Commissioner Ewald W. Lund dissenting.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

[redacted], Abreu, Domingos Viegas.
[redacted], Achtman, Marcel or Mozes.
[redacted], Akliros, Lucas George or Lukas Acliros or Lucas Liros.
[redacted], Albers, Gustav Heinrich or Gustav H. Albers or Gustav Henry Albers or Gus Albrecht.
[redacted], Alexandris, Stamatios Anthony.
[redacted], Ali, George Hatim.
[redacted], Ali, Osmuth or Asmal Ullah or Osmuth Ullah or Armenthat Elluh and Asmath Ali.
[redacted], Alimanesteanu, Ileana (nee Eremie).
[redacted], Ambrosini, Vittorio.
[redacted], Anthony, Wellington.
[redacted], Antonopoulos, John G.
[redacted], Anthony, Mario Ivanov or Martin Ivanov Antonov.
[redacted], Antonsson, Valdemar Torsten or Valdemar Antonsson or Torsten Valdemar Antonessen.
[redacted], Arar, Alexandra (nee Alexandra Nikelsberg).
[redacted], Araujo, Antonio Jose or Antonio Jose De Araujo.
[redacted], Arcos, Jesus Martinez-De.
[redacted], Attin, Carol Diane or Carole Diani Attin.
[redacted], Badr, Sharof Yousey or Sharof Youssef Badr.
[redacted], Balanikas, Vasilia or Vasilia Vallas (nee Fargani).
[redacted], Baratta, Ennino or Pedro Gomez or Joseppe Bacchieri.
[redacted], Barilla, Muriel Mavis (nee Baker).
[redacted], Belanger, Marie Alice (nee Lecours).
[redacted], Bereincua, Teresa Calderon De or Teresa Calderon-Cazares.
[redacted], Bianchi, Ralph or Raffaele Bianchi.
[redacted], Bibliowicz, David or David Bibiqwicz Szmuklarewicz.
[redacted], Binder, John or Janos Binder or John Bender or Johann Binder.
[redacted], Bonnesen, Mary Ann Catherine.
[redacted], Bosch, Louis or Luis Bosch-Delgado.
[redacted], Botermans, Karel Frans.
[redacted], Bott, Shu-Ying (nee Shu-Ying Chen).
[redacted], Bottiglieri, Luigi.
[redacted], Bouchard, Miriam Ernestine.
[redacted], Boulion, Raymond Perez.
[redacted], Bourassa, Lydia Rose or Lydia Rose Lombardino.
[redacted], Bowen, Sidney Henderson.
[redacted], Braun, Mauritiu.
[redacted], Breen, Michael.
[redacted], Brown, Frances Norah.
[redacted], Burgess, Mortimer Myrle or Bently Burgess.
[redacted], Buttaro, Giuseppe.
[redacted], Byndloss, Theopilus.
[redacted], Canive, Mariano Ramirez or Juan Bilbao Canive.
[redacted], Capasso, Michele.
[redacted], Carlo, Antonio Di.
[redacted], Carty, John Daniel.
[redacted], Casada, Maria Bindi.
[redacted], Castaneda-Cantu, Juan Andres.
[redacted], Castaneda-Cantu, Marie Anita.
[redacted], Castaneda-Navarro, Adolfo.
[redacted], Castillo, Antonio Sinohui or Antonio Castillo-Sinohui or Tony Castillo or Jose Antonio Sinohui Castillo.
[redacted], Catania, Salvatore.
[redacted], Chaar, Hadj Ahmed.
[redacted], Chen, Ah San (nee Ah San Yuen).
[redacted], Cheong, Ching or Cheng Chong.
[redacted], Chin, Sam.
[redacted], Chin, Sam Sing.
[redacted], Chong, Gee Ling or Cheung Cam.
[redacted], Chow, Chung Hsiang or Chester H. Chow.
[redacted], Christoforatos, Evangelos Angelos.
[redacted], Christopher, Arthur Leopold.
[redacted], Christopher, Evelyn Rhymer.
[redacted], Chu, Yee Goon.
[redacted], Chui, Chau.
[redacted], Chung, Won or Woon Chung or Chung Choy or Chung Wing.
[redacted], Cik, Abraham.
[redacted], Cik, Feiga (nee Davidovic).
[redacted], Cilia, Carmelo or Charles Cilia.
[redacted], Cirocki, Leon Stanley.
[redacted], Clarke, Arthur Alexander.
[redacted], Cochran, Sylvia Schanier.
[redacted], Cockburn, Stanley Aloysius.
[redacted], Colachio, Matteo or Mattia Colachio.
[redacted], Conceicao, Manuel Jose.
[redacted], Cordero, Rita (nee Diaz or Soler).
[redacted], Cordoso, Renee Szwarc de Magalhaez.
[redacted], Cortes, Julia (nee Julia Muratte Verano).
[redacted], Cotrina, Jose Rosell or Jose Ignacio Rosell Cotrina.
[redacted], Crabbe, Ifield.
[redacted], Davies, John Pryce.
[redacted], Dennis, Cecil.
[redacted], Desousa, Miguel Alberto Simoes.
[redacted], Diaz, Julio Del Valle Y.
[redacted], Diaz, Zenaida (nee Leon).
[redacted], Dickson, Leon Ruliford or Leon Aston Dickson.
[redacted], Dodge, Henry or Heinz Deutsch.
[redacted], Dominguez-Dominguez, Cruz.
[redacted], Drazlovskis, Konstantins.
[redacted], Duer, Sanda Banescu or Maria Alexandra Banescu.
[redacted], Dunn, Sing or Shing Dunn or Wu Fun or Hong Wah.
[redacted], Dvozenja, Joseph or Govan or Dvozenjoc or Joseph Dvozenvoz or Joe T. Duozenja.
[redacted], Eggebrecht, Wilhelm or William Eggebreckt.
[redacted], Eliassen, Edward.
[redacted], Escallon, Santiago Gamba.
[redacted], Esken, Maria Roosi.
[redacted], Esposito, Luigi.
[redacted], Esteso, Arturo Torrecilla.
[redacted], Esther, Eva Darling.
[redacted], Estwick, Joshua Reynold.
[redacted], Evelyn, Louis Buchanan.
[redacted], Fernandez, Gregorio Sandalio Villegas or Gregorio Sandalio Villegas y Fernandez or Gregorio Villegas Fernandez or Villegas Fernandez Gregorio Sandalio or Sawalio or Sandalio Fernandez.
[redacted], Fernandez, Elsa Villegos or Elsa Eugenia Vilella Garcia or Elsa Eugenia Petrona Vilella y Garcia or Elsa Eugenia Vilella.
[redacted], Fernandez, Maria Patria or Maria Patria Roges-Daffos.
[redacted], Fernandez-Legra, Jorge Armando.
[redacted], Ferrieri, Joseph or Guiseppe Ferrieri or Ferriere.
[redacted], Florio, Dante de or Dante Virgilio-Omero de Florio.
[redacted], Focareta, Gennaro or Gennaro Fogaretta.
[redacted], Fong, Fook or Fong Fook.
[redacted], Foo, Hing Ning or Hing Ming Foo or Hung Yan Foo.
[redacted], Fook, Wong Bong or Bong Wong or Wong Zee Tin.
[redacted], Frank, Mollie or Mollie Wechner or Wieczner.
[redacted], Freeman, John Frederick or Joseph F. Freedman or Joseph F. Freeman.
[redacted], Friedmann, Israel A.
[redacted], Friedmann, Greta Dina.
[redacted], Frisone, Orazio.
[redacted], Fruciano, Guiseppe or Joseph Fruciano.
[redacted], Gadekar, Shreekrishna Mannohan.
[redacted], Galbreth, Mary Lou (nee Korn) or Maria Ender.
[redacted], Garces, Virgilia or Virginia Pancorbo Navares De or Virgilia or Virginia Garces (nee Pancorbo Navares).
[redacted], Garcia, Jesus Pena.
[redacted], Garcia-Martinez, Juan.
[redacted], Garcia-Torres, Gil or Gil Torres-Garcia or Gilberto Garcia.
[redacted], Gardeslen, Roel Elfrith.
[redacted], Gaudio, Nicola Simeone.
[redacted], Gerald, Gladys Marion Fitz.
[redacted], Gerald, Constance Dale.
[redacted], Gerald, Richard Alexander.
[redacted], Gerald, David Ross.
[redacted], Gervino, Pasquale.
[redacted], Gervino, Alfredo.
[redacted], Giannoutsos, Christos Gregores or Christ Gregory Giannoutsos or Gianoutsos.
[redacted], Giovinco, Ignazio or Joe Giovinco.
[redacted], Glogower, Szlama or Stanley.
[redacted], Glyptis, Nicolaos or Nicholas or Nick Gliptis.
[redacted], Goldstein, Albert.
[redacted], Gomez-Mendoza, Jesus.
[redacted], Gonzales, Gertrude Kalab.
[redacted], Kalab, Eveline Berta.
[redacted], Gordon, Marie Florence (nee Marie Florence Goggins).
[redacted], Gottdenger, Menyhert or Melchior Gottdenger.
[redacted], Grabel, Nicole Beatrice.
[redacted], Green, Louis or Tommy Dale.
[redacted], Greindl, John or Joseph or Josef.
[redacted], Grier, Mennell Leach.
[redacted], Grossi, Felice or Felice Mose Grossi.
[redacted], Guagliano, Calogera or Calogera G. Barone or Gloria Guiliana.
[redacted], Gutierrez-Romero, Justiniano.
[redacted], Gutierrez, Sabina Lopez-Gomez de.
[redacted], Halvorsen, Janey Annie Ethel.
[redacted], Hansen, Karl Bernard K.
[redacted], Hanson, Hilja Johanna (nee Hilja Seppanen).
[redacted], Hendrikson, John Thorwald.
[redacted], Herrera-Mendizabal, Manuel or Miguel Torres.
[redacted], Hibbard, Sarah Kate.
[redacted], Hiramatsu, Tarokichi or Isamu or Fujio Hiramatsu or Tarokichi Masagatani or Isamu Masuda.
[redacted], Hon, Bng Kin or Yee Yew Ging.
[redacted], Hong, Chin or Charles Wing.
[redacted], Hotte, Claire Theresa.
[redacted], Hunter, Clorinda Goltra.
[redacted], Jarzyna, Zygmunt Tadeusz or Teddy or Zygmunt Jarzyna.
[redacted], Jerusalemy, Marcel Tautu Rene Ceran or George Marcel Archer Ceran or Marcel Ceran.
[redacted], Jiminez, Guadalupe.
[redacted], Johnson, Guelda Winnifred.
[redacted], Johnson, Samuel Joseph.
[redacted], Jording, Wilfried Johannes Hinrich.
[redacted], Joyce, Mary.
[redacted], Juarez, Maria Reyes Dolores.
[redacted], Flores, Victor.
[redacted], Flores, Maria Gracia.
[redacted], Flores, Jesus.
[redacted], Kakanis, Eleftreia (nee Gagasouli).
[redacted], Kalodoukas, Konstantinos.
[redacted], Kamouh, Alexander.
[redacted], Kanhan, Lee.
[redacted], Karlich, Joseph or Giuseppe Carlich.
[redacted], Keeton, Gladys Mildred.
[redacted], Kemeny, Emery or Emery Grand.
[redacted], Kemeny, Alice or Alice Grand (nee Alice Wahrmann).

[redacted], Kerchevicius, Pranas or Frank Kershis or Kersis or Pranas Kersevicius.
[redacted], Khani, Saleh.
[redacted], Khani, Vadjiheh D.
[redacted], Kim, Ester Fajardo (nee Fajardo).
[redacted], King, Benjamin Alexander or Horace King.
[redacted], Kirzner, Fritzi (nee Wenkert).
[redacted], Kiss, Andrew.
[redacted], Koffinas, Kiriakos or Charles Koffinas.
[redacted], Kokenes, Voula Meletea or Voulachris Kokenes.
[redacted], Konstantios, Demitros.
[redacted], Kovacovsky, Albert or Albert Kovacovzki.
[redacted], Kuchauk, Jenne.
[redacted], Kugler, Guillermina Fonseca.
[redacted], Kugler, Henry or Enrique.
[redacted], Kugler, Sonia.
[redacted], Kugler, Erna.
[redacted], Kwai Zumg Wen or William Zumg.
[redacted], Kwan, Hugh or Hui Kwan or Kwan Hui.
[redacted], Larrosa, Maria Magdalena Alba Iris Santanach y or Alba Santanach.
[redacted], Latkovic, Thomas.
[redacted], Lauen, Olav Martinsen.
[redacted], Lee, Chung Bar or Lee Chung Ball.
[redacted], Lee, Jim or Chang Yung Suck.
[redacted], Lee, Jun.
[redacted] Lee Ok Cha (nee Ok Cha Kim).
[redacted] Lee, Shiu Lam or Lam Lee.
[redacted] Lee, Wo or Robert Wo Lee.
[redacted] Lemos, Pandelis Leon Christos.
[redacted] Lemos, Aspasia Pandelis (nee Lignos).
[redacted], Leon, Manuel or Munoz.
[redacted], Leon, Rogelio Manuel Sainz Diaz De.
[redacted], Lesica, Zygmunt.
[redacted], Levitan, Rose (nee Shoshana Fisher).
[redacted], Li, Ching-Sen or Johnson or Johnny Lee.
[redacted] Li, Ming Tao or T. L. Cuo or Andrew C. Huang.
[redacted], Li, Liu Wen Hwa or Liu Li or Wen Hwa Liu or Mrs. T. C. Tsao or Mrs. T. H. Dan or Mrs. C. G. Chang or Mrs. Martha Yang.
[redacted], Loach, Margaret Mary De.
[redacted], Loh, Mei Hung.
[redacted], Loh, May E. (nee Hu).
[redacted], Loman, Jervis Frank or Frank Loman.
[redacted] Lopez, Daniel Morales or Daniel M. Lopez or Freddy Lopez.
[redacted], Lowy, Leopold.
[redacted], Lowy, Sara (nee Rosenberg).
[redacted], Lung, Lee Ching or Lee Mon Che.
[redacted], Chu, Daisy Wong or Hung Gee.
[redacted], MacDonald, George.
[redacted], Mah, Harry Hong or Cheung On Mah.
[redacted], Majcunich, Mirko.
[redacted], Malach, Chil.
[redacted], Manabe, Akira.
[redacted], Mandel, Luis or Louis.
[redacted], Manzo, Anna Mary (nee Meola).
[redacted], Martinez, Francisca Hernandez.
[redacted], Martinez-Barajas, Salvador or Salvador Martinez-Hernandez or Salvador Monjarrez or Salvador Martinez Gonzalez or Salvador B. Martinez.
[redacted] Mavros, Dimitrios Theodoros or James Theodore Mavros.
[redacted], McKenzie, Louis or Louis Maltimore McKenzie.
[redacted] Medina, Ana Gomes Coelho (nee Coelho).
[redacted] Melloni, Gian Franco.
[redacted], Mihalios, John.
[redacted], Miller, Kitty.
[redacted], Miller, Sonia (nee Waite).
[redacted], Ming, Chu.
[redacted], Minici, Luigi.
[redacted], Moeller, Karl Heinrich.
[redacted], Mootoo, Conrad Augustus.
[redacted], Mora-Capetilla, Tomas.
[redacted], Moraitis, Georgios John.
[redacted] Morales, Pedro.
[redacted], Morales, Petronila Lydia.
[redacted], Moreno, Leonardo Gallardo.
[redacted], Moskowitz, Hersch or Hersch Rubin Moskowicz or Moscovici.
[redacted], Moya-Aranda, Alfredo or Alfredo Moya or John Tello.
[redacted], Navarro, Ramon Ramirez.
[redacted], Ness, Agnar Mathias.
[redacted], Ng, Yu Fong or Fong Ng or Hwang Wu or Yu Fong Wu.
[redacted], Ntentakis, Demetrios Christos or James Dedes or James Dedas or Demetrios Dentakis or Demitrios Dentakis.
[redacted], Nunes, David.
[redacted], Occhio, Antonio D'.
[redacted], Orintas, Joseph.
[redacted], Orintas, Ona (nee Martisius).
[redacted], O'Rourke, Jimmi Rudi.
[redacted], Osup, Nana Jose or Jose Osup.
[redacted] Oviedo, Virginia Carranza.
[redacted], Paasiala, Reino Olavi.
[redacted] Pak, Chan.
[redacted], Pao, Koo Shun.
[redacted] Papconstantis, Panagiotis or Panagiotis Papaconstantis.
[redacted], Pappas, Angelo or Angelo Pappakonstantis.
[redacted] Paraskevopoulos, Dimitrios Theodoros.
[redacted] Paulogiannis, Georgios or George Pauljohn.
[redacted], Peliz, Armando Manuel Buria y.
[redacted], Peros, Tome.
[redacted], Peters, Olga Virginia Jenner or Olga Jenner or Frances Jenner.
[redacted], Petherbridge, Archie Reginald Mardon or Albert Johnson.
[redacted], Pettigmano, Giuseppe.
[redacted], Pohlen, Kurt.
[redacted], Pohlen, Gerda Salomea.
[redacted], Pohlen, Eva Kathe.
[redacted], Pohlen, Michael Ernst Fran.
[redacted], Posmas, Antonias or Tony Psomas.
[redacted], Pyros, Eleftherios or Larry Philip Pyros.
[redacted], Ramihez, Marcos or Marcos Ramirez-Arredondo.
[redacted], Ramos, Holly Terril.
[redacted], Rauly, Julio Martinez or Julio Simon Martinez Y Rauly.
[redacted], Reinke, Karl Otto.
[redacted], Rigas, Teologos.
[redacted] Rivadnevra, Roberto Flores or Roberto Flores.
[redacted], Rivera, Jose or Jose Leiva-Rivera.
[redacted], Rivera-Marichilar, Juana or Juanity Rivera-Marichilar.
[redacted], Robinson, Ahmed Beye Abdulah or Spencer John Bernard Robinson.
[redacted], Rodriguez, Carlos Pesquera or Carlos Pesquera.
[redacted], Rodriguez-Mendez, Miguel or Miguel Mendez-Rodriguez.
[redacted], Rosa, Salvator.
[redacted], Rose, Rosa (nee Klein).
[redacted], Rossolimo, Xenia (nee Skugarevsky).
[redacted], Saduddin, Adil or Adil Eff Arif Sad Ed Din.
[redacted], Saguinsin, Maria (nee Perez).
[redacted], Salazar, Melton de la Garza.
[redacted], Salvatierra, Federico or Frederico Salvatiere.
[redacted], Sang, Mok or Sang Mork.
[redacted], Sanna, Salvator or Joseph Anthony Rizzo.
[redacted], Sarbia, Liugi or Louis.
[redacted], Sardos, Theodore Markos or Theodore Salvouvardos.
[redacted], Sarian, Hratchia Khatchik.
[redacted], Scarino, George or Giorgio Marinella.
[redacted], Schlittner, Ernst.
[redacted], Schlontz, Alexander.
[redacted] Schlontz, Magdalena Lena.
[redacted], Schmidt, William or Willie Wilhelm.
[redacted], Schnur, Sara.
[redacted], Scialbi, Cosimo.
[redacted], Sclavounos, Evangelos.
[redacted], Scuto, Angelo or Oddo Scuto.
[redacted], Serensen, Hugo or Paul Serge Sergis.
[redacted], Sgarbossa, Francesco or Frank Sgarbossa.
[redacted], Sgarlata, Vincenzo.
[redacted], Shapiro, Julius.
[redacted], Shin, Wong King.
[redacted] Short, Lillian Pauline (nee Paquin).
[redacted] Silva, Feliciano or Feliciano Silva-Vargas or Felix Silva.
[redacted], Silvestri, Gaetano.
[redacted], Simone, Filippo or Phillip De.
[redacted], Sion, Elio.
[redacted], Slivka, Mike.
[redacted], Smith, Alvena Viola or Alvena Viola Waters.
[redacted] Smith, Ferdinand.
[redacted], Sober, Louis.
[redacted], Soma, Alex or Alexander.
[redacted] Sourvanos, Christos.
[redacted], Steinberg, Gisella.
[redacted], Steinberg, Mordhai.
[redacted], Steinfeld, Wilhelm.
[redacted], Stewart, Rose Marie or Rose Marie Deterra or Rose Marie Lockner.
[redacted], Stilidiadis, Ioannis D.
[redacted], Stokes, Margaret Cecelia.
[redacted], Suden, Hudson Ben or Hassan Bensuden.
[redacted], Suey, Ng.
[redacted] Sullivan, Mary Winifred.
[redacted], Tai, Ping or Pong or Pang Tai.
[redacted], Tan, Lawrence Kok Joon.
[redacted] Taub, Chaim Leib.
[redacted], Theodoratos, Stavros or Steve Theodore.
[redacted], Theodore, Carole Avgerinos (nee Mandarakas).
[redacted], Tomlinson, Charles Victor.
[redacted], Tom, Chow or Joe Ton.
[redacted], Tong, James.
[redacted], Tong, To.
[redacted], Toot, Mary Isabel (nee MacDonnell).
[redacted], Torresola, Mario Seijo.
[redacted], Trumpet, Alpheus Leonard.
[redacted], Turnbull, Bernice.
[redacted], Tzitzikas, George.
[redacted], Ulett, Sepherin Joshua Gonzarlia or Sepherin Ulett.
[redacted], Ullah, Mossob.
[redacted], Vallentine, Alfred Christian.
[redacted], Vaughn, Lewis Harcourt or Vernon Volney.
[redacted], Veino, Naaman Alexander or Naman Veinot or Naaman Vino or Norman A. Veinot.
[redacted], Velasquez-Estrada, Miguel.
[redacted], Vella, Peter.
[redacted], Villia, Luis Rene or Louis Rene Villia.
[redacted], Vinje, Ragnheld F. or Ragnhild Vinje.
[redacted], Virgulti, Giovanni.
[redacted], Vitelli, Edward or Eduardo Hugo.
[redacted], Vitoratos, Evangelos or Angelo Victor.
[redacted], Wagner, Baron Vyne.
[redacted] Walker, Kenneth Eugene or Kenneth Scott.
[redacted], Weisz, Josef.
[redacted], Whitehouse, Gertrude Mary (nee Smith).
[redacted] Williams, Albert or Allie Mohamed.
[redacted] Williams, Jimmie or Jaimie Williams.
[redacted] Wilson, Clarice Isolene (nee Thompson).
[redacted], Wislocki, Wlodzimierz.

[redacted], Wolberg, Dora.
[redacted] Wolberg, Szloma.
[redacted], Wong, Ngai or Wong Tai.
[redacted], Woo, Diana Hsui-Fang Tan.
[redacted], Woo, Jenny I. Tsung Chiang.
[redacted], Yatrou, Steve or Stamatis Yatrou.
[redacted], Yee, Chin or Frank Chin.
[redacted], Yee, Wong Chun.
[redacted], Ying, Chin Len or Chin Gaing Wee.
[redacted], Yow, Yuen.
[redacted], Zernowitz, Rubin Zedick or Reuben Shell or Rubin Shell.
[redacted] Afzal, Shaik.
[redacted], Agerup, Karl Wilhelm.
[redacted] Aguiar, Dawn Elaine (nee Howard).
[redacted] Aguirre, Lucas Ramirez.
[redacted], Ah, Ning or Ah Ning.
[redacted] Aliberti, Eliane.
[redacted], Ametller, Vose.
[redacted], Andersen, Victor Alfred.
[redacted], Anderson, Harold George.
[redacted] Anderson, Mary Killeen.
[redacted], Aoki, Asaka (nee Asaka Kubota).
[redacted], Apfelbaum, Anna or Anna Waldhauser (nee Balog).
[redacted], Arbore, Nicola.
[redacted], Arellano, Ignacio alias Ignacio Arellano Garnica.
[redacted] Arellano, Rosa Maria alias Rosa Maria Arellano Olmedo.
[redacted], Armour, Harry Wilford.
[redacted], Armstrong, Samuel alias Norman Reid alias Samuel Nathaniel Armstrong.
[redacted] Artenian, Zovinar (nee Der-Bedrossian).
[redacted] Babin, Joseph.
[redacted], Bach, Helen Fenech (nee Leverenz).
[redacted] Balado, Marcial Tobias.
[redacted] Ballon, Armando Hector.
[redacted], Barbieri, Mafaldo.
[redacted], Baronti, Enorio alias Mario Baronti or Enario or Enrico Baronti.
[redacted], Barro, Jessus Lopez Y.
[redacted], Bathe, Herman Otto George.
[redacted], Bau, David Hong-Toh.
[redacted], Bau, Deanna.
[redacted], Bau, David, Jr.
[redacted], Beck, John Oscar.
[redacted], Bellistri, Domenico.
[redacted], Benes, Emilie Anna.
[redacted], Benes, Borus Metej.
[redacted], Benis, Peter Dunat.
[redacted], Bennett, Zachariah.
[redacted], Biase, Francesco Di.
[redacted] Biondi, Maria Carmela.
[redacted], Biondi, Filippa.
[redacted] Biondi, Paolina.
[redacted], Blanchard, Barbara Jean (nee Rendall).
[redacted], Blanco, Salvador.
[redacted], Boer, Johan Lecheree de.
[redacted], Bonanno, Josephine Leto (nee Leto).
[redacted], Bonney, Freda Leona.
[redacted], Borjas-Nieto, Benito.
[redacted], Bower, Everett Earl.
[redacted], Bracero, Juana Luisa (nee Perez).
[redacted], Braut, Ivan Marijan alias John Braut.
[redacted], Brawer, Lajos alias Louis Braver.
[redacted] Brown, Richard Nelson.
[redacted], Brusendorff, Gertrude.
[redacted], Bryan, Alfred alias Alfredo Augustus Bryan.
[redacted] Caalim, Josefina Ramones.
[redacted], C Vamara, Seydou or Suede.
[redacted], Campo, Oswald Salvatore.
[redacted] Campos, Mario Armando de.
[redacted] Canedo, Olga alias Olga Emelia Martinez Yanes.
[redacted], Carver, Marjorie Somerton (nee Noseworthy).
[redacted], Casagrande, Agostino.
[redacted], Cassidy, Lillian Fabiola (nee Martin).
[redacted], Castelyn, Amelia Maria (nee Brias).
[redacted], Castelyn, Alfred Francis.
[redacted], Castelyn, James Vincent.
[redacted] Celantano, Antonio or Anthony.
[redacted], Cervantes, Antonio.
[redacted], Cervantes, Rosa Mendiola de.
[redacted], Chang, Chen-Siang.
[redacted], Chang, Diana Lee alias Shun Yee Lee.
[redacted], Chang, Lo Chiang.
[redacted] Chao, Chi-Mei Hwang.
[redacted], Chin, Wan.
[redacted] Ching, King or Ching King or Charles C. King.
[redacted] King, Zi-Mei Fan nee Zei-Mei Fan.
[redacted] Fan, King.
[redacted] Nan King.
[redacted], Chinn, Harold Tai.
[redacted], Chung, Ping Chich alias George Chung.
[redacted], Cheo, Lucy Ho (nee Luch Chu-Hsuan Ho).
[redacted] Chow, Tien Bao.
[redacted], Chu, Jen Chu.
[redacted], Huan-Ying, Chu Mao.
[redacted], Ciazzo, Ettore Renato.
[redacted] Cipollone, Raffaele or Ralph.
[redacted], Clarke, Neville Hilton.
[redacted] Clevenger, Eva Festyne or Evon Festyne Clevenger.
[redacted] Cobos, Andres.
[redacted] Cobos, Isabel.
[redacted] Cohen, Joseph or Colen.
[redacted] Cole, Gerald LeRoy alias Gerald LeRoy Neil.
[redacted], Collins, Grace Louise.
[redacted], Consigli, Polixeni.
[redacted], Cornelius, Catherine Elizabeth.
[redacted], Cukier, Mordechai or Mordechai Zucker.
[redacted], Cummings, Anna Frances.
[redacted], Cura, Francisco.
[redacted], Cutri, Salvatore.
[redacted], Das, Beatrice Laurena alias Beatrice Laurena Battersey or Laurena Dauncey.
[redacted], Davidsohn, Max.
[redacted] Davis, Alma Justine.
[redacted] Dean, Jane.
[redacted], Delgado, Antonio Theathilo.
[redacted] Delgado, Jose Ruben Ceerayes.
[redacted], Dellagrannatikas, Joannis or John G. Dellas.
[redacted] Dicks, Francisco Alfredo or Francisco Durant.
[redacted], Donesky, Peter William.
[redacted], Dorosti, Touran Nassir (nee Zadeh).
[redacted] Dow, Ernest Archibald.
[redacted], Droin, Rosa or Rosa Amelia Sanchez.
[redacted], Dudmuyk, Anton Dragan or Anton Dragan or Anton Klym alias Andrij Lucin.
[redacted] Duncan, Ivy Louise (nee Williams).
[redacted], Enderle, Emiko (nee Mori).
[redacted] Eriqat, Abdul Kareem Muhammad.
[redacted], Espantman, Shah-Bahram.
[redacted] Espinoza, Amada (nee Rios).
[redacted] Espinoza, Jose Palomina.
[redacted], Estornel, Gloria Zayas.
[redacted], Estrada, Rosa Marie (nee Mercedes).
[redacted] Ferguson, Frederick Arthur.
[redacted] Fernandez, Casto Juan or Casto Juan Fernandez Carballido.
[redacted], Fidelman, Sally.
[redacted], Figueiros, Antonio Martinez.
[redacted], Flores, Maria Isabel Martinez de.
[redacted] Silva-Martinez Rogelio.
[redacted] Fong, Donald Dennis alias Ronald Dennis McLeod.
[redacted] Fong, Stanley.
[redacted] Foseidengen, Valborg.
[redacted], Foster, Phaedra Evangelidou (nee Phaedra Athanasios Evangelidou).
[redacted], Francis, Harold Moore.
[redacted], Frediani, Concepcion Arrieta.
[redacted] Freilich, Aron.
[redacted] Frett, Ovilda Isadora.
[redacted] Frias, Dolores Menendez alias Susana Memendez Fernando.
[redacted], Friedrich, Elmer Harry.
[redacted] Frost, Dorothy alias Dorothy Urienicz or Dorothy Uriewicz (nee Franzel).
[redacted] Fuss, Leisellotte, or Liselotte.
[redacted] Gallier, John Alexander.
[redacted], Garcia, Catalino Luis Martinez.
[redacted] Garcia, Francisco Marino Camino.
[redacted] Garcia, Miguel alias Miguel Garcia-Bermudez alias Mike Garcia.
[redacted] Garcia-Artes, Luis.
[redacted], Garland, Norman.
[redacted], Gaskin, Wattward Melville.
[redacted], Gasper, Fred Tyron.
[redacted], Gebhardt, Afra (nee Afra Satzger).
[redacted] Ghersini, Anthony.
[redacted], Girskowski, Kurt Herbert alias Kurt Girskowski alias Kurt Willud.
[redacted] Gomez-Michel, Salvador.
[redacted] Gonzales, Florencio Cabrera.
[redacted], Cabrera, Maria Alicia Partida De.
[redacted], Goto, Fuku Kaoru (nee Fuku Covita) formerly Fuku Imazeko.
[redacted] Green, Alvin.
[redacted], Greenidge, Alma alias Alma Theodora Greenidge or Alma George Theodora George.
[redacted], Grinoch, Etelle or Ethel Esther (nee Ella).
[redacted], Guidici, Andrea.
[redacted], Gumbs, Claudette June Arlene.
[redacted], Gumbs Maxine.
[redacted], Guzman-Sanchez, Benancio.
[redacted], Gyulai, Zuzana Mirjam.
[redacted], Haar, Wynand Van De or Wayne Van De Haar.
[redacted], Hallas, Spiros Nicholas.
[redacted], Hamel, Joseph Etienne Gustave or Gustave Hamel.
[redacted] Hansen, Borge.
[redacted] Hernandez, Amparo Rivas.
[redacted] Hernandez-Cerna, Jose Jesus.
[redacted] Herrera, Calixto alias Calixto Herrera-Rodriguez.
[redacted], Hassik, Jonnes.
[redacted], Hermo, Angel Sanisidro.
[redacted] Hing, Jung Four alias John Fau Ting alias Chaing Wah.
[redacted], Hoffman, Ramona formerly Mayr.
[redacted], Howe, Willie.
[redacted] Howe, Christine.
[redacted], Huang, Yi.
[redacted] Huang, Siao-Ming.
[redacted], Hui, Chung alias William Hui.
[redacted], Hunter, Eric alias McCarthy.
[redacted], Hwang, Kao.
[redacted] Hwang, Ning Tso (Sheila) (nee Ning Tso Chen).
[redacted] Hylton, Cecil.
[redacted] Hylton, Cecil Howard.
[redacted], Ikezawa, Fujiko.
[redacted], Jablonski, Joy Campbell.
[redacted], Jacobs, Silvia.
[redacted], Jacobs, Silvia Villar (nee Silvia Villar Gonzales) alias Silvia Villar Muller.
[redacted], Jederlinic, Anton alias Anton Yederlynic.
[redacted] Jerez, Jose Zanabria.
[redacted], Joe, Wai Kin alias Low Shee or Lo Ah Sam.
[redacted], Johnson, James.
[redacted], Jones, Audley Ivan.
[redacted] Jung, Bing-Ho.
[redacted], Kall, Jennie or Zelda Kall.
[redacted], Kamarinos, Georgios or George Camarinos.
[redacted] Kastanis, George or Georgios Kastanis.
[redacted], Kavouras, Demetrious or James.
[redacted], Kee, Chong.
[redacted], Keen, Gee Sue or Keen Gee.
[redacted], Kenakis, Stelios or Steve.
[redacted] Kim, Jean Yong.
[redacted], King, Frederick Oliver.
[redacted], King, Yip Shu or Yip Lin.
[redacted] Kishel, Simba alies Simba Roztein.

[redacted], Kittrell, Diana Patricia formerly Denesse Jennifer Brown.
[redacted], Khaddaj, Amer or Khaddage.
[redacted], Khaddaj, Adla or Khaddage or Sana (nee Jadaon).
[redacted], Kong, Lam For alias Lam Kwong.
[redacted], Koon, Chow or Chow Kuen or Koon Chow.
[redacted], Kow, Goon or George Yickson Goon alias Joseph Akow.
[redacted], Kow, Yip or Kow Yip.
[redacted], Kralovsky, John.
[redacted], Labasbas, Arnulfo Ovejas.
[redacted], Lalonde, Theresa Raymonde.
[redacted], Lam Kenneth Y. or Lam Kan Yue.
[redacted], Larkins, Millicent Alvira (nee Gumbs).
[redacted], Lattaris, George Velisaris.
[redacted], Layton, Henrique.
[redacted], Lee, Kwong Chuen.
[redacted], Lee, Moses Harvey.
[redacted], Lee, Soon Bok Woo.
[redacted], Levy, Hilda Louise Trenfield.
[redacted], Lekakos, Alexander or Alex or Lekos.
[redacted], Leichuck, Constantina Vasilios (nee Staicopoulou) (Kavafaki).
[redacted], Lenffer, William Hinrich or Wilhelm Hinrich Lenffer.
[redacted], Leonard, Elizabeth (nee Elizabeth Flanagan).
[redacted], Lettsome, Nydia.
[redacted], Lettsome, Oleavine Electa.
[redacted], Lew, Far Choen.
[redacted], Li, Anna Kwanyat.
[redacted], Liang, Tsu Wen alias Stephen T. W. Liang.
[redacted], Linares-Nunez, Roberto Eugenio.
[redacted], Lisi, Hannah Gunilla Dee (nee Aaltonen).
[redacted], Lissabet, Porfrio.
[redacted], Lobus, Fritz Voldemar.
[redacted], Loe, Madeline.
[redacted], Loock, Emma Maria.
[redacted], Lopez, Noris alias Noris Altagracia Rodriguez Lopez (nee Noris Altagracia Rodriquez Morales).
[redacted], Lopez-Campos, Miguel.
[redacted], Lopez, Gregoria Magallanes de.
[redacted], Louis, Cheung alias Louis Cheung alias Louis Car Cheung.
[redacted], Lozada, Luz de Santos.
[redacted], Lu, Shou Shu or Ru Hsia-Shu.
[redacted], Luca, Vincenzo De.
[redacted], Lucero, Aurora Grey.
[redacted], Lucero, Manuel Pedro.
[redacted], Lum, Dong Long alias Dong Lum Long or Tang Ah Lum.
[redacted], Mair, Hugh Sterling.
[redacted], Malau, Lambok alias Manik Bin Amat.
[redacted], Manning, Henriette (nee Noel).
[redacted], Manousos, Costas.
[redacted], Mantagas, Ioanis Dimitrios.
[redacted], Maratos, Anthony or Antonios.
[redacted], Mar-Castan, Alberto.
[redacted], Mark, Sulhan alias Tuck Ming Mark.
[redacted], Maroosis, Dionisios Demetreou.
[redacted], Maroyan, Toros.
[redacted], Martinez, Maria Antonia.
[redacted], Martinez, Raul Abreu Y.
[redacted], Martinez-Rodriguez, Salvador.
[redacted], Mastin, Ida M.
[redacted], Mataalii, Siniva.
[redacted], Matarangas, Nikolaos.
[redacted], McGeecham, George.
[redacted], McKay, James.
[redacted], McKayle, William.
[redacted], Meizoso, Jose Martinez alias Jose Martinez.
[redacted], Mende, Thomas Julius.
[redacted], Mendez-Acebedo, Guadalupe.
[redacted], Messer, Heinrich.
[redacted], Mikity, Dejan.
[redacted], Millhollin, Renee Yvonne.
[redacted], Miranda, Guadalupe Pena.
[redacted], Miranda, Huvaldo.
[redacted], Miranda, Carlos.
[redacted], Moldt, Sabine Falkner.
[redacted], Morehouse, Olli Sisko Regina Saatamoinen.
[redacted], Mota, Francisco Martins Da.
[redacted], Montgomery, Marie Eugenia Blanche.
[redacted], Morelli, Alberto or Albert.
[redacted], Moreno, Tomas Hernandez.
[redacted], Moriarty, Michael.
[redacted], Mosquito, Marcelina.
[redacted], Moustakas, John or Ioannis Mathew Moustakas.
[redacted], Moyano, Eusbbio Emilio or Eusebio Emilio Moyano-Junco.
[redacted], Murayama, Eiko (nee Eiko Hayashida).
[redacted], Murray, Jacob alias Jacob DeCosta Murray or George Turner.
[redacted], Muyen, Christian Lambertus.
[redacted], Myrmirides, George.
[redacted], Nacinovich, Mario.
[redacted], Nassr, Edward Selim.
[redacted], Nauz, Carlotta Clariza formerly Carlotta Clariza Medina.
[redacted], Nevarez, Maria De La Luz Martinez De.
[redacted], Nevel-Meneses, Raymond Salatiel.
[redacted], Newhouse, George Arthur.
[redacted], Ngoi, Woun or Ngr or Yuen Wuy.
[redacted], Niforatos, Gerasimos.
[redacted], Niles, Eleazar Augustus alias Henry Hewitt.
[redacted], Nolan, George Washington alias George William Nolan.
[redacted], Obando, Heriderto Quinde.
[redacted], Ojeda, Armando Vera.
[redacted], Onofrio, Giovanni Luigi formerly Fontecchio.
[redacted], Opperman, Ida (nee Ida Marta Wolzeschke.)
[redacted], Ormsey, William Augustus.
[redacted], Osman, Abdel Rahim Selim.
[redacted], Pai, Youngai alias Mary Alice Pai.
[redacted], Palma, Angelo.
[redacted], Pamuk, Ozhan Mehmet.
[redacted], Papaioanou, Nicolaos.
[redacted], Pappavasiliou, Athanasious alias Athanasious G. or George Pappavasiliou (Papavasiliou).
[redacted], Parmenter, Gladys.
[redacted], Pathazay, Francis.
[redacted], Pathazay, Sophie.
[redacted], Patterson, Oreste Garcia.
[redacted], Pau, Maria Lydia (nee Reyes).
[redacted], Pei, Yu Tsung.
[redacted], Pellakis, Michael or Michel Pellakis.
[redacted], Pennant, Clarence Augustus.
[redacted], Perez, Julia Gonzalez, nee Julia Gonzalez y Losada).
[redacted], Peters, Rita Scott (nee Rita Eustacia Matthew) alias Rita E. Matthew Peters.
[redacted], Phillipopoulos, Evangelo alias Angelo Phillips.
[redacted], Phipps, Theophilus or James Phipps or Jimmy Phipps.
[redacted], Pierre, Brigitte Jean.
[redacted], Pinder, Cecil Samuel.
[redacted], Pipe, Edward Henry.
[redacted], Pipe, Therese Mary.
[redacted], Pirjas, Efrosini formerly Skalkou (nee Pahos).
[redacted], Skalkou, Maria.
[redacted], Polo-Olguin, Jesus.
[redacted], Poon, Tsan Sing.
[redacted], Quinones, Jose Luis alias Jose Luis Quinones y Zayes.
[redacted], Quinones, Nellie alias Juana Nerida Sotomayor y Diaz.
[redacted], Radmore, Henry Thomas or William John Clark or Harry Walsh.
[redacted], Ramchandani, Kewalram D.
[redacted], Ramos-Ybarra, Jose Manuel alias Manuel Garcia.
[redacted], Reinhard, Martin John.
[redacted], Rio, Agustin Iglesias Y Del.
[redacted], Rivera, Juan.
[redacted], Rivera, Maria Luisa.
[redacted], Roberts, Emma Cecilia Duenas De.
[redacted], Robles-Garcia, Anacleto alias Armanda Del Bosque.
[redacted], Robles, Romelia Del Bosque.
[redacted], Robinson, Merton Seon or Frank Robinson or Merton Boyce.
[redacted], Rodriguez, Esther Nellina.
[redacted], Rodriguez, Florangel Valentina Martinez y alias Flora Martinez.
[redacted], Rodriguez, Jose Maria or Juan Sanchez-Perez alias Juan Alvarado Ramirez.
[redacted], Rodriguez, Julio Contreras.
[redacted], Romer, Albert George.
[redacted], Rothschild, Sallie.
[redacted], Rouse, Teresa Gerbino.
[redacted], Rouse, Frank James alias Salvatore Aliotta.
[redacted], Rubin, Sophie (nee Florence Sophie Berman).
[redacted], Rue, Jose Luis Ramon alias Joseph Luis Rue.
[redacted], Runge, Max William Frederick.
[redacted], Ruppert, Istvan.
[redacted], Ruppert, Louisa (nee Apolt).
[redacted], Ruutikaimen, Heimo Juko Jorma.
[redacted], Rymer, Raymond Alvin.
[redacted], Saclo, Bernardino Canares.
[redacted], Salazar, Jesus Pasos.
[redacted], Pasos, Alena Arivizu de.
[redacted], Salazar, Porfirio Escamilla.
[redacted], Salgado, Lorraine Giron.
[redacted], Saludares, Antonia Bilong.
[redacted], Salvatore, Francesca Teresa (nee Mancinelli).
[redacted], Samms, Caswell Leopold or Samuel Samms or Samuel Taylor.
[redacted], Sang, Chung Tin alias William Chung.
[redacted], San, Shih Tsung or Johnny Sang.
[redacted], Santos, Rosario Lopez Dos (De Santos).
[redacted], Savy, Regina (nee Jenny Regina Levy).
[redacted], Scala, Emidio Di.
[redacted], Scamardella, Ciro.
[redacted], Schaffer, George.
[redacted], Schardt, Anna Margarethe.
[redacted], Schlegel, Irene Lina Elsie (nee Irene Lina Elsie Zimmermann).
[redacted], Schultz, Julius.
[redacted], Scott, Lilla Elizabeth (nee Smith).
[redacted], Seamoto, Binichi.
[redacted], Segato, Luigi Sante.
[redacted], Segato, Emma.
[redacted], Seliste, Bruno.
[redacted], Shao, Bing-Kun.
[redacted], Shalhoub, Elias Namour.
[redacted], Shalom, Nessim or Scialom.
[redacted], Shalom, Hannah (nee Cohen)
[redacted], Shatara, Olga Badra (nee Olga Badra).
[redacted], Sheahan, Mary Kate.
[redacted], Shee, Fung or Fung Nguk Hing or Fong Shee.
[redacted], Sheng, Sing Shu-Heng.
[redacted], Shew, Ann Bernice Soloway.
[redacted], Shirato, Masa Aoyama.
[redacted], Shoretz, Osher.
[redacted], Shoretz, Golda (nee Szorita).
[redacted], Shroff, Phiroze D.
[redacted], Shroff, Elizabeth Iledan.
[redacted], Simotao, Sanmatu or Sanmatsu Shimotao.
[redacted], Simpson, Oliver.
[redacted], Sing, Lum alias Lam Sing or Lam Shing or Lum Som.
[redacted], Sing, Wong or Wong Sin.
[redacted], Skantzos, Michael.
[redacted], Skoff, Raimund Kurt or Raimund M.x Kurt Urban Skoff.
[redacted], Skyers, Clarence Fitzrennie.
[redacted], Slawitschek, Stephan Alexander alias Stephan Alexander Mader.
[redacted], Smet, Herta Anna De
[redacted], Smet, George De.
[redacted], Som, Tom Po.
[redacted], Soto, Rita.

[redacted], Sow, Yip.
[redacted], Spence, Harold Valentine.
[redacted], Spence, Lindfore E. or Lindsay Bradsman.
[redacted], Spitz, Sarah.
[redacted], Sprenker, Hans Jurgen.
[redacted], Fabian, Reiner.
[redacted], Feyerabend, Uwe.
[redacted], Springall, Lillian Hellen.
[redacted], Springer, June Eira alias Eira June Springer.
[redacted], Springer, Phyllis Loraine.
[redacted], Stark, Egon.
[redacted], Stathopoulos, Nick.
[redacted], Steidl, Wilma Gudrun.
[redacted], Stephens, Albertha.
[redacted], Stephens, Chrystneta.
[redacted], Sternbach, Bernath.
[redacted], Sternfeld, Frederick.
[redacted], Sternfeld, Renee.
[redacted], Stowe, Rosemary Cheng or Cheng So Mui.
[redacted], Strube, Christine.
[redacted], Sukur, Sheik Abdul.
[redacted], Suliven, Matio Gamilit Junior alias Jose Jimmy Soliven.
[redacted], Surkis, Malke or Maria Surkis nee Malke Berkovits or Maria Berkovits.
[redacted], Taddeo, Alberto Carmine.
[redacted], Tai, Ho.
[redacted], Tai, Sang.
[redacted], Taitt, Mavis Adassa (nee Bailey).
[redacted], Tan, Chi-Ming or Tan Chi Ming.
[redacted], Tan, Hsing Chow or Bera Tan (nee Hsing Chow).
[redacted], Tao, Pung Fai.
[redacted], Tao, Pauline Luying.
[redacted], Tapino, Vito Antonio.
[redacted], Tau-Chao, Fan or Tau-Chao Fan.
[redacted], Topacio, Gerardo Jose.
[redacted], Topacio, Antonio Francisco.
[redacted], Topacio, Magno Wilson.
[redacted], Terez, Elda Isabel Eskinach.
[redacted], Termentzis, Angelo.
[redacted], Todd, James Cyril alias James C. Carter.
[redacted], Todman, Clarena.
[redacted], Todman, David.
[redacted], Toivonen, Sigrid Maria.
[redacted], Tom, Hong Yen alias Tom Yen.
[redacted], Tomazos, Alfredos Stelios Adamantios or Alfredos Stelios Tomazos.
[redacted], Tong, Ah, or Wu Ah Tong or Ah Tong Wu.
[redacted], Trigo, Antonio.
[redacted], Tsampis, James George.
[redacted], Tse, Ysi Sang alias Yei Sang Tse alias Jse Yee Sing alias Tse Yee Sing.
[redacted], Tsekouras, Pantelis Georgiou or George Tsekouras.
[redacted], Tsien, Shou I.
[redacted], Tsien, Chia-Wei.
[redacted], Tsolakides, Harilaos Aristides alias Harry Duval.
[redacted], Tuck, Chin.
[redacted], Tucker, Bruno formerly Bruno Piero Cani.
[redacted], Tung, Hsi Hsin alias Sik Sun Tung alias David Tung.
[redacted], Tung, Vera I-Di (nee Gien).
[redacted], Tyburczy, Cecile Marie (nee Cecile Marie Salach).
[redacted], Ungar, Chaim alias Hyman Ungar.
[redacted], Vaage, Hans Jakob Hansen or Hans Vage.
[redacted], Vaeyens, Rachel Mostrey.
[redacted], Valdes, Raul Ambrosio or Oscar Perez.
[redacted], Valmas, Nicholas M.
[redacted], Vandertoll, Jan Jarich alias John J. Vandertoll.
[redacted], Vasquez-Gonzales, Trinidad alias Jesus Vasquez Gonzales.
[redacted], Vega, Ana nee Ana Zoyla Mandado Dias alias Anna Zoyla Mandado.
[redacted], Vega, Fernando Amilcar alias Fernando Amilcar Vega Montana.
[redacted], Velardocchia, Andrea.
[redacted], Velasquez-Garcia, Jesus.
[redacted], Villar, Arturo Mordoche alias Arturo Villar.
[redacted], Vincent, Willias Edward.
[redacted], Vralais, Demetrios Spiros.
[redacted], Vulgaris, Nicholas alias James Chase.
[redacted], Wah, Wong Shu.
[redacted], Washimi, Shokichi.
[redacted], Weinholzer, Helmut Walter.
[redacted], Whittaker, Donald D.
[redacted], Williams, Ivan Augustus.
[redacted], Williamson, Frederick Sullivan.
[redacted], Wilson, Clarence Benjamin alias Sam Clarence Benjamin Wilson.
[redacted], Winke, Angos or Angos Perez Macias.
[redacted], Wisdom, Stanford Alexander.
[redacted], Woldmer, Heiko or Henry.
[redacted], Wong, Jah Sang Cynthia (nee Jah-Sang Yu).
[redacted], Wong, Tze Chwan.
[redacted], Wood, Byron alias Ivan Wood.
[redacted], Wu, T. C. Sheng.
[redacted], Ye, Chu Yee Hing or Hing Ye Yee or Yu Hong Yi Yung or Yee Shee.
[redacted], Young, Michael or Michael Yugolow or Michael Yougtioglau.
[redacted], Young, Sing.
[redacted], Yuen, Kwai or Yen Kin.
[redacted], Zacevich, Anicento.
[redacted], Zairis, Leonidas.
[redacted], Zee, Tang Koei.
[redacted], Zuniga, Zeonon Plata.
[redacted], Alaniz-Gonzalez, Samuel.
[redacted], Alibudin, Wahap Bin or "Jimmy."
[redacted], Alvarez, Juan or Juan Emilio Alvarez Y Blanco.
[redacted], Alvarez, Josefa Selas De or Josefa Selas Varela or Josefa Selas.
[redacted], Ambo, Toraichi.
[redacted], Andasola, Ismael.
[redacted], Andersen, Gustav.
[redacted], Andersen, Marija Lilly (nee Mechberg) or Marija Lilly Ahlmann.
[redacted], Anderson, Cecil or Ezra Anderson.
[redacted], Antoine, Cecile Carmeleau or Cylotte.
[redacted], Arita, George Jiro or Jiro Arita.
[redacted], Arkouzis, Demetrios Spiro or James Arkouzis.
[redacted], Ayres, Encarna Vazquez.
[redacted], Bajo, Rodriquez, Adrian.
[redacted], Bakalas, George Costas.
[redacted], Balzano, Michele or Mike Balzano.
[redacted], Barba, Pacita T. (nee Pacita Nartatez).
[redacted], Beaumont, Jane (nee Jane Spellman) or Jennis or Jane Spellman.
[redacted], Beban, Mate.
[redacted], Betti, Cecilia Maria.
[redacted], Bettin, Avellino or Lino Bettin.
[redacted], Birdsey, George David.
[redacted], Borovich, Eli or Ely or Elija or Elija Borovich or Borovic.
[redacted], Bourlotos, James or Demetrios Bourlotos.
[redacted], Boutros, Youssef George.
[redacted], Bowery, Mary (nee Brayanovich) formerly Brayan.
[redacted], Brown, Robert Clinton.
[redacted], Caceres, Juan.
[redacted], Camporeale, Carmine.
[redacted], Capitani, Atildo.
[redacted], Cappelleri, Vincenzo.
[redacted], Carbajal, Ricarda Martinez.
[redacted], Carino, Virginia Ferrer or Mrs. Alejandro Carino (nee Ferrer).
[redacted], Ferrer, Judy or Judy Carino.
[redacted], Casas, Encarnacion.
[redacted], Casas, Elena Payan de.
[redacted], Cengotitabengoa, Maria Esther Gregoria.
[redacted], Chan, Ah or Ow Chung.
[redacted], Chan, Warren Mun or Mun Wong Chan.
[redacted], Chanakos, Athanasia Louis or Elie Tsenecou.
[redacted], Cheng, Tao-Sheng.
[redacted], Chip, Jung Chung.
[redacted], Chong, Jim Yew or Jung Jim Yew or Chu Yew Chong.
[redacted], Chong, Bik Lin or Bik Lin Chuey or Choy Bak Lin or Mrs. Jung Jim Yew.
[redacted], Chow, Chuck King or King Tsao.
[redacted], Chu, Mi Lu or Chu Mi Lu.
[redacted], Coe, Oscar.
[redacted], Cortes-Arroyo, Jesus.
[redacted], Cowie, James.
[redacted], Crane, Rose or Rose Nathanson or Rose Morris.
[redacted], Crowe, Young Soon Kim.
[redacted], Daras, Andreas.
[redacted], Davis, Helen.
[redacted], Davis, Walter.
[redacted], Delaquis, Camille Lilia Marie.
[redacted], Dennhardt, Helmuth Erich or Henry Eric Denhardt.
[redacted], Diamantis, Andrea Avelina (nee Andrea Avelina Diaz-Vazquez).
[redacted], Diaz, Pedro.
[redacted], Dontas, Nicholas John.
[redacted], Dorantes, Alejandro.
[redacted], Dorsett, William Errick.
[redacted], Drago, Pietro or Peter Drago.
[redacted], Dumouchel, George Joseph.
[redacted], Duncombe, Herbert James or James Duncombe or Harcourt Major.
[redacted], Duran-Sigala, Felipe.
[redacted], Eng, Ye Yang or Ye Yan Eng.
[redacted], Evazkhani, Akbar.
[redacted], Felton, Evelyn Rose Dow.
[redacted], Fishman, Sydney or Osias or Oscar or Arthur Kronenfeld.
[redacted], Fond, Anne Margaret La.
[redacted], Foo, Lum.
[redacted], Fotinakis, Costas.
[redacted], Furuta, Paul Takeo.
[redacted], Furuta, Hisayo.
[redacted], Gallegari, Domenico Giovanni.
[redacted], Garcia, Micaela Eumelia (nee Micaela Eumelia Sainz De La Torre).
[redacted], Garcia-Mendez, Roberto.
[redacted], Garcia-Pantoja, Octavio.
[redacted], Gates, Guadalupe Nodiega de or Guadalupe Noriega.
[redacted], Gaviria, Luisa or Maria Luisa Castilla.
[redacted], Gibertts-Leyva, Ramon or Ramon Leyva-Giberts.
[redacted], Gill, Harry William Cyril.
[redacted], Gill, Kathleen Rose.
[redacted], Gill, Sheila Margaret.
[redacted], Gill, Humphrey Graham.
[redacted], Gomes, Silvino Vieira or Silvino Vieira.
[redacted], Gomes, Mercedes Vieira or Mercedes Vieira-Gomes.
[redacted], Gomes, Silvina Josefina Vieira or Silvina Josefina Vieira-Gomes or Silvina Vieira Gomes.
[redacted], Gomez, Henry Valdes or Enrique Gomez.
[redacted], Gonzales, Aniano Cruz y.
[redacted], Gonzalez-Monfort, Julian Jose Hiran.
[redacted], Gonzalez, Maria or Maria Gonzalez-Monfort or Maria De Los Angelos Leon.
[redacted], Gonzalez-Saldana, Eleuterio.
[redacted], Gosalves-Romero, Rosario.
[redacted], Gouacide, Michael Florent.
[redacted], Graham, Patrick or Patrick Lewis Graham.
[redacted], Gray, Mrs. Bridget or Mrs. Kocher (nee Moore).
[redacted], Grindeland, Stella Muriel (nee Proudlock).
[redacted], Groves, Reginald Alexander.
[redacted], Guastella, Francesco.
[redacted], Guerreio-Velasco, Alberto.
[redacted], Guerrero-Toscano, Anastacio.
[redacted], Guerrieri, Shirley (nee Shirley Goldman) or Shirley Schafran.
[redacted], Schafran, Alan.
[redacted], Gullberg, David Fritjof Sune or Sune Dave Gullberg.
[redacted], Hall, Victoria Ruiz de.
[redacted], Harris, Melvia (nee Nolan).
[redacted], Hartwig, Martin John or John Hartwig.

[redacted], Hernandez, Jesus Labrade.
[redacted], High, Mary Violet (nee Chow).
[redacted], Higuera, Cristobal or Cristobal Higuera Hernandez.
[redacted], Hines, Edward Frederick or Edward F. Hins.
[redacted], Ho, Dorothy or Ho Ying Leong.
[redacted], Hoff, Frank or Steigler.
[redacted], Hoo, Kou-Chung.
[redacted], Hudulin, John or John Korunich.
[redacted], Hutchinson, Doris Elizabeth or Doris Elizabeth Hutchinson Brice.
[redacted], Hwang, Cirila Casquite.
[redacted], Ibanez-Tovar, Antero.
[redacted], Islam, Facrik.
[redacted], Jennick, Frank Deckers.
[redacted], Joseph, Ahmad or Joseph Ahmad and Ahmad Abdallah Josef.
[redacted], Kalantzis, Julia George (nee Julia John Tsiteloni).
[redacted], Kalin, Molly or Molly Medline.
[redacted], Kan, Hong Yong or Hung Yung Kan or Al Young or Charley Young.
[redacted], Karjus, August.
[redacted], Kassavetis, Ifigenia George (nee Coroneos).
[redacted], Keen, Owen Leopold.
[redacted], Keenan, Vera Sarah or Vera S. Keenan.
[redacted], Kew, Lee or Lee Fook.
[redacted], Khan, Mustapha Mohamed.
[redacted], Koen, Lee or Li Kuan or Lee Sop.
[redacted], Kolodziejezk, Hieronin Henry.
[redacted], Komisaroff-Kremer, Vera.
[redacted], Kontos, Steve or Stavros Kontominos.
[redacted], Kouvaras, Christos.
[redacted], Kun, Mak Ying.
[redacted], Larrance, Patricia Shaen (nee Hammersley).
[redacted], Lauscher, Kurt.
[redacted], Ledee, Joseph Emanuel.
[redacted], Lee, John or Lee Yen.
[redacted], Lefas, Isidoros Demetrios.
[redacted], Lefler, William C.
[redacted], Leitao, Jose Franco.
[redacted], Leitz, Mary Margaret.
[redacted], Lembesis, Ioannis or John Lembesis.
[redacted], Leotsakos, Michael Dimitrios.
[redacted], Liakiardopoulos, Vasilios or Bill Likas or William Likas.
[redacted], Lip, Chin or Chan.
[redacted], Lopez, Juan.
[redacted], Los, Gerard.
[redacted], Lotito, Ilarione.
[redacted], Loudaros, Nikitas John.
[redacted], Luera-Sandoval, Cleofas Manuel or Manuel Luera Sandoval.
[redacted], Maahs, Heini or Henry or Heinrich or Herman Maahs.
[redacted], Maciel-Garcia, Antonion or Antonio M. Garcia.
[redacted], Macpherson, Eric George.
[redacted], Malagutti, Luciana Grace.
[redacted], Manchan, Luke or Luke Fred Manchansingh.
[redacted], Mandy, Norma Kathleen (nee Moore).
[redacted], Mangione, Pietro.
[redacted], Marcus, Hans.
[redacted], Margolin, Efraim.
[redacted], Marshall, Kenneth Renton or Kenneth Marshall.
[redacted], Martinez, Agustina Mariano or Severina Baoingan Mariano.
[redacted], Martinez, Josephine Nellie Puentes de (nee Josefina Manuela Puentes).
[redacted], Martinez, Matilde (nee Bravo) or Garcia.
[redacted], Mastrocola, Mario Vincent.
[redacted], Masuda, Isao.
[redacted], Maxwell, James or Fred Mortimer.
[redacted], Meisels, Joseph.
[redacted], Melian, Francisco Ramos or Frank Ramos.
[redacted], Mendoza, Ignacia Martinez-Barriecanal de.
[redacted], Miller, Florence Mary (nee Laurin).
[redacted], Miller, Harry Sam.
[redacted], Mitsiliotis, Nickolaus or Nick Preston or Nick Mitchell.
[redacted], Mohn, Per Haakon or Pete Mohn.
[redacted], Montelongo-Garza, Anacleto.
[redacted], Montesantos, Constantinos or Gus.
[redacted], Montes-Garza, Juan.
[redacted], Mosquera, Melva or Melba (nee Oblitas-Pino).
[redacted], Munoz, Gavino.
[redacted], Munoz, Alejandro.
[redacted], Munoz, Florencia.
[redacted], Munoz, Antonio.
[redacted], Murillo, Federico Ramirez.
[redacted], Murphy, John Joseph.
[redacted], Nagee, Ali Said.
[redacted], Nalecz, Mieczyslaw or Mitchell Nalecz.
[redacted], Natividad, Jesus.
[redacted], Navarro-Moreno, Luis.
[redacted], Nishi, Eikichi or Akiyoshi Yamaguchi.
[redacted], Nizzi, Maria or Maria Amidei.
[redacted], Ohashi, Taro.
[redacted], Ohashi, Fusae.
[redacted], Ohashi, Victor M.
[redacted], Ohashi, Clara M.
[redacted], Olveira, Jose Munez or Jose Munez.
[redacted], Oppedisano, Angelo.
[redacted], Ortega-Lujano, Luis.
[redacted], Ostreicher, Samuel or Fojtech or Vejtech Weinstein.
[redacted], Ostreicher, Rozalia or Razalia Weinstein (nee Weiss).
[redacted], Oztekin, Muammer Ahmet.
[redacted], Paldomino-Escobar, Seferino or Alfonso Arriaga-Campos or Roverto Gonzalez.
[redacted], Pan, Li-Chi.
[redacted], Pan, Lucy S.
[redacted], Pao-Ching, Sunn or Pao-Ching Sunn.
[redacted], Papp, Nick.
[redacted], Peltola, Jaakko Ilmari.
[redacted], Peng, David Kwanghua.
[redacted], Pepe, Jose or Joe Pepe.
[redacted], Perez, Olga (nee Olga Meyer).
[redacted], Perez-Perez, Luis.
[redacted], Perla, Filomena Angelini.
[redacted], Pian, Theodore Hsueh-Huang.
[redacted], Pietro, Amelia Tammetta Santi Di.
[redacted], Pietro, Fernanda Santi Di.
[redacted], Pini, John Athos.
[redacted], Pirovolos, Kostos or Constantinos.
[redacted], Pokropowicz, Maria Exposito Pelayo.
[redacted], Puccinelli, Samuel.
[redacted], Quaranta, Francesco.
[redacted], Ramirez, Gregoria Villarreal De.
[redacted], Raimrez-Rodriguez, Martin.
[redacted], Rebelo, Antonio Dos Santos or Antonio Rebelo.
[redacted], Regino-Mendoza, Epifanio.
[redacted], Reinisch, Simon.
[redacted], Rhymer, Rufus Alvin.
[redacted], Rhymer, Leslie Lorenzo.
[redacted], Richardson, Ruel Wilfred.
[redacted], Riedl, Christian.
[redacted], Robertson, Lorayne (Loraine) Neilson.
[redacted], Robus, Charles John.
[redacted], Rodriguez, Augustin Gomez.
[redacted], Rodriguez-Rodriguez, Juan.
[redacted], Rosales, Francisca Del Carmen Galvez Rodriguez.
[redacted], Roth, Clara.
[redacted], Ruschak, John.
[redacted], Salvemini, Vito.
[redacted], Sang, Wong Chan Lai.
[redacted], On, Ernest Wong Yuen.
[redacted], Santos, Apolonio Eligio or Alberto Eligio Santos.
[redacted], Sassouni, Armen.
[redacted], Sauro, Guerrino or Warren Sauro.
[redacted], Sauve, Howard James or Dale James Sauve.
[redacted], Seltzer, Abe.
[redacted], Seltzer, Laura.
[redacted], Seltzer, Ray.
[redacted], Seltzer, Shirley Celia or Shirley Cilia Seltzer.
[redacted], Shao, Chu Kao.
[redacted], Shao, Huan Wen Lee or Huan Wen Lee or Hen-Wen Lee or Mary Lee.
[redacted], Shee, Jeung (nee Jeung Klu).
[redacted], Sherrod, Dorothy Allene.
[redacted], Shong, Ng Lee or Ng Kim Yat.
[redacted], Siemensma, Thiemotheus.
[redacted], Simulevics, Fruze or Fruze Rupeks or Ulozas.
[redacted], Singh, Partop.
[redacted], Sitbon, Jeanne D'Arc.
[redacted], Slobodnik, Vasil or William.
[redacted], Smart, James Allen.
[redacted], Smyk, Ann Violet.
[redacted], Solis-Rios, Felipe.
[redacted], Sonnekalb, Ingrid.
[redacted], Sperber, Jose Rodriguez.
[redacted], Staggs, Lucie Marie.
[redacted], Staggs, May Estelle.
[redacted], Stemmer, Emanuel or Emanuel Mendel Stemmer.
[redacted], Stoia, Joseph.
[redacted], Sullivan, John or John O'Sullivan.
[redacted], Sutherland, Maida Alethea.
[redacted], Talavera-Torres, Victor.
[redacted], Tam, Piu Chiu or Tam Pui Chiu.
[redacted], Tam, Foong Sui or Chow Foong Siu.
[redacted], Tom, Eugene or Eugene Tan and Tam Chen Tsien or Chen Tsien Tam.
[redacted], Tambakis, Panagiotis or Peter Tambakis or Peter Tamvakis.
[redacted], Terry, Bias Celerino.
[redacted], Thompson, Samuel Melvin.
[redacted], Tjong, Rudy or Harry Chang or Eugene Haw.
[redacted], Tobias, Leford.
[redacted], Tolentino-Beltran, Jesus.
[redacted], Torrealba, Juan or Juan Rafael Torrealba Carvacho.
[redacted], Toscano, Antonio.
[redacted], Tovar-Cantu, Florencio.
[redacted], Tovar, Simona Gamboa De.
[redacted], Triana, Leydia Irene Diaz De.
[redacted], Quintana, Jose Pedro Triana y.
[redacted], Uribe-Santiago, Jesus or Jesus Uribe.
[redacted], Urrutia-Ayesa, Estilita or Estilita Canas.
[redacted], Valenzuela, Rebecca Trejo de.
[redacted], Valladares-Medrano, Alvaro.
[redacted], Vasquez, Maria De Jesus Roman De.
[redacted], Vloten, Gertrude Van or Quesada (nee Junska).
[redacted], Wah, Chong or Cheung Wah Chow.
[redacted], Walsh, Charles Rudolph.
[redacted], Walsh, Sighlit Georgia Helga or Sighlit Georgia Helga Wilke.
[redacted], Ward, Michael or Eric Michael Ward or Michael Eric Ward.
[redacted], Ward, Edith (nee Fritz) or Cavins.
[redacted], Watkins, Mary Carmen (nee Mary Carmen Dean) or Mary Dean Schwartz.
[redacted], Webster, Frank Victor.
[redacted], Williams, Aubrey George.
[redacted], Wilson, Winston Minter or Clarence Wilson.
[redacted], Wolf, George or Georg Wolf.
[redacted], Wong, Henry Sam.
[redacted], Woodcock, Karin.
[redacted], Wu, Chung.
[redacted], Wu, Helen Lu-Chen.
[redacted], Wu, Kwang Tsing.
[redacted], Yue, Nadine Jean (nee Nadine Jean Li).
[redacted], Yue, Wen-Yao.
[redacted], Yuen, Koon Shau or Koon Sham Yuen.
[redacted], Zacarias, Perfecto.
[redacted], Zacarias, Maria De Jesus Urena De.
[redacted], Zaragosa-Parada, Francisco.
[redacted], Zaragosa, Jesua Preciado de.
[redacted], Zaragosa-Preciado, Guadalupe.
[redacted], Zaragosa-Preciado, Juan.

[redacted], Zaragosa-Preciado, Carmen.
[redacted], Dardamanis, Dimitrios.
[redacted], Chang, Ching Chieh.
[redacted], Chang, Hsien Wei.
[redacted], Raymond, Leslie or Leslie Roteman.

REPORTS ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

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

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. WILEY:

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

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

By Mr. KENNEDY:

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

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

By Mr. KENNEDY (by request):

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

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

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

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

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

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 2139. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special series of postage stamps in commemoration of the life and works of Dr. Lyman Copeland Draper; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MALONE:

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

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

By Mr. LANGER:

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

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

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

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

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

EXTENSION OF RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Synthetic fibers and manufactures are down 9 percent.

Coal and related products are down 16 percent.

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

Chemicals and related products are down 16 percent.

Office machines and parts are down 25 percent.

Cotton manufactures are down 20 percent.

Wood and paper are down 16 percent.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Section 5: This section provides that subsection (b) of section 516 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (which enables an American manufacturer to protest customs rates and classifications) shall not apply with respect to any article of a class or kind covered by a foreign-trade agreement. This provision was in the original Trade Agreements Act but was eliminated in the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951.

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

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

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

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

In the period from 1934 to 1947, when the GATT was negotiated, the United States entered into 29 bilateral agreements. In 1947, agreements were in effect with the following 27 countries: Argentina, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Ecuador, El Salvador, Finland, France, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Iran, Luxembourg, Mexico, the Netherlands, Paraguay, Peru, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, the United Kingdom, Uruguay, and Venezuela. Agreements with Czechoslovakia and Nicaragua were not in effect. The effective agreements involved, on a 1939 basis, reduction or binding of rates of duty on almost 70 percent of dutiable imports.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

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

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

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

By Mr. MARTIN:

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

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

By Mr. LEHMAN:

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

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

By Mr. WILEY:

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

By Mr. FULBRIGHT:

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

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

By Mr. MUNDT:

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

By Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska:

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

By Mr. KENNEDY:

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

By Mr. THYE:

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

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

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

By Mr. GORE:

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

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

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

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

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

By Mr. PURTELL:

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

By Mr. BUTLER of Maryland:

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

FOLDING OF SPEECHES FOR SENATORS

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

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

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

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

JUNE 15, 1953.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

JUNE 15, 1953.

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

DEAR MR. CHAMBERS: In regard to the incident which occurred within recent days involving the availability of the folding room for the folding and insertion into envelopes of copies of a speech I had made and which I had directed be sent to individuals in New York on my mailing list, I have some observations and some questions.

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

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

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

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

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

Very sincerely yours,

HERBERT H. LEHMAN.

McCARTHY, LEHMAN IN SENATE BATTLE—NEW YORKER, ACCUSED OF ABUSE OF FRANKING, SAYS CHARGE IS INTIMIDATION ATTEMPT

(By Clayton Knowles)

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

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

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

"The pattern and the intention is to intimidate, to frighten, to call off all those who are in disagreement with him," declared Mr. LEHMAN, who has long criticized the methods employed by Mr. McCARTHY.

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

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

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

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

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

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

CHALLENGES EXCHANGED

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

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

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

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

OFFICIAL DUTY EXPLAINED

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

CONTROL OF NATURAL GAS PRICES

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

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

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

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

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

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

[From the Milwaukee Journal of May 28, 1953]

NATURAL GAS REGULATION GAINS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

[From the Washington Star of May 28, 1953]

MORE ABOUT THE PRICE OF GAS—WHY CONSUMERS REMAIN UNPROTECTED AGAINST RISING RATES; FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION REFUSES TO FOLLOW LAW

(By Lowell Mellett)

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

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

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

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

Whether the Commission will continue to insist on its impotence remains to be seen. By refusing to exercise its authority, it is defying the law, as interpreted several times by the Supreme Court.

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

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

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

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

AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

They deserve our support and our understanding.

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

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

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

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

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

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

THE CHALLENGES TO THE REPUBLICAN PARTY

It is a great privilege to address this outstanding convention.

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

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

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

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

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

BASIC ESSENTIALS OF FOREIGN POLICY

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

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

We know that we must prevent the Soviet Union from succeeding in her strategy of divide and conquer. This means preventing her from taking over:

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

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

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

All this is needed for our own self-preservation.

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

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

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

The danger today is the greatest in our history.

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

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

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

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

BADGER REPUBLICANS HAVE BEEN ALERT

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

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

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

WISCONSIN FARM PROBLEM CRITICAL

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

THE MESS WE INHERITED

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

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

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

We've faced a staggering $267 billion national debt; a 2½-million-man payroll; $80 billion in unpaid, c. o. d. obligations; mountains of redtape which have had to be slashed.

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

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

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

ADMINISTRATION HAS MADE MUCH PROGRESS IN FOREIGN POLICY

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

It has taken the initiative.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

THE ALTERNATIVE TO OUR LEADERSHIP

We can, however, continue to exercise strong leadership.

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

The alternative to American leadership is Soviet leadership.

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

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

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

WHAT WE WILL NOT DO

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. I wish to ask the Senator from Iowa whether, as a result of the study of the information program, the committee has been able to ascertain its effectiveness upon the people behind the Iron Curtain.

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

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

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(See exhibit 1.)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

EXHIBIT 1

OUR INFORMATION SERVICES

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I should be less than human if I were not grateful for the Senator's very kind words about me, but I feel that they are undeserved. The Senator from Arkansas was chairman of the committee in the last Congress, and set a most eminent pattern for procedure. I can only say that the committee could proceed as it did only because of the zeal and earnestness of its previous chairman and the other members of the committee and the pattern which had been established. I merely attempted as chairman to follow the rules and to carry on the work which had been, if I may quote, "so nobly begun." Nevertheless, Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Arkansas for his courtesy and thoughtfulness.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

INTERNATIONAL CLAIMS COMMISSION

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

CAPT. JOY BRIGHT HANCOCK, UNITED STATES NAVY

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

CAPT. JOY BRIGHT HANCOCK, UNITED STATES NAVY

Captain Hancock was born in Wildwood, N. J., on May 4, 1898. She attended high school in Wildwood; George Washington University and the Crawford Foreign Service School, both of Washington, D. C.; the Pierce School of Business Administration, Philadelphia, Pa.; and the Paris branch of New York School of Fine and Applied Arts, Paris, France. She had flying instruction at the Henry Berliner Aviation School, Washington, D. C.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

THE HELLS CANYON PROJECT

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Ted F Berry, Washington Grange News, 3104 Western Avenue, Seattle, Wash.; Clarence M. Carter, Union County PUD, Route 2, LaGrande, Oreg.; Amelia May Bateman, Hells Canyon Dam Association, Clarkston, Wash.; Harold Withrow, Buena Vista Farmers Union, Independence, Oreg.; Lee Wooden, Oregon Rural Electric Co-op Association; John E. Bunn, Klickitat PUD, secretary; White Salmon, Wash.; Less Jasslin, Portland, Oreg.; Harry Tupling, wholesale merchandise, Portland, Oreg.; Charles L. Hensley, precinct committeeman, Portland, Oreg.; R. L. Woolley, Electric Co-op Association, Hermiston, Oreg.; Phil Dyer, northwest region, American Veterans Committee, Portland, Oreg.; Howard Morgan, chairman, Democratic Party of Oregon, Monmouth, Oreg.; Don S. Willner, national committeman, Young Democrats of Oregon, Corbett Building, Portland, Oreg.; John A. Rademaker, Oregon Farmers Union, 960 Shipping Street, Salem, Oreg.; William W. Widmer, Democratic precinct committeeman, 1125 Southeast 113th Avenue, Portland, Oreg.; Walter Wislow, Electric Union, 8014 North Swift Boulevard, Portland, Oreg.; Vuhrey Martin, Oregon State Building Trader, Portland, Oreg.; Glenn Torbelf, Warren Grange 536, Warren, Oreg.; Ralph Langdon, Chaman Grange, Scoppoose, Oreg.; Vilas L. Shepard, Clatskamie PUD (president), Clatskamie, Oreg.; W. R. Armstrong, chairman of SCS St. Maries, Idaho, Farmington, Wash.; George H. Bailey, chairman, Legislative Committee of Central Grange 276; Alden L. Bailey, manager, Clatskamie PUD, Clatskamie, Oreg.; Albert Niva, representing Morse Men, Tigard, Oreg.; James A. E. Olson, member 5246610, 3890 East 21st, Eugene, Oreg.; Frank R. Brown, Springfield Utility Board, box 638, Springfield, Oreg.; Joseph F. Murphy, Young Democrats, 909 Corbett Building, Portland, Oreg., and Ontario, Oreg.

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

Tom Bidder, IVOE Local 87, 4225 Southeast Ninth Avenue, Portland, Oreg.; Arch M. Sams, Cape Horn Grange, No. 70, State master, Skamania, Wash.; Dorothy A. Sams, Cape Horn Grange, No. 70, Skamania, Wash.; H. E. Nissen, Charter Oak Grange, No. 582, Vancouver, Wash.; Rolf Jemtegaard, Cascade Pomona Grange, Washougal, Wash.; Mr. and Mrs. Robb W. Casebeer, Evening Star Grange, Portland, Oreg.; Arthur Parrish, Fernwood Grange, Newberg, Oreg.; Howard M Crinklaw, Coos-Curry Electric Co-op, Coquille, Oreg.; Willard Il Johnson, Hood River Electric Co-op, Hood River, Oreg.; R. J. Thomas, Portland, Oreg.; Beulah Hand, consumer, 2515 10th Avenue, Milwaukee, Oreg.; Heye H. Meyer, Clark P. U. D., Route 5, Vancouver, Wash.; Joseph A. Ast, Clark P. U. D., Box 165, Camas, Wash.; O. G. Hittle, Cowletz Co. P. U. D., 1329 22d, Longview, Wash.; Walter Wells, Hood River Electric, Box 320, Hood River, Oreg.; C. R. McCoy, Hood River Electric, Parkdale, Oreg.; Lloyd Tupling, Hells Canyon Association, 1308 Warm Springs Avenue, Boise, Idaho; Mrs. Hub Howe, Hells Canyon Association, 537 Thanin Road, Lewiston, Idaho; Herbert Howe, Nez Perce County Pomona Grange, 537 Thain Road, Lewiston, Idaho; Frank Carlisle, Fernwood Grange, No. 770, Springbrook, Oreg.; Lucille Kimble, Fern Hill Grange, No. 592, Goble, Oreg.; W. W. Kimble, Fern Hill Grange, No. 592, Goble, Oreg.; A. M. Larson, Carpenters Local 226, Portland, Oreg.; Byron C. Brinton, secretary, Hells Canyon Development Association, care Record-Courier, Baker, Oreg.; G. Lowell Fuller, Baker County Commercial Club, Baker, Oreg.; Lucille Flint, Farmers Union, Box 228, Salem, Oreg.; Gay Ginther, Better Pension Council of Oregon, Meldrum Avenue, Portland, Oreg.; Oscar Ingram, 510 Second Street, Lebanon, Oreg.; Lynn Tuttle, Asotin County Waterways Association, Box 168, Clarkson, Wash.; George Penkill, Asotin County Grange, No. 235, 571 NC 24th, Palter, Wash.; Ben Buiman, Oregon Grange.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATIONS, 1954

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

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

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

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

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Is there objection to the request?

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

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

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Chair.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., *June 1, 1953.*

Senator MILTON YOUNG,
Senate Office Building:

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

DON FLETCHER.

FARGO, N. DAK., *May 29, 1953.*

Senator MILTON R. YOUNG,
Senate Office Building:

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

Regards,

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

WASHINGTON, D. C., *June 4, 1953.*

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

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

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

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

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

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

JOHN C. LYNN,
Legislative Director, American Farm Bureau Federation.

ATLANTA, GA., *June 1, 1953.*

Hon. MILTON R. YOUNG,
Senate Office Building:

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

TOM LINDER,
Commissioner of Agriculture.

WAYCROSS, GA., *June 1, 1953.*

Hon. MILTON R. YOUNG,
Senate Office Building:

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

Georgia District Supervisor
J. MARVIN STRICKLAND,
President.

ST. PAUL, MINN., *May 29, 1953.*
Hon. MILTON R. YOUNG,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Your support of increased appropriation for agricultural research is urged.
H. MACY,
Dean, of the Institute of Agriculture, University of Minnesota.

ATHENS, GA., *May 30, 1953.*
Senator MILTON R. YOUNG,
Chairman, Agricultural Subcommittee of Appropriations, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:
Earnestly request your committeee to support $17 million increase for research. This amount urgently needed for basic and applied research. Backlog of research findings is being rapidly depleted. Future progress will be determined on new research findings.
C. C. MURRAY,
Dean and Director, College of Agriculture.

MEMPHIS, TENN., *June 1, 1953.*
MILTON R. YOUNG,
Chairman, Agricutural Subcommittee of Appropriations, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:
Understand vote will be taken on appropriation for agriculture research at early date. Urge you to support $17 million increase over last year. Many problems including poultry and livestock diseases and pink bollworm control require research for which funds not now available.
LIPPERT S. ELLIS,
Director, Arkansas Agriculture Experiment Station, Fayetteville, Ark.

GAINESVILLE, FLA., *May 31, 1953.*
Senator MILTON R. YOUNG,
Chairman, Subcommittee, Agricultural Appropriations, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
Respectfully recommend full $17 million increase Federal appropriations for agricultural research of which $7½ million designated for grants to State experiments stations. Florida Legislature doing its part by this week increasing State research appropriations with ratio now over 11 to 1 of Federal grants. The additional Federal funds needed for more fundamental research.
WILLARD FIFIELD,
Director, Florida Experiment Station.

AUBURN, ALA., *May 30, 1953.*
Hon. MILTON R. YOUNG,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Earnestly urge your support for $17 million increase for agricultural research.
E. V. SMITH,
Director, Alabama Agricultural Experiment Station.

ORONO, MAINE, *May 30, 1953.*
MILTON R. YOUNG,
Chairman, Senate Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations, Washington, D. C.:
Urge support of $7½ million increase in appropriation for agricultural research. Solution of agricultural problems severely handicapped by lack of adequate Federal support of State experiment stations. Total Federal funds to Maine station increased only 62 percent since 1940. This is less than one-half the 131 percent increase in index of prices all commodities bought by farmers which corresponds to cost of conducting agricultural research. Total agricultural appropriation of $17 million needed to provide for increased research costs and some increased work on marketing and other current problems.
GEORGE F. DOW,
Associate Director, Maine Agricultural Experiment Station.

KNOXVILLE, TENN., *May 30, 1953.*
Hon. MILTON R. YOUNG,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
We respectfully ask your support of the request for an increase of $17 million over last year's appropriation for agricultural research. Agricultural research lagging far behind research in other fields and our agricultural leaders in Tennessee are asking additional funds for experimental work.
J. H. MCLEOD,
Dean and Director.

BATON ROUGE, LA., *May 30, 1953.*
Senator MILTON R. YOUNG,
Chairman, Agriculture Subcommittee of Appropriations,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Louisiana will appreciate your committee's consideration of the item sponsored by the national farm organization for research.
W. G. TAGGART,
Director, Louisiana Agricultural Experiment Station.

STARKVILLE, MISS., *May 30, 1953.*
Senator MILTON R. YOUNG,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Respectfully urge increase of $17 million for agricultural research, $7½ million for grants to States, and $9½ million to USBA Bureaus. Research most important but almost completely neglected by House.
CLAY LYLE,
Director, Mississippi Agricultural Experiment Station.

MANHATTAN, KANS., *June 1, 1953.*
Hon. MILTON YOUNG,
Chairman, Senate Committee on Agricultural Appropriations,
Washington, D. C.:
Urge approval of including additional item of $17 million for agricultural research. Appropriations for agricultural research have not kept pace with increased cost of research in recent years. Expanded program of agricultural research would be an excellent investment.
ARTHUR D. WEBER,
Dean of Agriculture and Director of Agricultural Experiment Station, Kansas State College.

COLUMBIA, MO., *June 1, 1953.*
Senator MILTON YOUNG,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Recommend inclusion of $17 million additional for agricultural research in 1954 appropriations.
J. H. LONGWELL,
Dean, College of Agriculture, University of Missouri.

CLEMSON, S. C., *June 1, 1953.*
Senator MILTON R. YOUNG,
Chairman, Agriculture Subcommittee of Appropriations,
Washington, D. C.:
The agricultural experiment station personnel is requesting the inclusion of the full $17 million for research over last year. Of this amount, $7½ million for grants to State stations and $9½ million to USDA bureaus.
H. P. COOPER,
Dean and Director, South Carolina Agricultural Experiment Station.

FARGO, N. DAK., *June 1, 1953.*
Senator MILTON YOUNG,
Chairman, Senate Committee on Agriculture Appropriations,
Washington, D. C.:
Strongly urge your support $17 million for agricultural research.
H. L. WALSTER,
Director, North Dakota Agricultural Experiment Station.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. YOUNG. I yield myself 2 minutes more.

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

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

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

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

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as part of my remarks the first 6½ pages of the report of the Senate Committee on Appropriations on the agricultural appropriation bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the report (No. 382) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Report of Committee on Appropriations (No. 382) to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 5227) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes, report the same to the Senate with various amendments and present herewith information relative to the changes made:

Amount of bill as passed House (direct appropriations)	$712,747,828
Amount of increase by Senate committee (net)	3,981,940
Amount of bill as reported to Senate	716,729,768
Amount of appropriations, 1953	737,209,833
Amount of estimates for 1954	749,852,342
The bill as reported to the Senate:	
Under the appropriations for 1953	20,480,065
Under the estimates for 1954	33,122,574

GENERAL STATEMENT

In reporting the bill to the Senate, the committee recommends total increases of $9,386,440 and total decreases of $5,404,500, for a net increase over the House bill of $3,981,940.

The largest item of increase recommended is $3 million for measuring cotton acreage in connection with allotments for 1954 crops. The second largest item of increase recommended is $2,454,000 for construction of access roads in north Idaho and Montana to permit salvage operations required by the infestation of the spruce bark beetle. The remainder of the increase recommended is for adjustments in the various research and control programs of the Department, of which research projects are increased by about $1,500,000.

The largest item of decrease recommended is $5 million for the new item of watershed protection inserted by the House.

RESEARCH

The need for continued research in agriculture is universally recognized. The platforms of both political parties have endorsed the providing of adequate funds for research in agriculture, and farm organizations as well as trade associations have repeatedly requested additional funds of as much as $17 million for such research.

The committee was advised that for all industry the total cost of research is estimated for 1 year at approximately $2 billion, of which the Federal Government is paying 47 percent. In the case of agriculture, total research expenditures are around $250 million, of which industry is putting up $140 million and $110 million is divided about evenly between the States and the Federal Government.

Since the beginning of time agriculture has provided the basic needs of all mankind. That truism applies to all of us in fuller measure today than ever because agriculture has also become the source upon which industry must depend for raw materials in producing the many things that add to the health, comfort, and convenience of everyday life.

Steel, oil, coal, rubber, and numerous other products are of course vital to our national well-being. But not one of them, nor all of them put together, are as basic to our individual lives or our national strength as food. Yet, the American public and perhaps too many of us in the Congress take for granted that sufficient food will always be available to us when, where, and how we like it.

That is a dangerous assumption. While it is true that American farmers have up to this time met, and sometimes exceeded, the demand for farm products, we must face the fact that the land we now have under cultivation must largely provide for our rapidly increasing population. With approximately 2 million more people to feed each year, and with little new land to move to, the most practical solution obviously is to further increase farm production per acre and per animal.

If the past can be used as a guide to the future, the farmers of this country can and will continue to meet our needs for products of the soil. Agriculture in the United States has made more progress in the last 75 years than in the previous 75 centuries elsewhere in the world. This period of remarkable advancement coincides with the history of research by the United States Department of Agriculture and the State agricultural experiment stations.

Over the past 25 years, agricultural research has increased crop yields by 45 percent; it has increased milk production per cow by 25 percent, and the increase in eggs per hen has increased even more. In 1900, 1 farm worker produced enough for himself and 7 others; he now produces enough for himself and 14 others. From the standpoint of comparative national strength, this progress takes on added significance when we consider that in Russia it takes 1 farm family to produce food for 2 families. In the United States, 8 out of 9 persons in the civilian labor force are working at jobs in industry and business.

While accomplishing its No. 1 job of providing enough food and fiber in peace and war, agriculture has become a tremendous market for the things produced by the nonagricultural industries. Great industrial establishments now make more tractors, trucks, combines, corn pickers, and many other types of farm equipment. The fertilizer business, the producers of pesticides, the electric appliance industry, the automobile and gasoline industries, all owe much, and some of their existence, to farm purchasing power.

In a recent year farmers owned about 4½ million tractors, 2,400,000 trucks, and 4,350,000 automobiles. Altogether, the equipment on farms nowadays is valued at more than $15 billion, and the investment has gone up sharply from year to year ever since mechanized equipment started to take the place of horses about 25 years ago.

Each year farmers use about 50 million tons of chemical materials. They use about 16 billion gallons of crude petroleum each year, more than is used annually by any other industry. Each year the tractors and other mechanized equipment on farms requires 320 million pounds of raw rubber or the amount required to put tires on 6 million automobiles. And under present conditions, farmers each year need about 20 billion kilowatt-hours of electrical power, the amount required to supply power to Philadelphia, Boston, Houston, Toledo, and Dayton.

Indeed, the interdependence of industry, labor, agriculture, our national strength, and the well-being of human beings in this country has become an established fact. All will benefit by striving to maintain this interdependence.

It has been roughly estimated that of the agricultural appropriations about half are primarily of benefit to farmers, and the other half is divided between benefits to the general public and benefits mutually between the farmer and the general public.

The cost of helping agriculture to reach its present high degree of efficiency has probably seemed high to many, but the investment has paid high returns. Cash receipts from farm marketings have more than tripled over the past two decades to about $28 billion. The net income of farm operators over that same period has gone from $4.3 billion to $13 billion. The value of farm assets has jumped from about $68.4 billion to $127 billion.

A more important yardstick for measuring progress, perhaps, is the fact that per capita consumption of such protective foods as meat, milk, eggs, fruit, and vegetables has increased appreciably. In 1950, for instance, consumers ate 19 percent more meat, poultry, and fish; 29 percent more eggs; 22 percent more dairy products other than butter; and 10 percent more fruit and vegetables than we ate just prior to World War II.

All this progress did not occur by accident. A combination of factors has helped to bring it about: A renewed effort on the part of farmers to apply research findings to their operations; reasonably favorable weather; and last, but not least, the assurance to farmers of returns that have had a fair relationship to the returns enjoyed by other segments of our economy.

There is little reason to doubt that farmers will continue to use good farming practices to the extent of their ability, now that they are convinced of their merits; the weather continues to be an unknown factor; since industry, labor, and consumers have such a high stake in a healthy and prosperous agriculture, the continuation of programs to help keep it that way, requires our most serious consideration.

Despite the progress that has been made in developing and bringing agricultural know-how to farmers, the job ahead is even more challenging. With the increasing number of people to consume food and fiber products, with a declining number of people on farms to produce them, and with relatively little new land on which crops can be grown, there has never been a more urgent need for efficient production, processing, and merchandising of farm products.

Each year insects still do about $4 billion worth of damage to our farm crops. The annual loss to cotton insect alone is more than $760 million. Our researchers estimate that we still lose 1 farm animal out of every 10 because of diseases and parasites. Mastitis and brucellosis of cattle still cost $240 million a year and poultry diseases another $200 million.

More than half of our timber resources are lost through fire, insects, and disease, and

waste in land clearing and other poor forestry management practices. It would be impossible to estimate, in terms of dollars, the loss of soil fertility that has taken place. It is a fact, however, that about 50 million acres of once productive cropland are too badly eroded for cultivation and another 100 million acres has been reduced because from half to all of the original topsoil has washed away.

As much as 30 percent of some of our fresh fruits and vegetables are lost through spoilage between the producer and the consumer. A few years ago a study in 13 Midwest States showed than one-third of the eggs marketed in those States dropped below grade A quality before they reached the first buyer. These are problems to which renewed attention must be given if we and those who come after us are to maintain the standard of living we now enjoy.

Few will challenge the merits of research and other services that have been and are being rendered for farmers by the United States Department of Agriculture. In many instances the end product of one research finding has more than paid the cost of Agriculture's annual appropriation. Take dextran, for example, which has been found to be a satisfactory substitute for blood plasma in treating shock casualties on the battlefield. While the value of this discovery cannot be evaluated in dollars and cents, it is a forward step in saving lives. The Department's Bureau of Agricultural and Industrial Chemistry has spent $750,000 on this research—only about one-fifth the cost of a B–36 bomber.

Several years ago the Department's Bureau of Agricultural and Industrial Chemistry perfected a new elastic-type cotton bandage that is particularly suitable for treating severe burns. It has proved under actual combat conditions to be superior to any bandage yet developed both from the standpoint of performance and cost. In fact, the Department of Defense saved about $5 million on its first order of 10 million bandages. This is about two-thirds of the entire annual appropriation for the Bureau.

The value of work done by the Department's researchers in the field of plant diseases defies computation. The hand of science in combating the effects of stem rust alone no doubt has meant the difference between success and complete failure in the production of cereal crops in this country. Through the use of rust-resistant varieties of oats in Iowa alone, farmers there have harvested the equivalent of an extra crop of oats each year for the past 12 years. The money value in that time amounts to well over $100 million. All in all, the value of disease-resistant cereals which have been developed by our plant breeders are now estimated to add about half a billion dollars a year to our cereal-crop income.

Research in the breeding, feeding, and management of animals is showing how to produce more meat per pound of feed. New meat-type hogs produce more choice cuts than the average hog, and recent tests indicate the possibility of increasing by 50 percent the daily gain in weight of cattle in the feed lot. Only a decade ago it took 12 pounds of feed and 12 weeks to produce a 3-pound broiler. Now 9 pounds of feed will produce such a bird in 10 weeks.

Research is helping to improve the grasslands of this country, and this fits in well with the overall need to produce more efficiently per acre, per animal, and per man-hour of labor. In North Carolina, for example, it has been proven that an acre capable of producing 50 bushels of corn can produce the equivalent in feed of 87 bushels of corn as improved pasture. The estimated return per man-hour of work was $23 from the improved pasture, compared with $3.69 from corn.

Soil and water conservation and good land-use practices in general are vital in peace and war. It is the best assurance that farmers will be able to maintain production in the years and generations ahead. But, as stated earlier, we must more than merely maintain production—we must make each acre and animal more productive than it is now to meet the definitely foreseenable increased demands of more and more consumers. Great progress has been made in this direction, but the Department's Soil Conservation Service estimates that only one-fourth of the total conservation job has been done. Therefore, some idea of the job ahead can be obtained by a brief résumé of what has already been accomplished.

At the present time approximately 2,500 soil-conservation districts and ranches—organized under State enabling acts and administered by locally elected supervisors—include about four-fifths of all the farmland in the country. In these districts, 2¼ million farmers or ranchers have completed conservation farm plans or are working toward completion of them with the help of SCS technicians. About 275 million acres are covered by complete plans and about 180 million acres have already received the combined conservation treatment called for by them.

Under the agricultural conservation program, which is administered largely by local county and community committees, 52 million acres of pasture and range have been improved by reseeding; 18 million acres are being protected through the construction of standard, broad-based terraces; permanent cover has been established on 2 million acres of land subject to erosion; 5 million acres have been leveled for irrigation; sod waterways have been established on 315,000 acres; trees have been planted on 900,000 acres; 824,000 small dams have been built on farms and ranches to retard soil losses and reduce flood damage. All this and only one-fourth of the job is done.

One-third of the land area of the United States is in forest land. If properly managed, these forests could produce all of the timber needed in the foreseeable future for an expanding economy. Unfortunately, however, the current annual drain on saw timber is in excess of the annual growth. Most public forest land is now managed for continuous production and many of the more progressive private owners of forest land are practicing excellent forestry. But much of the timber cutting on private lands is still not up to good forestry standards.

The Department's Forest Service administers the national forests which consists of about 180 million acres of public lands. These forests each year make a major contribution not only to the Nation's welfare but directly in cash to the Federal Treasury. Last year, in receipts from the sale of timber, grazing fees, and other special uses, they returned to the Treasury more than the total cost of managing and protecting the national forests.

Much of the Department's work in helping farmers and the handlers, processors, and merchandisers of farm products to do a better job of getting these products from the farm to the consumer is of a continuing nature. The cumulative investment in services rendered for research, soil conservation, marketing, plant and livestock inspection, market news, crop reporting, farm credit, and many others, adds up to a tremendous sum. But it is estimated that the cumulative returns exceed by manyfold the total cost. The investment is one that must be protected lest we lose the incalculable benefits that have been gained.

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

Mr. YOUNG. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. I notice by the report that there have been reductions of $5,404,500, in appropriations provided by the House, and that one of the items stricken out is $5 million for watershed protection. I call attention to the language found on page 15 of the committee report, which reads:

> The decrease recommended by the committee is to deny this approach to a recognized problem. The committee is advised that the number of projects intended to be covered by the amount provided are a few of a large number of such projects on which preliminary examinations or surveys have been made but which have not been authorized under the Flood Control Act of 1944.

I should like to ask the distinguished chairman whether he does not believe that these projects would be authorized under Public Law 46 of the 74th Congress, and the Soil Conservation Act of 1935?

Mr. YOUNG. Not being a lawyer, I will not attempt to give the Senator a very expert legal opinion. At least some of the members of the subcommittee on agricultural appropriations believed that there was a close question as to the authorization for these projects. I think appropriations could be made for them on the basis of their being classified as experimental or test projects. I would like to say to the Senator from Kansas, who has a great interest in these projects—and I think they are worthy ones—that the committee did not delete this item because of any belief that the projects were not meritorious. It was rather a question of the legal requirements of their proper authorization. I think the Congress could appropriate for them under the authorization, I believe it was, of 1936.

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

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I appreciate very much the statement by the Senator from North Dakota, but I should like to point out that Public Law 46 of the 74th Congress gives the Soil Conservation Service authority to deal with all matters relating to conservation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a memorandum which I have prepared on this subject.

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

> I point out that Public Law 46 of the 74th Congress gives the Soil Conservation Service authority to deal with all matters relating to conservation.
>
> Among the purposes of the act as set out are flood control, the prevention of the impairment of reservoirs, and the maintenance of navigability of rivers and harbors.
>
> In carrying out the provisions of the act, the Secretary is authorized, among other things, and I quote: "To carry out preventive measures, including, but not limited to, engineering operations, methods of cultivation, the growing of vegetation, and changes in the use of land."
>
> That is interpreted by the solicitor's office in the Department of Agriculture and also in the Bureau of the Budget, as giving full authority to whatever is necessary, including the building of suitable structures to deal with this type of a project.
>
> The 48 originally listed projects which passed the House are fully authorized under the provisions of Public Law 46 of the 74th

Congress. They have been approved by the Department of Agriculture and there is full authority for their construction.

I have discussed this matter with the Bureau of the Budget on previous occasions and that is the position they have taken; namely, that it is not necessary that they be authorized under the 1936 Flood Control Act.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I may say to the Senator from Kansas that some of the watershed programs have been authorized by the regular authorizing committees of the Congress. As the Senator says, some of them have not been so authorized. The $5 million would make possible the starting of about $29 million worth of projects. There was a question in the mind of some of the Senators as to whether we should support this large program without regular authorization by the authorizing committees of the Congress. I think this is a question which probably can be ironed out in conference. All members of the committee feel that these are worthy projects, and that the program itself is an excellent one.

Mr. CARLSON. I want to make for the RECORD an observation which I believe to be important. I was a Member of the House of Representatives at the time in 1936 omnibus Flood Control Act was passed. As a matter of fact, I was a member of the committee that wrote it.

The omnibus Flood Control Act of 1936 authorized the Secretary of Agriculture to develop watershed programs. It is under this act and amendments thereto that a few watershed projects have been authorized and for a number of years Congress has made appropriations to carry on these projects. However, these appropriations have been exceedingly meager. The projects have developed slowly and none have progressed far enough, as yet, to demonstrate what can be achieved in the way of flood control. In most cases it will be many years, at the present rate of appropriations, before the projects can be completed.

The watershed projects submitted in this bill before the Senate, having passed the House, are not submitted under the provisions of the 1936 Flood Control Act but rather under the authority which the Department of Agriculture has to deal with flood control matters in the original Soil Conservation Act of 1935, which is Public Law 46 of the 74th Congress.

I assure the distinguished Senator from North Dakota that it is my thought that the projects, which were approved by the House committee and which were passed by the House, would be authorized under the 1936 act, which I firmly believe carries adequate authority for projects of this kind.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I am very happy to have the comments of the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. I appreciate very much, if the distinguished Senator will yield further, his statement that the committee will be pleased to give consideration to this matter in conference. I sincerely hope they will. It is a program in which our country in interested. It is a program which ought to be established. We hear a great deal about expenditures for flood control. With reference to the projects which were approved by the House of Representatives, the local contributions would be 52 percent of the cost. In other words, the Federal Government can get assistance in carrying out some of these projects to control water runoff at its source, which, of course, has an effect on the floods in the valleys. I shall not stand upon the Senate floor to say I believe it will protect the valleys from floods; I do not believe it will; but it should be a part of the program, and I hope the distinguished chairman and the other members of the committee will give serious consideration to this matter when it is taken to conference.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a memorandum on this subject.

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

I take this opportunity to express my sincere hope that the Senate will approve the item which passed the House, providing $5 million for the development of watershed programs.

If we do not take definite action on the item as it passed the House, I would urge the conferees between the Senate and House to give serious consideration to the inclusion of this item and the final passage of the bill.

All over the country our people have awakened to the realization that soil conservation and the terraces, gully stops, contour farming, check dams and stock ponds, designed to hold the water where it falls, are an essential part of flood control.

Furthermore, they are beginning to realize that these water-hold structures and practices must be applied to the whole upstream watershed areas, of which there are thousands, if we are to take the action necessary to help prevent disastrous floods and flood damage.

The control of water runoff at its source is important as a part of a long-range soil conservation program. At the present time we have a few partially completed programs of watershed control, but at the rate of present work on these projects, it will be many years before they are completed.

The projects in the pending bill are projects that can be completed in from 1 to 5 years and they would give this Nation test or pilot projects that could be used to evaluate their effectiveness on the control of water runoff, soil conservation, and floods in the lower valleys. They are truly test or pilot projects.

I am sure that the Members of the Senate are aware of the tremendous interest in watershed programs which exists throughout the country. As a matter of fact, I am convinced that the country is far ahead of the Department of Agriculture and the Congress on this subject. They are demanding that we take action to get some projects completed at the earliest possible date.

The approval of this item of $5 million, with a total original cost to the Federal Government of less than $30 million, would require local contributions of over $30 million. Therefore, the Federal Government would, in reality, be securing $60 million worth of work for less than $30 millon. The local contributions would constitute approximately 52 percent and the Federal contribution 48 percent on the final completion of these projects.

It occurs to me that this would be to the distinct advantage of the Federal Government in securing projects that will, in my opinion, add protection and wealth to our Nation of many times more than the original cost.

Mr. YOUNG. The Senator has made a good case, and I am sure the committee will give the matter careful consideration.

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

Mr. YOUNG. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. GRISWOLD. In connection with the matter which the Senator from Kansas has just discussed, I may say I am sure the Senator from North Dakota realizes that there is a real interest in the State of Nebraska in this same problem. I should like to ask whether the committee fully understood that a great deal of the expense would be borne by way of local participation in carrying out most of the program?

Mr. YOUNG. Yes, I think most of the Members of the committee are fully aware of the contribution to be made by the local people. As I said before, I think the committee is generally strongly in favor of the projects.

Mr. GRISWOLD. Has there been much opposition throughout the Nation to this general type of program?

Mr. YOUNG. No, on the contrary there has been very little. I personally believe that the program should have been carried on at the same time and at the same rate as are other big water development programs, including flood control projects. This program is in many respects less costly, and in many cases, it can do a better job of holding water where it falls on the upper reaches of streams than can the larger dams.

Mr. GRISWOLD. I thank the Senator from North Dakota for making clear some of the questions which were in my mind.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the first committee amendent.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Department of Agriculture—Title I—Regular Activities—Agricultural Marketing Act," on page 2, line 12, after the word "Department," to strike out "$5,500,000" and insert "$5,250,000."

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I wish to offer an amendment to the committee amendment. I send to the desk an amendment and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, line 12, it is proposed to strike out "$5,250,000" and to insert in lieu thereof "$5,290,000."

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, the amendment which I have offered is to increase the amount for the agricultural marketing programs by $40,000, bringing the total from $5,250,000, recommended by the committee, to $5,290,000.

The specific purpose of this amendment is to provide funds to enable the Department of Agriculture to initiate a new market news and statistical service for the turkey industry.

This was originally included in the $250,000 in increased funds for marketing programs recommended in the Truman budget, eliminated in the Eisenhower budget, restored by the House, and again recommended to be taken out by the Senate committee.

The Department of Agriculture over a period of years has improved its marketing service in many particulars, including the type of weekly production reports which is here proposed for turkey growers.

With production 13 percent above that of the previous year, turkey raisers last year faced a marked surplus which so depressed the market and threatened to destroy the turkey industry, that the Secretary of Agriculture authorized purchases largely for distribution to nonprofit school-lunch programs.

From October 1952 to March 1953 such purchases amounted to 48,400,000 pounds of frozen ready-to-cook 1952-crop turkeys.

This represented an investment of $26,100,000 by the Government.

The purchases were made with section 32 funds provided by Congress to encourage consumption of agricultural commodities by diverting surplus quantities from normal channels of trade.

The recent conference of turkey producers called by the Secretary of Agriculture to explore means to avoid a repetition of such surpluses as occurred last year recommended a weekly statistical service to indicate what turkey hatchings are, month by month or week by week, so that they could keep informed on what is happening. In this way the farmers growing turkeys would be better informed of what the production prospects are likely to be and could expand or contract their output accordingly.

Here is the case of an industry itself seeking, through an entirely reasonable request for a Government reporting service at a nominal cost, to help solve some of the surplus problems with which it is confronted and which are costly to the producer and the Government alike.

I believe, Mr. President, we could save a great deal of money if we make the funds available so that the Government may enter into such statistical reporting service, because, if the producer knew that there would be a sharp increase in the number of poults hatched and put on feed, he would be likely to cancel orders or reduce in the next month his turkey production. Then there would not be the sharp increase we have witnessed over past years.

Inasmuch as the House committee had this item in its recommendations, I believe the Senate Appropriations Committee made a mistake at the time it reported the bill. It is for that reason that I have offered my amendment. I have had numerous calls with reference to it. I know the importance of statistical reporting in connection with the livestock industry. I think we should have the same kind of reporting for the turkey industry, because it has become one of our major industries and sources of agricultural income.

I hope the chairman of the committee will agree to accept my amendment.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, the Senator from Minnesota has made a very good case for his amendment. I have received many telegrams from all over the United States with reference to the proposed reduction in the appropriation, and I think it would be advisable to take the amendment to conference. I shall accept the amendment and take it to conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

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

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Agricultural Economics," on page 3, line 22, after the word "trends," to strike out "$2,120,000" and insert "$2,372,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Agricultural Research Administration—Office of Administrator," on page 5, line 19, after the word "building," to insert "whichever is greater."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, line 19, after the word "greater" in the amendment heretofore stated, to insert a colon and the following additional proviso: "*Provided further*, That transfers not to exceed $11,000 may be made to this appropriation from the several appropriations of the Agricultural Research Administration for general-use capital improvements at the Agricultural Research Center."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office of Experiment Stations—Payments to States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puero Rico," on page 7, line 4, after the name "Alaska," to strike out "$62,500" and insert "$75,000," and in line 8, after the name "Puerto Rico," to strike out "$13,441,208" and insert "$13,453,708."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Animal Industry," on page 9, line 14, after "(7 U. S. C. 429)", to strike out "$3,916,500" and insert "$4,189,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 10, line 4, after the word "products", to strike out "$8,635,000" and insert "$8,480,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 10, line 22, after the numerals "1952", to strike out "is hereby repealed" and insert "is amended by adding 'voluntary' before the word 'reimbursements'."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Agricultural and Industrial Chemistry," on page 11, line 19, after the word "thereof", to strike out "$7,625,000" and insert "$7,750,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Plant Industry, Soils, and Agricultural Engineering," on page 12, line 12, after the word "airplanes", to strike out "$11,586,000" and insert "$12,230,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine," on page 14, line 4, after word "application", to strike out "$3,888,760" and insert "$4,076,900."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 15, line 6, after "(7 U. S. C. 150–150g)", to strike out "$5,187,000" and insert "$5,600,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 16, line 17, after "(7 U. S. C. 147a)", to strike out "$2,600,000" and insert "$2,750,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 16, line 24, after the word "citizens", to strike out "$500,000" and insert "$750,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Control of Forest Pests," on page 17, line 19, after "(16 U. S. C., Supp. V, 594–1–594–5)", to strike out "$2,300,000" and insert "$3,350,000", and, at the begining of line 20, to strike out "$1,900,000" and insert "$2,920,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 18, at the beginning of line 2, to strike out "$3,000,000" and insert "$3,095,000", and, at the beginning of line 10, to strike out "$950,000" and insert "$1,045,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Forest Service—Salaries and Expenses," on page 19, at the beginning of line 18, to strike out "building" and insert "building;".

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 21, at the beginning of line 24, to strike out "$29,665,700" and insert "$29,715,700."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 22, line 20, after the word "economics", to strike out "$5,350,000" and insert "$5,402,300."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Forest Roads and Trails," on page 23, line 8, after the word "administration", to strike out "$13,546,000" and insert "$16,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Acquisition of Lands for National Forests—Weeks Act," on page 24, at the beginning of line 2, to strike out "toward" and insert "of."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 26, after line 19, to strike out:

WATERSHED PROTECTION

For expenses necessary to conduct surveys, investigations, and research and to carry out preventive measures, including, but not limited to engineering operations, methods of cultivation, the growing of vegetation, and changes in use of land, in accordance with the provisions of Public Law 46, 74th Congress; $5,000,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Soil Conservation Service—Salaries and Expenses," on page 27, line 22, after the word "employees", to strike out "$60,844,014" and insert "$60,944,014."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Water Conservation and Utilization Projects," on page 29, line 22, after the word "expended", to strike out "$425,500" and insert "$685,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Agricultural Conservation Program," on page 32, line 10, after the word "than", to strike out "$1,000" and insert "$1,500."

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, would an amendment on page 32 be in order at this time, or should I wait until the committee amendments are adopted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the Senator's amendment to the committee amendment which is now under consideration?

Mr. WILLIAMS. No. It is on page 32, line 2.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that the amendment would not be in order at this time.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 33, line 6, after the word "counties", to strike out the colon and *"Provided further,* That not to exceed 1½ percent of the allocation for the agricultural conservation program for any State may be utilized in determining the most needed conservation practices on individual farms for which Federal assistance shall be given," and in line 23, after the word "pernicious", to strike out "polticial" and insert "political."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Production and Marketing Administration—Agricultural Adjustment Programs," on page 34, line 15, after the word "labor", to strike out "$35,500,000" and insert "$38,500,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Marketing Services," on page 37, at the beginning of line 9, to strike out "$11,486,000" and insert "$11,496,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Rural Electrification Administration—Loan Authorizations," on page 38, line 11, after the word "program," to strike out "$50,000,000" and insert "$67,500,000", and in line 12, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$30,000,000" and insert "$45,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Farmers' Home Administration—Loan Authorizations," on page 40, line 15, after the word "amended," to strike out "$7,000,000" and insert $6,500,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes the committee amendments.

The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask that it be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 32, lines 2 and 3, it is proposed to strike out "$195,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$140,000,000."

On line 10, it is proposed to strike out "$1,500" and insert in lieu thereof $1,000."

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, the purpose of the amendment is to reduce the appropriation by $55,000,000 and, at the same time, to reduce the maximum amount of payment which can be made to any single farmer to $1,000.

This reduction is in line with the amount requested by the Secretary of Agriculture speaking for the administration, and I hope the chairman of the subcommittee will accept the amendment without further debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair advises the Senator from Delaware that the second amendment, on line 10, to reduce the item from $1,500 to $1,000 is not in order.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Then I offer the first part of the amendment, the purpose of which is to reduce the appropriation by $55,000,000. This reduction has been approved by the administration—it has been endorsed by Mr. Alan Kline, the president of the American Farm Bureau—it has been endorsed by Mr. J. T. Sands, legislative representative of the National Grange. Both these great farm organizations are in favor of the lower figure and rather than reject their recommendation I think the Senate should give them a vote of thanks. Surely they should be commended for their unselfish approach to the problem of cutting Government expenditures.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I not only refuse to accept the amendment but I am strongly opposed to it. The Department of Agriculture asked for $140 million for the agricultural-conservation program, and the payments would only be made on nonrecurring items. This would eliminate fertilizer, phosphate, and many other parts of the soil-conservation program.

The House raised the amount to $195 million and reinstated substantially the present program. That is covered also in the language of the report of the Senate Committee on Appropriations.

I personally believe that $500 million, or even more, probably could be wisely spent each year to conserve the soil of the United States, and it would be well worthwhile, because soil is perhaps the greatest of our assets. However, I believe that the compromise on $195 million reached by the House is a good one. I think the Nation can well afford to spend $195 million on soil conservation in the coming year.

I understand that amendments will be offered to raise the amount to $225 million, and anyone could make a good case for that figure. However, I personally believe that the bill as a whole is a good one, so far as agriculture is concerned, and that it is substantially a good bill for farmers. I believe that a reduction to $140 million on this program would do irreparable harm to the soil-conservation program in the United States.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I wish to say a word about the proposal to reduce the agricultural-conservation program to $140 million from the $195 million which the committee has proposed. As I understand, the Department of Agriculture has been working on a program to be put into effect in the event the appropriation is reduced to $140 million. Unfortunately, the type of program which is proposed on the $140 million basis would provide for continuing the program in a few States, primarily what are known as the range States, at a level comparable to that which prevailed when the appropriation was $250 million. The reduction would come largely in the older farming States, where there are small farms, and where soil improvement probably is needed as much as it is needed on a large part of the western land.

The same proposition was encountered 4 or 5 years ago, when a program was proposed which would have benefited primarily the States where it was possible to improve ranges. Of course, ranges ought to be improved, but it should not be done at the expense of all the other States.

If $140 million were appropriated, it would probably result in about 25 percent being used for administrative purposes. That is altogether too high an amount for that purpose. If it should be decided that the amount should be reduced to $140 million, probably it would be better to eliminate the program completely, and then to establish an entirely new program for the improvement of ranges.

I think the amount arrived at by the House and by the Senate committee is fair. It will provide for a continuing of the soil-conservation program in the Eastern States, and in the Mountain States of the West, as well. Personally, I hope it will be possible to improve the ranges and also the farms. There is some question whether liming and the application of other chemicals which have been depleted from the soil is a permanent improvement or not. There is also question whether irrigation ditches or terraces are permanent, unless they are cared for.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I wish to concur in the statement just made by the Senator from Vermont in regard to a continuation of this appropriation in the amount of at least $195 million. We who are familiar with the program realize that it is not only an important one, but that to reduce the figure to $140 million would be most serious.

I wonder if I am correct in assuming that the House committee evidently took the figure of $250 million, which has been the amount appropriated in the past, or which has been at least mentioned in the budget, subtracted $140 million from that, leaving $110 million, then compromised by adding 50 percent of that amount to $140 million arriving at the figure of $195 million. That is a practical solution, and I hope the Senate will adopt it.

Mr. AIKEN. I do not know how the House arrived at its figure, but it seems to me to be fair. The Department of Agriculture is taking a cut in its appropriations, just as we expect other segments of our economy to take cuts in an effort to balance the budget. If the budget is not balanced very quickly, it will not

make much difference what is done about appropriations. We shall be in serious trouble.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield if I have the time. I do not know whose time I am using.

Mr. COOPER. I noticed that the Secretary of Agriculture has been consistent in support of the proposal to reduce this appropriation to $140 million, and has said that what are called nonrecurring soil practices would be eliminated. Does the bill now before the Senate eliminate what we have termed "nonrecurring practices," such as the application of lime, phosphate, and fertilizer?

Mr. AIKEN. I am not speaking for the chairman of the subcommittee, but I am certain that it was the purpose and intent of the Committee on Appropriations, in increasing the amount from $140 million to $195 million, to make it possible that these common practices of the Eastern States should be continued. As a matter of fact, if the soil is limed, or if superphosphate, manganese, or magnesium, or any of the trace elements, are applied to the soil, and they are not used up, the effect is probably as permanent as terraces, irrigation ditches, or other methods which are called permanent practices, if they are not cared for from year to year.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the committee report sets forth very clearly the intention of the committee. I think it would be well to insert it in the RECORD at this stage. The item is discussed very briefly on page 12 of the committee report.

Mr. COOPER. It was my understanding that it was the intention of the Senate Committee on Appropriations to continue what are called recurring practices, but I wished to have the statement made as a matter of record.

Mr. RUSSELL. I read from page 12 of the report:

> The committee has heard with grave concern of the proposed changes to be made in the types of conservation practices for which ACP payments will be made. We believe that it would be a mistake to institute such drastic changes.
>
> The committee, in approving the authorization for soil-conservation practices, intends to adhere to the policy of having these practices instituted by the several State committees as has been the case in past years. The State committees are fully informed as to the practices necessary to carry on a well-balanced conservation program within the State and should be permitted to select these practices at the State level with a minimum of control from Washington.

This is the most cogent part of it, I may say to the Senator from Kentucky:

> We do not approve of the changes proposed by the Secretary of Agriculture and his assistants, and have authorized the crop year 1954 ACP payments through PMA committees with the intent that the program in effect in 1953 will be substantially followed in 1954.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. In order that it may be quite clear in the RECORD, I should like to ask the Senator a question. I am sure that because of his experience the Senator from Georgia knows that in large degree the practices—at least in the Southern States and in the border States—consist of the application of lime, phosphates, and fertilizers, not only in the first year in which there is a seeding but in subsequent years. Is that correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not know that the proportion would be as great in all cases as the Senator has indicated, but that is certainly a material part of the program in the States to which the Senator has referred.

Mr. COOPER. I notice that the Secretary said in the hearings that it was the intention in submitting the figure $140 million to consider the first application of lime or phosphate as a permanent-type practice, but that under that program the Department would not permit further applications. Is it the understanding of the Senator, as a member of the committee, that under the authorization of $195 million not only the first application of minerals and fertilizers but, as agreed upon between the county committees and the farmers, recurring applications can be made?

Mr. RUSSELL. It is my understanding of the authorization figure—and this is an authorization for 1954—that it is the intention of the committee, and, I may say, of the Senate, unless some action to the contrary is taken by the entire Senate, that the practices now in effect in any State will be substantially adhered to in 1954, including the practice of fertilizing referred to by the Senator from Kentucky. I am sure the chairman of the subcommittee will bear out that understanding.

Mr. COOPER. Is it the opinion of the Senator from Georgia that the practical effect of this reduction would be borne by farmers—a great many of whom are tenant farmers—who have used the recurring type of soil-improvement practices?

Mr. RUSSELL. I think there can be no question about that. That goes to the amount.

Mr. COOPER. Yes.

Mr. RUSSELL. I may say to the Senator that I propose, at the appropriate time, to offer an amendment which would allow a 10-percent reduction in this program and authorize a program for next year in the amount of $225 million, so that the reduction would not be so severe. At the appropriate time, I intend to offer my amendment.

Mr. COOPER. I have an amendment of my own to offer. At least, I shall support the Senator's amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. I shall gladly support the Senator's amendment or I shall be happy to have the Senator join me in my amendment.

Mr. COOPER. I shall be very glad to do so.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator. I shall add his name to the amendment, as well as the name of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE].

Mr. President, the attention of the chairman of the subcommittee was diverted when we were discussing the nature of the program contemplated for 1954. I had stated that, in my opinion, the Senate committee—and the Senate as well, if it approves this action—intends that substantially the same program shall be adhered to in 1954 as was followed in 1953. I think it would be well for the RECORD if the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee were to make a statement as to whether or not that is his understanding.

Mr. YOUNG. That is the understanding of the chairman of the subcommittee. The committee itself was almost unanimously in favor of carrying on substantially the same program as we have had in the past. The language of the report so states.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, if I may make a final statement, my own State of Vermont was one of the first States to make full use of the ACP. It has worked there probably as well as in any other State in the Union. Agricultural experts estimate that because the agricultural conservation program in New England the price of milk to Boston consumers is about 3 cents a quart less than it otherwise would be today. The program has worked well enough so that the last two sessions of the Vermont Legislature, in both houses, including the legislature which adjourned a week ago, unanimously memorialized Congress to continue this program.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield for a question?

Mr. AIKEN. I am glad to yield, if I have the time.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does the Senator from Vermont believe that the parliamentary discussion which has just taken place, plus the statement of the committee, will be binding upon the Secretary of Agriculture? Does the Secretary of Agriculture, under the original act, have the power to lay out the program?

Mr. AIKEN. I think the discussion which has taken place on the floor will be morally binding upon the Secretary of Agriculture. I am sure the Secretary of Agriculture would not undertake to go contrary to the intent of the Congress. I do not know whether the present discussion would be legally binding or not, but I suspect that it would be. I am not an attorney. I think it would be morally binding on Ezra Benson, which is just as good as though it were legally binding.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does the Senator from Vermont have any assurances that the Secretary of Agriculture will follow the unofficial will of Congress in this matter?

Mr. AIKEN. The Secretary of Agriculture has assured the Congress and the people of the United States time and time again that he will carry out the intent of the Congress, even though it may disagree with his own viewpoint. I have full confidence that that is true.

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

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Will this condition prevail no matter what the total sum may be which is authorized—whether we authorize $195 million, $140 million, or $225 million? Will the method of distribution be the present method?

Mr. AIKEN. If this appropriation is made, it will indicate with certainty the intent of the Congress to continue, in the ACP, those practices which have been used so successfully in all States of the Union since the inception of the program.

Mr. DOUGLAS. And this will be true regardless of the sums authorized?

Mr. AIKEN. I am sure of that.

Mr. GRISWOLD. Mr. President, I should like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee a question.

In the committee report on the ACP program there is reference to the question of the authority of State committees to make certain decisions within the States, as to what type of program they wish to carry out. In the actual operation of the program, if an allotment is made to a State—perhaps a temporary allotment—and then the State committee decides to reduce the program, does that mean a saving to the Treasury of the United States? Would the money then be spent through the Department of Agriculture in other States of the Union, or would there be a saving to the Treasury? There is reference to the State having some control, and not being subject to too much Federal control. If the State reduces a program, does that mean a saving, or will other States spend the money?

Mr. YOUNG. I should like to have the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] answer that question in detail. He is completely familiar with the subject. My understanding is that practices are initiated by the States themselves and approved by the Secretary of Agriculture. The amount of money going to each State would depend largely on the type of practices approved in the State.

However, there is an allocation to the States, under the formula and there is a special provision that no State, under a change of program, shall lose more than 15 percent. I should like to have the Senator from Georgia explain the situation. He is much more familiar with the subject than I am.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. HENDRICKSON in the chair). The Senator from North Dakota asks unanimous consent to yield to the Senator from Georgia in order that he may answer a question.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I appreciate very much the confidence which the Senator from North Dakota has manifested. However, in connection with this specific question I am afraid it is not well placed. There is an allotment made among the several States, under the formula. That allotment is broken down within the State, by counties or local subdivisions of Government—parishes, or whatever the local subdivision may be called.

Mr. YOUNG. That is based upon the type of program approved.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is correct. It depends upon the type of program. Then the money is distributed at the local level by the local committee, after it has inspected to see that there has been compliance with the practices permitted within the State. Heretofore the program has originated at the State level. The State committees would meet and decide what were the most essential conservation practices within the State, and the relative weight to be given to each of those practices, as well as the amount of money which would be available for each of them. The programs submitted to the Department of Agriculture in Washington, and the department has in most instances approved the State programs, although there have been in instances of the department having disallowed certain practices and has not permitted the payments to be made.

Under the old system, which was in effect when the appropriation was in the amount of $500 million, which was the amount of the appropriation for many years, there was a system of redistribution, but it is my opinion—I do not state it as a fact—that today no such system of redistribution is in effect, and that any sum which is not expended within a State either is carried over in the appropriations for next year by act of Congress, or reverts to the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. GRISWOLD. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is my opinion.

Mr. AIKEN. I may say that the officials of the PMA, or the officials who have charge of the ACP program, have discussed the matter with me, and they insist that the suggestions sent out by the Department of Agriculture under memorandum No. 5 were not final, and that the States still are entitled to make other suggestions as to what should be in the program so as to provide the greatest benefit to each State. Therefore I contemplate that the States' desires will be observed in this respect.

I may say that last year, apparently, several million dollars were not spent. In the early days, as the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] has stated, if a State did not spend its money another State could use it. For many years Vermont used money which was not spent by New York and Maine, and we appreciated that practice very much. However, after a while Maine and New York used all of their allotments, and Vermont could use only what the State was entitled to use under its own allotment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HENDRICKSON in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I request the yeas and nays.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I renew my request for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], and myself, I offer a substitute amendment for the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 32, in lines 2 and 3, it is proposed to strike out "$195,000,000", and insert in lieu thereof $225,000,000."

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, is it the purpose of the Senator from Georgia to amend my amendment or to amend the committee amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia offers the amendment as one in the second degree. The vote will be taken first on the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia, and then on the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I offer the amendment as a substitute for the amendment proposed by the distinguished Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I understand.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I have 15 minutes in which to discuss this amendment. Therefore, I shall not be able to yield for questions, although I regret that very much.

Mr. President, no man who has knowledge of the facts about the farms of the Nation today can deny the beneficial effects of the soil-conservation program.

One has only to travel throughout the country to see the great strides which have been made in repairing the waste which has been caused by erosion brought about by water and wind and careless cultivation.

When we consider the productive capacity of the farms of America, we realize that in the case of almost every agricultural commodity we are now producing substantial quantities per acre greater than the production before this program was inaugurated and put into effect.

The issue here is whether the entire Nation has a stake in preserving the fertility of our soil.

This program was originally adopted as a half-billion-dollar program, and an appropriation in that amount was authorized. Year after year Congress appropriated half a billion dollars for this important work.

Then came the war. During the war we could not make large Federal Government appropriations for the conservation of the soil. We called upon farmers everywhere to plant crops which were soil-depleting in character; that was requested in order that we might have the food and fiber necessary for ourselves and our allies, so as to gain a victory over the totalitarian states. During the war this appropriation was reduced to $300 million.

At the end of the war the necessity for increased production momentarily ceased. But we did not restore the program. Instead, it has been whittled away and whittled away, year after year, until now, if this amendment is adopted, the appropriation will be only $225 million. If not adopted, there will only be available the inadequate sum of $195 million.

The authorization for the current year is $250 million. This amendment represents a reduction of 10 percent in the authorization for this important work, which is, I say, a part of the defense effort—to preserve the fertility of the soil, so that we can produce the food and the fiber necessary in case of an emergency.

Mr. President, let me say that if all other appropriation items were reduced in the amount the appropriation for this program has been reduced, the total budget for the Federal Government would not be more than $60 billion. The original authorization for this program was $500 million. Therefore, the authorization for the current year represents a 50-percent decrease in the original authorization. My amendment calls for a 10-percent decrease in the authorization for this year. If the appropriations for all items and programs were reduced 10 percent, we would have a balanced budget. Mr. President, the farmers of the Nation should not be called upon to accept a greater reduction than that.

The population of the United States is increasing at the rate of almost 7,000 new citizens every 24 hours—7,000 more mouths to feed, 7,000 more persons to clothe, each and every 24 hours. In the face of that situation, some propose that we strike down and almost fatally impair the important soil-conservation program.

Last year it was argued that conditions on the farms were so good that the farmers were able to pay for all these practices, that the people of the Nation had no interest in the soil-conservation program, and that there was no occasion for the appropriation from the Federal Treasury of funds for the program.

In reply, Mr. President, I point out that the costs of these practices have greatly increased; in fact, they have almost doubled. Thus we see that this program has been cut in two ways. First, cuts are made in the appropriation at a time when the cost of soil-conservation practices is increasing. Furthermore, at a time when farm income is declining from day to day, it is proposed still further to whittle away the very modest payments which are made to preserve the one great asset that is basic to our existence, and without which we cannot live.

Mr. President, we may get by with fewer airplanes or we may get by with fewer other things, although to do so would seem to some of us to tend to weaken the national defense. However, if we ever permit the soil of the Nation to erode and if we permit the topsoil to be blown away or to be washed into the streams, and eventually into the sea, we shall be losing something which cannot be replaced and as a result our great civilization will be brought to its eventual doom.

Mr. President, if I can read aright the signs of the times, the farmers' income is going to continue to decrease for some time to come. Thus, it is vital that the soil conservation program be maintained.

I deplore the fact that it is necessary to reduce the appropriation for the program by $25 million, as proposed by this amendment. But certainly we cannot afford to withdraw all the incentives to the farmers to continue the soil-conservation program.

Mr. President, I do not suppose any discussion of the political effects of the vote on this item has any proper place in the debate; but I assure my colleagues that the farmers of the Nation today are placed in such a position that they almost have to count their pennies—not their dollars, but their pennies. If the appropriation made by the Federal Government, as its share in this program which is so vital to our people, is cut down at the very time when the farmers' income is decreasing $1,500,000,000 a year, the farmers will say that the United States Senate is adding insult to injury, and the farmers will not feel very kindly toward those who vote against this program, which as of today has caused many of the streams to be clear flowing, whereas in the past they were filled with mud.

Mr. THYE rose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota, who is a coauthor of the amendment.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I seek the floor in my own right; I shall not disturb the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. Very well.

Mr. President, conservation of the land of the Nation is favored in the abstract by everyone. I was greatly impressed by the statement made by the President of the United States in his state of the Union message when he said:

> We must match the substantial achievements in the half century since President Theodore Roosevelt awakened the Nation to the problem of conservation.

Mr. President, I say to you there is no more vital program to the future security of the Nation than that of preserving the fertility of the soil and seeing to it that generations yet unborn have as their heritage a soil sufficiently fertile to be able to produce the essentials of life.

The farmer produces in its original state about half the annual production of the wealth of the Nation. The other day I read some figures given the wage income of the various groups and classes of our people. The list was led, as I recall, by the steel workers, the automobile workers, the electrical workers, and the coal miners. The workers in those categories have average earnings of $75 a week. But down at the bottom of the list was the American farmer, with an average across-the-board income to all farmers, including the farm workers, of $15 a week—for producing the essentials of life, the things that are basic to our existence from day to day. The income of the farmers and farm workers was at the very bottom of the list, and their income is still decreasing. Yet now it is proposed that a great decrease be made in the soil-conservation program.

Mr. President, in view of the great burden the farmer is assuming today, as a result of the squeeze to which he is subjected between declining income and increasing costs of the things he must buy, it is all the more important that this fund be provided as an incentive to him to carry on the soil-conservation practices that will permit us to leave a legacy to those who come after the last one of us has departed from these Halls, which will enable them to also enjoy the bountiful fare and clothing which this generation has known and which has made our country the envy of the world.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I rise to support the statement made by the distinguished and able Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. He has spoken wisely as to why there should be a continuance of the soil-conservation payments. One needs but to go into any community in the Nation to find young men assuming the responsibility of farm management. Whether in the North or in the South, the young men have assumed great financial obligations, as farm operators and farm managers.

A young man who has assumed such a responsibility needs the continuance of the soil-conservation program, in order that he may have an incentive to make applications of lime and fertilizer

to his acres, applications which are sorely needed in order to assure a good stand of grass. If the soil is not properly conserved, there is every chance that when grass seed is sown there will not be a sufficient growth of grass to survive the rigid winter months; and if it does not survive, there will not be legumes with which to build the soil or to furnish forage for livestock. For that reason, knowing that today there is a greater legume acreage over the countryside of the Nation than existed prior to the introduction of the conservation program, I am in full support of it.

I realize that there has been a decline in soil-conservation payments from the figure of $500 million to the present allowance of $250 million. We are now faced with the threat of a reduction to less than $200 million. It is for that reason that I am supporting the amendment.

Mr. President, if we are to leave to oncoming generations a heritage that will be of benefit and value to them, it is the fertility of the land. If the land is depleted and eroded, coming generations will find a lack of the fertility necessary to enable them to work it profitably.

We are familiar with what happened in the ancient world. We know what happened to the great fruit orchards and the great productive fields of Israel and of other sections of the ancient world, once the people ceased to take proper care of their fertile acreage and to protect the soil. Today there are sands which shift back and forth, where once were fertile fields of grain and of legumes, as well as orchards.

Mr. President, is this incentive payment needed annually in order to encourage the type of farm management there should be? I say it is, because every year there is an oncoming crop of young farmers.

Beyond that, Mr. President, there is commonsense in the argument that there must be an organization in the field in order to carry out the program and if the appropriation is reduced below $225 million, then too great a percentage of it will have to be spent in administrative costs, instead of being spent in rebuilding the soil. For that reason, we are facing an economic question, not only from the standpoint of the preservation of the fertility of the land, but also from the standpoint of wise appropriation procedure, for when there is a staff in the field which is administering a program, they should be given something to administer, rather than merely have them in the field spending money and doing nothing in return for the money spent.

So I plead with Senators to support the appropriation of $225 million. It will insure a greater return than any other appropriation I know of, not only today and tomorrow, but in the generations that are to follow.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I should like to be able to agree with my colleagues, the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from Minnesota, because they have not overemphasized the value of the soil conservation program during the past 12 or 15 years of its existence. Our land, particularly the land east of the Missouri River, is in definitely much better condition as the result of this program. If we were to view the situation from that standpoint alone, I would say unhesitatingly that we should provide not only $225 million, but should provide the full $250 million, as we did last year.

However, there are other things to be considered. One of the first is whether we intend to operate the Government of the United States as a solvent business. We now have a national debt approaching $270 billion, which is bound to increase so long as we continue to operate the Government from year to year on a deficit basis. The dollar which the farmer receives for his produce today is worth but 52 percent of what it was worth some 10 or 12 years ago. I think it would be dangerous if we were to let the present condition continue much longer and not bring Government expenditures and receipts into balance.

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

Mr. AIKEN. I yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course, because of the Senator's great familiarity with all agricultural matters, he knows that the appropriation bill for the Department of Agriculture is the only one of the departmental bills in which the amount of the appropriation for the next fiscal year is below the amount appropriated for 1940. An increase has been made several times in all the others. Is there not some limit to what we ought to take out of the farmer's hide? Should we not be at least a little fair in our distribution of the cuts?

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

Mr. AIKEN. I should like first to reply to the Senator from Georgia. He has pointed out that we are cutting the agricultural appropriations lower, perhaps, than we ought to; but I point out that there is another agricultural bill, an expense bill, so to speak, or a charge account, which will be coming in before the end of the next fiscal year, and which will have to be reckoned with. That is a bill carrying several hundred million dollars for the support of farm prices. If the amount in that bill is added to that in the bill now under consideration, I should be very much surprised if we did not find that together they made one of the largest agricultural appropriation expenditures in the history of the United States—possibly the largest.

There are on hand at the present time tremendous crops of certain commodities. Last year the Government subsidized the wheat-export program at 62 or 63 cents a bushel. Taking into consideration the conditions in the wheat market, I shall be very much surprised if it will not be necessary to subsidize it more nearly at 70 or 80 cents a bushel this year. That, of course, represents an expense to the Government for the benefit of agricultural producers.

It is only right that we should maintain a prosperous agriculture, and, whether we reduce the appropriation for this particular item to $225 million or to $195 million, as recommended by the two committees of the Congress, or to $140 million, or whether we eliminate it entirely, we are still going to have to spend more in order to maintain a prosperous agricultural economy than we have spent for a long time.

If the Russell amendment is rejected we shall then revert to a vote on the Williams amendment, which would reduce the program to such an extent that it would benefit a comparatively small number of the States, and would entail a very large percentage of administrative costs.

So I think we had better follow the recommendation of the majority of the members of the House Committee on Agriculture and the Senate Committee on Agriculture, who deemed an appropriation of $195 million sufficient in order to carry on a worthwhile program in all the States of the Union. In my opinion, we should not approve either the $225 million, which represents a $30 million increase, or the amendment of the Senator from Delaware, which proposes a $55 million decrease in the amount which the committees of both Houses of Congress have approved and considered to be a fair figure to bring before the two Houses at this time. So I shall go along with the committee recommendation of $195 million. Under ordinary circumstances, I should like to see $225 million, or even $250 million appropriated, because I think it would be a good investment; but we have other things to consider, and, in view of that fact, it appears to me that $195 million is a fair figure.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I join the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], and other Senators in sponsoring the amendment which proposes to raise the authorization for the agricultural conservation program for the calendar year 1954 from the sum of $195 million to $225 million.

I have great respect for the Committees on Agriculture of both the House and the Senate. I have always respected the judgment of the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and the distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], who, I think, know agricultural conditions throughout the entire Nation.

But, in this instance I think the Senate should take a second look at the authorization of $195 million which is proposed. I believe that the Senate should increase the authorization to $225 million as provided in the substitute amendment which has been offered by the Senator from Georgia for himself and in my name and for other Senators.

Mr. President, I first want to address myself to the argument made by the distinguished Senator from Vermont, that the increase should not be voted because of the necessity of reducing expenditures. It is an argument which carries force.

When we begin to talk about increasing authorizations and appropriations we are subject to the criticism that we are not willing to economize in governmental expenditures.

But, if the increase to $225 million should be voted, it will still be a 10 percent reduction from the authorization of $250 million for 1953. I believe that reduction of 10 percent is enough. The hearings brought out an interesting fact. During the hearing in response to a question by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], it was developed that since 1940 every department of our Government had increased its expenditures in percentages ranging from 185 percent for the Department of the Interior to 1,146 percent for the State Department, and that the only department since that time which has reduced its expenditures is the Department of Agriculture. Its expenditures for the past year represented a 30 percent reduction from its expenditures in 1940.

The chief argument I make for the amendment increasing the appropriation to $225 million is that we are dealing with the basic resources of the country. During World War II farmers were called upon to actually mine their soil in order to provide the food and fiber required during the war, and, after the war, to help our allies and needy peoples of the world. At the end of the war a reduced program for conservation practices was started with an expenditure of approximately $250 million a year. It has been steadily reduced.

The actual expenditures for the soil-conservation program for the calendar year 1951 were $272,930,000.

Expenditures for the calendar year 1952 amounted to $256,500,000.

For the calendar year 1953, the authorization was $250 million.

So the average for these years is more than $250 million a year.

The pending bill proposes to reduce that figure to $195 million for the calendar year 1954, a reduction of $55 million from the average appropriations for this purpose.

We must ask the reason for this proposed reduction. It is not necessary, I believe, to argue the merits of the conservation program. Even those who support the reduced authorization admit its merits.

I should like to read a statement from the report of the committee which I think points up the continuing need for this program. On page 2 of the report there appears the following statement:

> While it is true that American farmers have up to this time met, and sometimes exceeded, the demand for farm products, we must face the fact that the land we now have under cultivation must largely provide for our rapidly increasing population. With approximately 2 million more people to feed each year, and with little new land to move to, the most practical solution obviously is to further increase farm production per acre and per animal.

On page 4, the committee report states:

> It would be impossible to estimate, in terms of dollars, the loss of soil fertility that has taken place. It is a fact, however, that about 50 million acres of once productive cropland are too badly eroded for cultivation and another 100 million acres has been reduced because from half to all of the original topsoil has washed away.

Again, on page 5 of the report, the following statement is made:

> Under the agricultural conservation program, which is administered largely by local county and community committees, 52 million acres of pasture and range have been improved by reseeding; 18 million acres are being protected through the construction of standard, broad-based terraces; permanent cover has been established on 2 million acres of land subject to erosion; 5 million acres have been leveled for irrigation; sod waterways have been established on 315,000 acres; trees have been planted on 900,000 acres; 824,000 small dams have been built on farms and ranches to retard soil losses and reduce flood damage. All this and only one-fourth of the job is done.

So, Mr. President, the real issue for the Senate to decide is whether an authorization of $195 million can carry on an adequate conservation program. I do not believe so.

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

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Did I correctly understand the Senator from Kentucky to say, in his remarks, that whereas the expenditures of the Department of Commerce had increased 1,370 percent since 1940, expenditures for the Department of Agriculture had decreased by approximately 30 percent?

Mr. COOPER. That is shown by a table which is found on page 30 of the hearings on the bill which we are considering.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have that table incorporated in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

Comparison of appropriations and employment of Department of Agriculture with other civilian departments (regular annual appropriations)

Department	Fiscal year 1940		Fiscal year 1953		Percentage increase (+) or decrease (−)	
	Appropriations	Employment	Appropriations	Employment	Appropriations	Employment
	Mil. dol.		*Mil. dol.*			
Agriculture	1,054.9	91,370	733.8	57,935	−30.4	−38.7
Commerce	54.2	26,699	797.2	65,172	+1,370.8	+144.1
Interior	191.2	46,547	545.5	60,677	+185.3	+30.3
Justice	52.6	14,720	184.4	32,194	+250.6	+118.7
Labor	34.6	3,484	222.5	7,815	+543.0	+124.3
Post Office	794.0	303,654	2,793.8	523,779	+251.8	+72.4
State	21.0	6,302	261.7	31,302	+1,146.1	+396.7
Treasury	215.9	59,256	655.5	89,460	+207.6	+50.9
Total above agencies (excluding Agriculture)	1,363.5	460,662	5,460.6	810,399	+300.5	+75.9

NOTE.—Employment figures of all departments other than Agriculture taken from Civil Service Commission reports for June 30, 1940, and June 30, 1952.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield for another question?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is the Senator aware of the fact that the comparisons made in that table are not on a comparative basis? The 1940 figures for the Department of Commerce, for example, do not include the Civil Aeronautics Administration, the Civil Aeronautics Board, the United States Maritime Commission, maritime activities, and the Bureau of Public Roads, which were included in the 1952 figures, and if we place the expenditures of the Department of Commerce on a comparative basis with those given in the table for the Department of Agriculture, the increase would be only approximately 86 percent.

Mr. COOPER. I am glad to have the information.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, at the conclusion of the remarks of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], a table showing a comparison of the Department of Commerce appropriations and expenditures for the fiscal year 1940 and 1952. This table indicates the fallacies of the table referred to by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER].

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield further?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is the Senator from Kentucky aware of the fact that there is a further loss to the Government through purchases of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and that this loss is not charged off?

Mr. COOPER. I am familiar with that.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that in 1940 there were almost no losses through the Commodity Credit Corporation, but in the current year the losses through the Commodity Credit Corporation are large? So if we lump in the Commodity Credit Corporation with the Department of Agriculture in measuring payments to farmers we will find, I think, that the increase has been as great as that of the Department of Commerce.

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

Mr. COOPER. In a moment.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] so indicated in his argument a

few minutes ago. He said that in the total amount of appropriations for the Department of Agriculture, the money to be spent by the Commodity Credit Corporation in support operations should be considered.

The first budget submitted by the outgoing administration underestimated by several hundred million dollars the amount that probably will have to be spent—according to the hearings—in support operations, principally for wheat and cotton. As I see it, expenditures for support operations and for a soil-conservation program are entirely different propositions. We are dealing now with the conservation of soil, the use of soil, and the continuance of fertility of soil in the future.

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

Mr. COOPER. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that in 1951 the total expenditures under the so-called ACP program amounted to $245 million; that of the $245 million, only $88 million, or one-third was used for permanent soil-improvement practices; and that the remaining two-thirds were used for fertilizers including lime, which are not generally considered permanent?

Mr. COOPER. The question of what constitutes a permanent program is not a matter of law or fixed in character. The Department of Agriculture determines what a permanent practice is today. But what is considered to be permanent practice in one State might be entirely different from what is considered to be permanent practices in the State of Illinois or other States.

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

Mr. COOPER. As soon as I have finished.

What is considered to be permanent soil practice in States such as Utah, New Mexico, and Arizona, where the chief interest is in the conservation of water, is entirely different from permanent soil practices in States such as my State of Kentucky and other border or Southern States, where water is not a great problem.

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

Mr. COOPER. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. On page 637 of the Senate hearings, the statement of the Secretary of Agriculture was that on the basis of permanent-type practices as defined by him, only $88 million was distributed in 1951.

According to the 1951 statistical summary of the agricultural conservation program, compiled by the Production and Marketing Administration in November of 1952, the last column, indicates that the total amount distributed for the ACP program was $245,700,000, roughly three times the amount that the Secretary of Agriculture said was for permanent-type practice. That figure may be found at the bottom of the last column on page 95 of the statistical summary.

As we know, in practice most of the money that has been distributed has been for fertilizer and for limestone. I do not object to that in the case of poor soils or for poor farmers. But does the Senator from Kentucky believe that we should subsidize rich farmers, who have the money with which to buy fertilizer, and who can recoup their out-of-pocket expenses for fertilizers from the sale of larger crops? I am perfectly ready to have a part of this money go to poor farmers, in States having poor soils, but I am opposed to giving money to rich farmers.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair reminds the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] that he has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. COOPER. I ask unanimous consent that I may continue for 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. YOUNG. I would rather yield the Senator from Kentucky 5 minutes of my own time.

Mr. COOPER. I will finish, then. I answer the Senator from Illinois by saying he has changed his argument. There is no suggestion that the increase will go to rich farmers. I do not favor that.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Kentucky yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. COOPER. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Commodity Credit Corporation has been brought into the debate. Is it not a fact that the Commodity Credit Corporation has shown a profit on major crops?

Mr. COOPER. There has been a profit on some crops, such as tobacco.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Commodity Credit Corporation has shown a profit on tobacco, corn, and wheat.

Mr. COOPER. I am not familiar with all the operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. MAYBANK. The distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] said that there would be a bill introduced with respect to the Commodity Credit Corporation. I merely wish to make certain that the RECORD shows that the Commodity Credit Corporation, thus far, has shown a profit on its sales of major crops. Of course, it was largely carried by the $100,000,000, provided for it, but it has shown a profit.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I thank my friend. I have only a few minutes remaining, and I do not wish to be diverted by discussions of other questions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Kentucky decline to yield further?

Mr. COOPER. I decline to yield further at this time.

I wish to confine my argument particularly to the point of the appropriation of funds for the agricultural conservation program. The amount ought to be increased from $195 million to $225 million. My first point is that it is needed to provide an adequate and satisfactory continuation of the program which has been under way since the war, a program averaging an annual expenditure of $250 million a year.

The administrative cost of the program as detailed in the 1954 budget presented by Mr. Truman's administration was about $38 million. The budget presented by the present administration calls for $27 million, a noteworthy saving. If $27 million is taken away from the $195 million, $168 million will remain for conservation practices payments to farmers. Compared to 1951, that is over $100 million less. Compared to 1952, it is about $80 million less, and compared to the year 1953, it is $70 million less.

As I understand the hearings, the Department proposes to reduce the amount of money and place emphasis upon what are called permanent practices. But what is the best practice for a particular State depends upon the soil, the water situation and other factors in that State. As I have said, what might be considered the best practice in Illinois, with its rich glacial soil, or in Utah or Arizona, which are interested chiefly in water, may not be the best permanent practice in the Southern States and border States, including my State, where conditions are different.

I can speak from my own experience. I can remember my own county in Kentucky, when I returned from school in 1926. It is a typical county of a border State. It has not the best land or the poorest land. Many of its fields and hillsides were bare and gullied. I have seen a change take place. It has been caused in great part through the use of lime and minerals, and the seeding of grass to prevent erosion of the soil, and to build up its fertility. This program has enriched the soil in border States, Southern States, and other States throughout the country. It has not been the only conservation program, but it has been a good one.

The Senate will make a grave mistake if it does not continue an adequate program by authorizing $225 million for 1954. The Department of Agriculture has stated, and I agree with the Department's purpose, that it intends to review and analyze its programs. The Department has said that in this year and next year it intends to undertake a thorough analysis and review of the farm program. Why cannot the Department review the agricultural conservation program in these 2 years? I think it unwise for Congress to alter or change the program radically by reductions in authorizations. This year and next year the Department may be able, by voluntary arrangements and through educational programs, to shift the emphasis to the permanent type practices. The Department of Agriculture in this year can give farmers throughout the country an opportunity to be heard on the matter and a better program can be developed.

It is not a question of economy alone. The $30 million which is involved will be more than repaid in soil fertility and the protection of soil throughout the entire Nation.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

EXHIBIT 1

(Submitted by Senator DOUGLAS as a qualification of table on p. 30 of Senate hearings)

Department of Commerce, comparison of appropriations and expenditures, fiscal years 1940 and 1952

[Figured in thousands of dollars]

	Appropriations			Expenditures		
	1940 [1]	1952 [2]	Increase (+) or decrease (−)	1940 [1]	1952 [2]	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
Office of the Secretary	1,235	1,975	+740	1,298	2,020	+722
Foreign and Domestic Commerce	2,156	10,754	+8,598	2,111	10,370	+8,259
Bureau of Census	28,947	14,810	−14,137	20,486	18,743	−1,743
National Bureau of Standards	2,436	13,803	+11,367	2,405	9,452	+7,047
Coast and Geodetic Survey	3,156	12,669	+9,513	4,000	12,430	+8,430
Patent Office	4,692	12,225	+7,533	4,589	12,086	+7,497
Commerce, miscellaneous	7		−7	500		−500
Bureau of Marine Inspection and Navigation (transferred out of Commerce)	(2,682)			(2,630)		
Bureau of Air Commerce, [3] trust accounts	(4)					
Total, general and special accounts (as in 1940 but excluding Bureau of Marine Inspection and Navigation)	42,629	66,236	+23,607	34,889	65,101	+30,212
Office of the Secretary: Salaries and expenses, defense production activities		41,837	+41,837		36,064	+36,064
Civil Aeronautics Administration	28,224	162,855	+134,631	25,277	171,461	+146,184
Civil Aeronautics Board		3,860	+3,860		3,784	+3,784
U. S. Maritime Commission: Maritime activities	100,007	218,320	+118,313	98,042	229,687	+131,645
Bureau of Public Roads	333,581	429,725	96,144	169,015	449,819	+280,804
Weather Bureau	6,137	26,970	+20,833	5,852	26,323	+20,471
Inland Waterways Corporation		(4)			1,000	+1,000
Total, Department of Commerce (as organized in 1952)	510,578	949,803	+439,225	333,075	983,239	+650,164
Percent			+86			+195

[1] From Combined Statement of Receipts, Expenditures, and Balances of the United States for fiscal year ending June 30, 1940, pp. 226–233, 168, 192, 152, 199.

[2] From Combined Statement of Receipts, Expenditures, and Balances of the United States for fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, pp. 212–220.

[3] Account stated under Civil Aeronautics Authority, independent offices.

[4] Undisbursed balance June 30, 1951 was $1,000,000.

Figures in parentheses are not included in totals.

Figures do not include trust funds.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I oppose the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] increasing the appropriation and, at the same time, speak in behalf of my own amendment, which would reduce the appropriation for PMA payments to $140 million. I know of no better argument to use in opposition to the amendment of the Senator from Georgia than to quote from the statements of representatives of two of the largest farm organizations in the United States, who testified before the Senate Committee on Appropriations. First, I wish to quote from the testimony of Mr. J. T. Sanders, legislative counsel of the National Grange, whose testimony begins at page 1115 of the hearings. Referring to the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Sanders said:

ENDORSEMENT OF CONSERVATION-PAYMENTS REDUCTION

We especially wish to endorse his reduction in the agricultural conservation payments for the fiscal year 1953–54 to the extent of $110 million from current appropriation of $251.7 million. We believe that the Secretary and his staff have earnestly and honestly sought out those agricultural-conservation payments that are for measures and supplies for nonpermanent types of conservation work. We believe that these payments should never be used as an excuse and substitute for price supports. However, they should be used as a portion of a skillfully planned part of farmland conservation. The Secretary, we believe, has undertaken to weed out that portion of these payments that do not qualify under this standard.

That would bring the amount down to $140 million, the same as my amendment.

On page 561, Mr. Allan Kline, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, made this statement:

Now, the $140 million represents a cut of $110 million, approximately. This seems to us to be generally in line with our proposal that these payments ought to be made on the basis of conservation needs. They ought to be made for real conservation. They should not be made, as in my own county, for the application of lime or phosphorus.

That is the testimony of representatives of two of the largest farm organizations, who spoke not only in opposition to the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] but also in endorsement of the amendment offered by me.

Mr. President, I repeat, that is the testimony of the representatives of two of the largest farm organizations, not only speaking in opposition to the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia, but also endorsing the amendment offered by myself which figure is supported by the present Secretary of Agriculture.

It was pointed out a few moments ago by one Senator speaking in favor of the increase that in ancient countries the soil was depleted. In studying ancient history, it might be well also to examine what happened to the governments of those countries and the currencies of those countries. In the same history book it will be found that every one of those countries became bankrupt under exactly the same kind of program as is being advocated here today. I refer to the wholesale giveaway programs. It is always much more popular to give away money than to stop the giveaway. If the amendment of the Senator from Georgia is adopted, it will mean that this year's appropriation for the Department of Agriculture will be 1½ percent more than Congress gave the same department last year. That certainly would not support a tax-reduction program.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator should know that this is the authorization for next year, 1954. It has no relation to the budget of this year, as such. So the figures cannot be completely applicable.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I point out to the Senator that it is easy to project the figures to 1954. However, whatever we authorize this year, we shall pay next year. Therefore, both appropriations and authorizations should be taken into consideration when we pass an appropriation bill.

The Senator from Georgia was pointing out the fact that his figure represented a reduction from the Truman request for authorization, but since when did we recognize Mr. Truman's budget as sacred? If we were to reduce the maximum payment to any one farmer to $1,000, rather than letting the payments go to a small group, such action would spread the program to the farmers needing encouragement. If we are to reduce appropriations we must begin somewhere. Certainly no one could speak with greater authority for the farmers than the representatives of the two largest farm organizations in the United States. They say they are willing and have taken official action favoring these cuts. It seems the height of folly to give them more money than they are asking for.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like to ask the Senator from Delaware a question. He mentioned the fact that the committee was claiming a decrease in appropriations as compared with 1953, and a decrease under the estimates prepared by the Truman administration. Is it not a fact that the committee is failing to appropriate for the fiscal year 1953–54 approximately $40 million, for the 1953–54 ACP program, which will come due during that year? On page 12 of the report the committee says:

If the amount provided is insufficient for that purpose—

Namely, meeting the estimate of $252 million—

the Department is expected to take the necessary action to secure additional funds which may be needed.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. In a moment.

That means, does it not, that there will be a supplementary bill coming in to make good the $250 million? Therefore the claim of economy which the committee makes in the latter part of its report, of $39,750,000, is a phony economy. When the bills for 1953–54 are finally footed, both in connection with this appropriation and the sugar appro-

priation, instead of economies of $20 million as compared with last year, we shall find an increase of $25 million, which will even exceed the Truman budget.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Delaware yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I shall be glad to yield in a moment.

Let me say in reply to the Senator from Illinois that there is no question that these authorizations will have to be met either next year or the year after.

I also point out that on page 51 there is another item, of $171,740,395, which is, in effect, an appropriation in this year's expenditures; however, it is not included in the total as compiled on the front page of the committee report. The item to which I refer represents note cancellations to pay for the cost of the International Wheat Agreement. This note cancellation authority has been one of the methods used by the Department to cover up the overall cost of the program.

The Commodity Credit Corporation keeps claiming in its financial statements that its losses are only relatively small over a period of 25 or 30 years; yet the Director of the Budget advises me that the reason it is able to report fairly small losses is that it has been counting as income appropriations by Congress plus its authority to cancel notes. It has not been charging them off as expenditures, as any sensible businessman would do.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield to me?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Will the Senator from Delaware agree with me that when the final bills for 1953 and 1954 are footed, the expenditures will exceed the expenditures for 1952–53 by enormous amounts?

Mr. WILLIAMS. If we adopt the pending amendment, as I previously stated, this appropriation will be 1½ percent more than the amount which was appropriated in the same bill in 1952.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. I heard the Senator from Illinois say that this cut of $40 million was a phony cut. If it is phony, then the Department of Agriculture is phony, because its estimate of the cost of last year's program was $211,982,000. It expects to hold expenditures within that amount. If expenditures should be slightly more than that, the committee proposes to authorize the Department to take the money out of the Commodity Credit Corporation fund.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Without entering into the exchange between the Senator from North Dakota and the Senator from Illinois, I point out to the Senator from North Dakota, that the bill as reported by the committee calls for $20,480,065 below last year's appropriation. The amendment which is now pending proposes to increase this appropriation by $30 million. If that amendment is adopted, it will mean that the bill will carry an appropriation of some $10 million more than last year's appropriation, or an increase of 1½ percent.

Mr. YOUNG. That is not an appropriation at all. It is not reflected in this bill. It is an authorization. However, it would cause additional obligations next year.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator from North Dakota will admit that contract authorizations and appropriations both represent obligations of the United States Government.

Mr. YOUNG. That is true.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If we adopt this amendment calling for a figure of $225 million, and authorize the Department of Agriculture to make commitments to that extent, we shall be obligated to appropriate the money next year; is not that true?

Mr. YOUNG. That is true.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Therefore we must treat these authorizations which are firm commitments, as though they were appropriations, even though they do not enter into expenditures until 1954.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. I think perhaps the Senator from Delaware is in error to a certain extent. As I understand, this bill proposes to authorize, in the calendar year 1954, the sum of $195 million for the entire conservation program. We must deduct from that amount administrative costs. If we take the average of the past several years, they run more than $30 million, leaving about $160 million for the conservation program for farmers. In 1951 and 1952, according to the hearings, payments to farmers were $276 million. In the next year they were $250 million; and this year they are almost $200 million.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, if I understand the Senator from Kentucky correctly, I think he has made an excellent argument in opposition to the increase by pointing out that of the $225 million, $60 million to $65 million will go to pay administrative costs. We have surely reached a sad state of affairs when it costs a third of the appropriation for administrative expenses.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield that I may correct the RECORD?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do not yield at this time. I shall be glad to yield in just a moment after yielding to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. THYE. The Senator from Delaware——

Mr. WILLIAMS. I decline to yield at this point.

Mr. THYE. The Senator from Delaware is mistaken.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I will yield to the Senator in a moment.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. I know the Senator misunderstood what I said. I stated that the authorization was for $195 million, and that if administrative costs were of the same order as they have been for the past 3 years, they would average more than $30 million, which when taken from $195 million, would leave $165 million for the program. The Senator made a mistake when he said I had stated $65 million is available for administrative expenses. I should like to go further and say that the bill calls for only $27 million for administrative expenses.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I misunderstood the Senator from Kentucky. I still point out, nevertheless, that if the amendment is adopted we will have authorized 1½ percent more for the agricultural program than was authorized for fiscal 1953.

In the next 15 days or so Congress will be confronted with the question of whether or not we shall extend the excess profits tax for an additional 6 months, and we shall also be confronted with the question of whether we will give a general tax reduction to the American people.

It is the height of folly for any Member of Congress to talk about giving the American people a 10 percent tax reduction and at the same time vote for an appropriation which calls for a 1½-percent increase over last year in expenditures. The two actions do not go together, and the sooner that fact is recognized the better.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I merely wanted to make sure that the figures are correctly stated in the RECORD. The appropriation for the past fiscal year was $250 million, of which $240½ million was spent. Approximately $9½ million was not spent, although allocated. The appropriation this year is for $211 million. The difference between $211 million and $240½ million is due to the fact that there were carryovers, as I understand, from the year before. The administrative costs in fiscal 1953 for the Federal, State, county, and community expenses are figured at approximately $26 million. I believe it is anticipated that those expenses will be lowered a little for the next fiscal year. If I recall correctly, it was thought that the $140 million appropriation would be administered for about $21 million, and that the $195 million appropriation would cost approximately $1 million more to administer.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator from Vermont is correct with respect to this single item. My statement, that if we adopt the amendment the appropriation would be 1½ percent more than last year, was based on the overall appropriation, because the bill itself calls for $716,729,768. That is the amount reported by the committee.

The amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] proposes to increase the amount by $30 million. If we adopt the $30 million amendment increase, it would mean that we would be adding $30 million to offset the claimed $20 million decrease reported by the committee, which would mean that the appropriation would be $10 million more than the amount appropriated for fiscal year 1953.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I made a comparison between the proposed bill

with the Russell amendment added to it and the amount appropriated last year. I do not know what the percentage would be.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I used the committee report as a basis for my figures.

Mr. AIKEN. I have before me a statement entitled "Reconciliation of 1953 program authorization with 1954 revised budget estimate." The statement has just been handed to me. It reads:

Authorization for 1953 program carried in 1953 appropriation act, $250 million.

Less operating savings and adjustments, reductions in aerial photography, reserve, et cetera, $9,400,760.

Revised total, 1953 program, $240,599,240.

Less operating expenses of 1953 program, $26,178,700.

Less "other program expenses" (checkwriting, printing, aerial photographs, etc.), $1,088,440.

I do not believe it is particularly interesting to read all of this statement. However, I ask that it be printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, so we will have before us the authentic figures involved.

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

Agricultural conservation program—reconciliation of 1953 program authorization with 1954 revised budget estimate

Authorization for 1953 program carried in 1953 appropriation act	$250,000,000
Less operating savings and adjustments, reductions in aerial photography, reserve, etc	−9,400,760
Revised total, 1953 program	240,599,240
Less operating expenses of 1953 program	−26,178,700
Less other program expenses (checkwriting, printing, aerial photographs, etc.)	−1,088,440
Total cash payments and grants of materials and services, 1953 program	213,332,100
1953 program payments paid from fiscal year 1953 appropriation as advances of conservation material and services	−44,521,378
Payments still due to farmers on 1953 program, to be paid from fiscal year 1954 appriation	168,810,722
Add operating expenses of 1953 program	+26,178,700
Add other program expenses (checkwriting, printing, aerial photographs, etc.)	+1,088,440
Add cash payments and grants of materials and services on the 1954 program from the 1954 appropriation	+25,304,156
Total fiscal year 1954 obligations	221,382,018
Borrowings from CCC:	
Payment to CCC (represents total amount owed to CCC as of June 30, 1953)	15,599,982

Agricultural conservation program—reconciliation of 1953 program authorization with 1954 revised budget estimate—Con.

Borrowings from CCC—Con.	
To be borrowed from CCC for advances of conservation materials and services on the 1954 programs	25,000,000
Net borrowings from CCC	−9,400,018
Revised budget estimate for fiscal year 1954	211,982,000

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, in a few days the Senate will have before it the mutual aid bill. In that bill there will be provided billions of dollars for economic aid to almost every country on the face of the globe.

The distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] is seeking to do something for the farmers of the United States.

If Senators want economy they can get it by voting against some of the economic aid it is proposed to give to many countries some of which I doubt if some Senators have even heard of, even though they may have been valedictorians of their college classes.

I ask unanimous consent that at this point in my remarks there be published telegrams, letters, and postcards which I have received from farmers in the State of North Dakota. I believe that my distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], received duplicates of many of these telegrams and letters. I ask that these telegrams, letters, and postcards be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks. I have brought to the floor only a few of the messages, because I do not wish to encumber the RECORD.

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

NEW ROCKFORD, N. DAK., *June 11, 1953.*
Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Urge you support farm appropriations recommended by Senate subcommittee, including two hundred and fifty millions for ACP.

LELAND SHROYER,
Chairman, Eddy County Farmers Union.

CARRINGTON, N. DAK., *June 11, 1953.*
Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Four hundred and seventy-three members of the Foster County Farmers Union urge your support to Senate Joint Resolution 79 and to the Hope bill, 5451.

FOSTER COUNTY FARMERS UNION,
PAUL MARRIAGE, *Secretary-Treasurer.*

STERLING, N. DAK., *June 9, 1953.*
Hon. Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We urge you to support farm appropriations at or above House appropriations, also support Mundt bill.

DRISCOLL PIONEER LOCAL FARMERS UNION,
Mrs. E. A. SCHAUER, *Secretary.*

CROSBY, N. DAK., *June 12, 1953.*
Senator WILLIAM LANGER:

We urge your vote for the Mundt bill and full support for adequate agricultural funds.

OLAI KVIGNE.
HARRY THOMPSON.
JOHN KARLBERG.
ORVILLE KNUTSON.

MINOT, N. DAK., *June 8, 1953.*
Senator WILLIAM LANGER:

Seventy-five members Eureka Local, No. 670, Farmers Union, strongly support (1) full restoration of agricultural appropriations, (2) Mundt bill.

NORMAN J. LIVINGSTON,
Chairman, Eureka Local, No. 670, Farmers Union.

MINOT, N. DAK., *June 11, 1953.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building:

Respectfully urge you to use your vote and influence in support of the recommendation by the Senate Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations. Agriculture's slow climb toward equality with other groups in our economy must not be checked now.

VERNON F. CARLSON.
GLENBURN, N. DAK.

MINOT, N. DAK., *June 11, 1953.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building:

Please support Senate subcommittee recommendation on appropriations for agriculture. Absolutely necessary to preserve the much needed present farm programs.

A. C. OLSON.

MINOT, N. DAK., *June 11, 1953.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building:

I am an operator of a family-type farm. From past experience of 30 years' farming, I deem it a must that the appropriations recommended by the Senate subcommittee be approved.

WALTER WEMER.

MINOT, N. DAK., *June 11, 1953.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building:

We feel that it is imperative that agriculture appropriations be supported as recommended by the Senate Subcommittee on Agriculture. We urge your support and vote to defeat any cut in these recommendations.

FREEDOM FARMERS UNION LOCAL,
DON BIVINS.
SAWYER, N. DAK.

CROSBY, N. DAK., *June 11, 1953.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building:

Please don't cut agriculture appropriations below 1952 level. We want ACP.

MELVIN MORTENSON.
ALVIN SVANGSTU.
ALEX MURPHY.
G. T. HOVERSTIN.
NOONAN, N. DAK.

MINOT, N. DAK., *June 11, 1953.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building:

Because Agriculture stands on the brink of disaster under present price structure of farm commodities, I urge your vote and support of the recommendations of the Senate Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations.

M. P. FREDA.

MINOT, N. DAK., *June 11, 1953.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building:

In the critical situation that agriculture finds itself in today, I ask that you vote for and support the agriculture appropriations

as recommended by the Senate subcommittee.

FARRELL L. NELSON.

TOWNER, N. DAK.

MINOT, N. DAK., *June 11, 1953.*

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building:

Am counting on you to lead the fight to support the agriculture appropriations as recommended by the Senate subcommittee.

INEZ N. HOLVORSON.

MINOT, N. DAK., *June 11, 1953.*

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building:

I believe that it is necessary to keep appropriations for our vital farm programs at a high level. Please support the subcommittee's recommendation on agriculture appropriations.

FLOYD FREDA.

MINOT, N. DAK., *June 11, 1953.*

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building:

It is impossible for us to understand why the family type farmer is being legislated out of the picture while all other segments of our economy are enjoying higher incomes than ever before. Please support the recommendations of the Senate subcommittee for agriculture appropriations to maintain our farm programs.

McKINLEY FARMERS UNION LOCAL,
IRVIN LARSON, *Secretary.*

REGENT, N. DAK., *June 11, 1953.*

Senator WILLIAM LANGER:

We ask that you support farm appropriations recommended by Senate subcommittee, including $250 million for ACP.

REGENT CO-OP EQUITY EXCHANGE,
WALTER BARTHOLOME.

MOTT, N. DAK., *June 11, 1953.*

Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building:

Urge your support farm appropriations bills $250 million for ACP as recommended by Senate subcommittee.

HETTINGER COUNTY FARMERS UNION,
Mrs. ED IVERSON, *Secretary.*

CROSBY, N. DAK., *June 10, 1953.*

Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Believe that Agriculture Department appropriation should be at least equal to last year's. Do what you can.

IVAN ERICKSON,
Republican County Chairman,
Divide County.

WHEELOCK, N. DAK., *June 10, 1953.*

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Urge your continued active support of higher level agricultural appropriations.

CLAIR AMSBERRY,
President Williams County Farmers Union.

HAZEN, N. DAK., *June 10, 1953.*

Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:

Support farm appropriation when reaches Senate also $250 million for ACP.

OLIVER COUNTY FARMERS UNION,
JOSEPH JOCHIM, *President.*

HAZEN, N. DAK., *June 10, 1953.*

Senator WM. LANGER,
Senate Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Support farm appropriation when reaches Senate. Also $250 million for ACP.

RED BUTTE LOCAL,
Mrs. DAN KIRCHMEIER,
Secretary,
Mr. OTTO ALBERS,
President.

VALLEY CITY, N. DAK., *June 10, 1953.*

Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

It is the general wish of our 2,000 patrons and stockholders that you use every effort to support the subcommittee appropriation measure, including $250 million ACP for agriculture. We should all realize that the farmers are the backbone of our purchasing power and in turn benefits everyone.

FARMERS UNION OIL CO.,
LEONARD J. BRAULICK.

MINOT, N. DAK., *June 11, 1953.*

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building:

Take this opportunity to urge you continued support for farm program appropriations. This program is an absolute must for our family type farmer. Without an adequate farm program these farmers face economic disaster.

GLEN PACE.

WOLSETH, N. DAK.

MINOT, N. DAK., *June 11, 1953.*

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building:

We urgently request the agricultural appropriations approved by the Senate subcommittee be aggressively supported. Also the $250 million recommended for ACP be passed. With the dwindling economy it is more important than ever that the agriculture be maintained on a sound basis.

ARNOLD HAGUE,
President, Ward County Farmers Union.

NEW ENGLAND, N. DAK., *June 10, 1953.*

WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senator:

Will you kindly support the appropriations which passed by the House for the farm program and also $250 million for ACP which is recommended by the Senate subcommittee.

ADOLPH REISENAUER.

ZAHL, N. DAK., *June 10, 1953.*

Senator WM. LANGER,
United States Senate:

Farmers in Northwest urge your support farm appropriations recommended by Senate subcommittee, including two hundred fifty million for ACP.

HENRY WILLIAMS.

SANISH, N. DAK., *June 12, 1953.*

Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building:

I urge you to support agriculture appropriations as recommended by agriculture subcommittee.

G. F. GULBRICKSON.

TOLNA, N. DAK., *June 11, 1953.*

Senator WM. LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Urge you support farm appropriation bill recommended by Senate subcommittee or at least as large as last year.

ROBERT JOHNSON.

TOLNA, N. DAK., *June 11, 1953.*

Senator WM. LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Urge you support farm program appropriation bill at least as large as last year.

LEONARD JOHNSON.

CARRINGTON, N. DAK., *June 11, 1953.*

WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Four hundred and seventy-three Foster County Farmers Union members urge your opposition to any cuts in appropriations for agriculture.

FOSTER COUNTY FARMERS UNION,
PAUL MARRIAGE, *Secretary-Treasurer.*

FLASHER, N. DAK., *June 12, 1953.*

Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building:

Urging you to support farm appropriations recommended by Senate subcommittee. Also asking you to support the $250 millions for ACP.

FARMERS UNION OIL CO.

BISBEE, N. DAK., *June 12, 1953.*

Senator WILLIAM LANGER:

We urge support for full agricultural funds to carry on farm programs.

TOWNER COUNTY FARMERS UNION BOARD,
Mrs. CATHERINE KOESTER,
County Secretary.

APPAM, N. DAK., *June 12, 1953.*

Senator LANGER,
United States Senate:

Farmers of Northwest urge your support on farm appropriations recommended by Senate subcommittee including $250 million for ACP.

Board of Directors of Appam Farmers Elevator Co. and Patrons Reuben Esterby, President; Elmer Amundson, Secretary; V. C. Anderson, Nels Hendrickson, Henry Williams, Albert K. Esterby, Soren Sorenson, Alvin Knutson, K. V. Esterby, Herbert L. Hyland, Peter P. Flories, Elias Svenson, O. H. Syland, Edgar S. Hyland, Lester B. Quie, Earl Esterby, Albert Knutson, Clifford Ryen, Melvin Dragseth, Martin Johnson, Herman Sunquist, Bennie Benson.

COGSWELL, N. DAK., *June 13, 1953.*

Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Washington, D. C:

We earnestly beg you to support farm appropriations equal to last year.

Mr. and Mrs. WILLIAM EVEN.

COGSWELL, N. DAK., *June 13, 1953.*

Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Washington, D. C.:

We earnestly urge you to keep farm program appropriations at the Senate subcommittee recommendations.

Mr. and Mrs. LAWRENCE KUMMETH.

COGSWELL, N. DAK., *June 13, 1953.*

Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Washington, D. C.:

The family type farmer must have farm program appropriations kept up to last year and I urge you to work for at least the recommendations of Senate subcommittee.

Mr. and Mrs. AMOS GRANDIN.

CROSBY, N. DAK., *June 12, 1953.*

Senator WILLIAM LANGER:

We want no cuts in agricultural appropriations and urge your backing.

BJARNE HOFSTAD.
THORSTEN KARLBERG.
SIGURD HOFSTAD.
ARNE BJARNSVEDT.

GWINNER, N. DAK., *June 12, 1953.*

Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Washington, D. C.:

We urge to support farm appropriations equal to last year, which was absolute minimum.

WHITE STONE HILL FARMERS UNION.

MILNOR, N. DAK., *June 12, 1953.*

Senator LANGER,
Washington, D. C.:

We, the Shuman F U local of 25 farm families, do urge your continued support in maintaining agricultural appropriations at least equal to last year's figure. We feel it necessary if we expect to maintain the family type of farm. Loss of family farm means economy loss to Nation.

ARNOLD FEDJE,
Secretary of Schuman Local.

GWINNER, MINN., *June 12, 1953.*
Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Washington, D. C.:
We urge to support farm appropriations equal to last year which was absolute minimum.
SARGENT COUNTY FARMERS UNION.

COGSWELL, N. DAK., *June 12, 1953.*
Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Washington, D. C.:
Seventy-five Sargent Harlem Local Farmers Union members, of Sargent County, urge you to work for the support of farm program appropriations recommended by Senate subcommittee. These are necessary to maintain the family type farmers; their loss will mean an economic loss to the Nation.
ED HANSON,
President.
LAWRENCE KUMMETH,
Secretary.

FLASHER, N. DAK., *June 8, 1953.*
Senator LANGER,
Washington, D. C.:
Depending on you to support appropriations recommended by Senate subcommittee, also need $250 million additional for ACP.
EDWIN B. TIMPE,
Vice Chairman, Farmers Union Local, No. 779.

BOWMAN, N. DAK., *June 9, 1953.*
Hon. Senator LANGER:
I urge your support for all farm appropriations recommended by the Senate subcommittee.
ALLEN SEDEVIE.

BOWMAN, N. DAK., *June 9, 1953.*
Hon. Senator LANGER:
I urge your support for all farm appropriations recommended by the Senate subcommittee.
OLE LEWISON.

BOWMAN, N. DAK., *June 9, 1953.*
Hon. Senator LANGER:
I urge your support for all farm appropriations recommended by the Senate subcommittee.
ISIDORE FISHER.

BOWMAN, N. DAK., *June 9, 1953.*
Hon. Senator LANGER:
I urge your support for all farm appropriations recommended by the Senate subcommittee.
JOHN SCHADE.

BOWMAN, N. DAK., *June 9, 1953.*
Hon. Senator LANGER,
Washington, D. C.:
I urge your support for all farm appropriations recommended by the Senate subcommittee.
JOE SONSALLA.
MARMARTH, N. DAK.

BOWMAN, N. DAK., *June 9, 1953.*
Hon. Senator LANGER,
Washington, D. C.:
I urge your support for all farm appropriations recommended by the Senate subcommittee.
PERCY KLEEMAN.

BOWMAN, N. DAK., *June 9, 1953.*
Hon. Senator LANGER,
Washington, D. C.:
I urge your support for all farm appropriations recommended by the Senate subcommittee.
MARTIN KLUKSDAL.
SCRANTON, N. DAK.

BOWMAN, N. DAK., *June 9, 1953.*
Hon. Senator LANGER,
Washington, D. C.:
I urge your support for all farm appropriations recommended by the Senate subcommittee.
JOE V. PALCZEWSKI.
SCRANTON, N. DAK.

BOWMAN, N. DAK., *June 9, 1953.*
Hon. Senator LANGER,
Washington, D. C.:
I urge your support for all farm appropriations recommended by the Senate subcommittee.
VIRGIL WEST.

FLASHER, N. DAK., *June 8, 1953.*
Hon. Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Washington, D. C.:
Depending on you to support farm appropriations recommended by Senate subcommittee including $250 million for ACP. Thank you.
HELGE ENGREN,
President, Morton County Farmers Union.

BOWMAN, N. DAK., *June 9, 1953.*
Hon. Senator LANGER:
I urge your support for all farm appropriations recommended by the Senate subcommittee.
NICK MOSBRUCKER.

BOWMAN, N. DAK., *June 9, 1953.*
Hon. Senator LANGER:
I urge your support for all farm appropriations recommended by the Senate subcommittee.
H. J. BURKE.

BOWMAN, N. DAK., *June 9, 1953.*
Hon. Senator LANGER:
I urge your support for all farm appropriations recommended by the Senate subcommittee.
H. F. OLSON,
Manager, Farmers Union Elevator.

BOWMAN, N. DAK., *June 9, 1953.*
Hon. Senator LANGER:
I urge your support for all farm appropriations recommended by the Senate subcommittee.
ANDREW JENSEN.

BOWMAN, N. DAK., *June 9, 1953.*
Hon. Senator LANGER:
I urge your support for all farm appropriations recommended by the Senate subcommittee.
DONALD BARTEL,
Chairman, Bowman County Republican Committee.

BOWMAN, N. DAK., *June 9, 1953.*
Hon. Senator LANGER:
I urge your support for all farm appropriations recommended by the Senate subcommittee.
E. H. ERICKSON.

BOWMAN, N. DAK., *June 9, 1953.*
Hon. Senator LANGER:
I urge your support for all farm appropriations recommended by the Senate subcommittee.
ERWIN HAGEMEISTER.
SCRANTON, N. DAK.

BOWMAN, N. DAK., *June 9, 1953.*
Hon. Senator LANGER:
I urge your support for all farm appropriations recommended by the Senate subcommittee.
JOHN MCCAFFERY,
Manager, Farmers Union Co-op Store.

BOWMAN, N. DAK., *June 9, 1953.*
Hon. Senator LANGER:
I urge your support for all farm appropriations recommended by the Senate subcommittee.
MORRIS NELSON.

DAZEY, N. DAK., *June 9, 1953.*
Hon. Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
We urge you to support Senate subcommittees appropriations for agriculture including $250 million ACP.
DONALD ANDERSON,
Chairman, County Farmers Union.

CROSBY, N. DAK., *June 9, 1953.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Washington, D. C.:
We request you support agriculture appropriations equal to last year.
S. MELVIN STOKKE.
EINAR NORDBY.
AXEL HAIBERG.
JAMES RAIT.
PERRY E. ROSENQUIST.

KULM, N. DAK., *June 9, 1953.*
Hon. Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Washington, D. C.:
Urge you to support farm appropriations at least equal to subcommittee recommendations including $250 million for CPA.
LEE HARTMAN,
Chairman, German Northwest Farmers Union Local.

DAZEY, N. DAK., *June 9, 1953.*
Hon. Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
We urge you to support Senate subcommittee appropriations for agriculture including $250 million ACP.
WARREN RASMUSSON,
Manager, Dazey Farmers Union Cooperative Association.

KULM, N. DAK., *June 9, 1953.*
Hon. Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Washington, D. C.:
Urge you to support farm appropriations at least equal to subcommittee recommendations including $250 million for CPA.
GOTLIEB HARTMAN,
Chairman, Dickey County Farmers Union.

BOWMAN, N. DAK., *June 9, 1953.*
Hon. Senator LANGER,
Washington, D. C.:
I urge that you give all farm appropriations your support.
WILLARD GROSS.

BOWMAN, N. DAK., *June 9, 1953.*
Hon. Senator LANGER,
Washington, D. C.:
I urge that you give all farm appropriations your support.
GEO. ERMANTROUT.

BOWMAN, N. DAK., *June 9, 1953.*
Hon. Senator LANGER,
Washington, D. C.:
I urge that you give all farm appropriations your support.
CLARENCE PLOUGH.

OMEMEE, N. DAK., *June 10, 1953.*
Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building:
We urge your wholehearted support of the agricultural appropriations increases where necessary, especially the 250 million for ACP.
Mr. and Mrs. DUNCAN FRASER.

OMEMEE, N. DAK., *June 10, 1953.*
Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building:
We urge your support of the agriculture appropriations by the Senate subcommittee, including the 250 million for ACP.
DUNCAN FRASER,
President, Bottineau County Farmers Union.

OMEMEE, N. DAK., *June 10, 1953.*
Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building:
Please support the increased farm appropriations recommended by Senate subcommittee and the 250 million for ACP.
Mr. and Mrs. ERIC SCHULTZ.

OMEMEE, N. DAK., *June 10, 1953.*
Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building:
Urge your support of the increased farm appropriation bill as set by Senate subcommittee, and especially the 250 million for ACP.
Mr. and Mrs. JACK FRASER

CROSBY, N. DAK., *June 10, 1953.*
Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building:
Urge you to support agriculture appropriations at least equal to 1952.
HELMER WALLEN.
VERDEAN F. PETERSON.
JOSEPH H. GALLAGHER.
OWEN C. LANSVERK.
ALFRED JOYCE.

VALLEY CITY, N. DAK., *June 10, 1953.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER:
Urge support of the subcommittee appropriation measure including the 250 million ACP for agriculture.
MARTIN BROCK,
Secretary, Barnes County Farmers Union.

GOLDEN LOCAL NO. 523,
FARMERS UNION, WALSH COUNTY,
Park River, N. Dak., June 2, 1953.
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Washington, D. C.
DEAR SIR: We, the members of Golden Farmers Union, local No. 523, meeting in regular session June 1, 1953, do hereby request you to use your maximum influence in support of the Mundt bill, which would authorize the raising of the wheat reserve from 350 million to 600 million bushels.
Sincerely,
ERNEST DENCKER,
Secretary.

FORDVILLE, N. DAK., *June 12, 1953.*
Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Senator Office Building,
Washington, D. C.
DEAR SENATOR LANGER: You have been doing a fine job of supporting farm legislation and we thank you for it.
We are urging your full support on the Mundt bill (S. J. Res. 79), of which you and Senator YOUNG are cosponsors. We feel it is the most fair method for our agricultural State and I will do my best to have the Farmers Union local here in Medford Township of which I am president give full support to this bill.
We also urge you to continue to fight for our REA and all farm programs. It's a tough fight and you are doing a good job—more power to you.
We would like to see Secretary Benson sent back to Utah to preach and an agricultural man in his place there. Best wishes for good health.
Yours sincerely,
Mr. and Mrs. ANDREW MORSTAD.
P. S.—Our Farmers Union local has 12 farm families behind your vote.
MRS. MORSTAD, *President.*

GENESEO, N. DAK., *June 12, 1953.*
Hon. MILTON YOUNG,
Washington, D. C.
DEAR SIR: We certainly do not want any cuts in agriculture appropriations, and expect your support against any cuts.
Thanks for the good fight you are putting up for agriculture.
Thank you.
Yours truly,
OLAF W. OLSON,
MRS. OLAF W. OLSON.

GENESEO, N. DAK., *June 12, 1953.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Washington, D. C.
DEAR SIR: We certainly do not want any cuts in agriculture appropriations, and expect your support against any cuts.
Thank you.
Yours truly,
Mr. OLAF W. OSON,
Mrs. OLAF W. OLSON.

FORT RANSOM, N. DAK., *June 8, 1953.*
Hon. Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Washington, D. C.
DEAR SENATOR LANGER: The Northland Farmers Union takes this opportunity to Thank you for the work you have done in behalf of the farmer. There is still a hard and bitter fight ahead if the farmers are going to get full adequate funds to carry on their work. We are 100 percent behind you in this fight. Keep on as you have and we know that you will win.
Yours truly,
Mrs. CONRAD OLSON,
Secretary, Northland Farmers Union.
(Representing 130 farm families.)

PETERSBURG, N. DAK., *June 10, 1953.*
Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.
MY DEAR SENATOR: We strongly urge that appropriations for our farm program be maintained. This country needs conservation and development of landed resources. Family-type farming should be given preference in any farm program.
Your truly,
NORTH DAKOTA FARMERS UNION,
LOCAL NO. 168,
FRANCIS SEARS, *Legislative Secretary.*

SYKESTON, N. DAK.
MY DEAR SENATOR: We of the Sykeston Farmers union local have agreed to request you to help get more appropriations for the farm program's parity and price supports.
Yours truly,
MRS. JOE STAHL,
Secretary.

WING, N. DAK., *June 9, 1953.*
Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Building,
Washington, D. C.
DEAR SENATOR: As a family-type farmer I cannot continue to operate under the present conditions without 100 percent of parity. We can't meet expenses without 100 percent. We also want and need soil conservation, PMA and RFA for our family-type farms.
Your truly,
OTTO E. ZOLLER.

AMBROSE, N. DAK., *June 9, 1953.*
Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Washington, D. C.
DEAR SENATOR: On behalf of the Ambrose Farmer's Union local which is comprised of 35 members we strongly urge you to exert everything in your power to maintain full, adequate agricultural funds which are so desperately needed to carry on farm programs.
Yours truly,
ROBERT GRUNDSTAD,
Secretary, Ambrose Farmer's Union Local.

MINOT, N. DAK., *June 8, 1593.*
Hon. Senator LANGER.
DEAR SIR: Do everything possible to hold agricultural appropriations as they have been voted in in the House, or raise them.
In other words help us save the family farm.
Sincerely,
H. B. ALMY.

GENESEO, N. DAK., *June 12, 1953.*
Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Washington, D. C.
DEAR MR. LANGER: I am writing to you to urge your support in the farm program all the way, we are trusting you.
LAWRENCE H. SEE.
SARGENT COUNTY, N. DAK.

GENESEO, N. DAK., *June 12, 1953.*
WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senate.
SENATOR LANGER: Farm program appropriations equal to last year is a must. That means you must fight.
Sincerely,
Mr. and Mrs. ROLLOF LEE.

THORNE, N. DAK.
We believe agricultural appropriations should be increased to avoid disaster and full support be given the Mundt amendment.
WM. BUSHAM.

THORNE, N. DAK.
We believe agricultural appropriations should be increased and full support be given the Mundt bill.
SIMEON GRENIER.

THORNE, N. DAK.
SENATOR: We believe agricultural appropriations should be increased and full support be given the Mundt amendment.
MARGIT GRENIER.

THORNE, N. DAK.
SENATOR: We believe agricultural appropriations should be increased and full support be given the Mundt amendment.
THEODORE GRENIER.

BRIEN, N. DAK., *June 10, 1953.*
Hon. Senator LANGER,
Washington, D. C.
DEAR SENATOR: I urge you to support farm appropriations recommended by the Senate subcommittee including 250 million for A. C. P.
Very truly yours,
OSWALD SKIFTUN.

THORNE, N. DAK.
We believe agricultural appropriations should be increased and full support be given the Mundt bill.
Mr. and Mrs. LUCIEN COSAUSUT.

THORNE, N. DAK.
I fully support the Mundt amendment and believe that agricultural appropriations should be increased.
LUCIEN CASARAND.

THORNE, N. DAK.
DEAR SIR: I believe agricultural appropriation should be increased and full support be given the Mundt amendment.
PAUL D. MALO.

THORNE, N. DAK.
We believe agricultural appropriation should be increased and full support be given the Mundt amendment.
Mrs. PAUL MALO.

BELCOURT, N. DAK.
We believe agricultural appropriations should be increased and full support be given the Mundt amendment.
Mrs. PHILIP BENKE.

BELCOURT, N. DAK., *June 5, 1953.*
DEAR SIR: I believe agricultural appropriations should be increased and full supports be given the Mundt amendment.
EDWARD BERUBE.

BELCOURT, N. DAK., *June 5, 1953.*
Hon. Senator LANGER:
DEAR SIR: I would like to see you support the Mundt amendment to the Agricultural Act, and also the agricultural appropriation.
PHILIP BERUBE.

BELCOURT, N. DAK.
I fully support the Mundt amendment and favor increased agricultural appropriations.
EMANUEL CHARLEBOIS.

BELCOURT, N. DAK.
I believe that agricultural appropriations should be increased and I fully support the Mundt amendment.
Respectfully,
Mrs. HAZEL CHARLEBOIS.

BELCOURT, N. DAK.
I believe agricultural appropriations should be increased and I fully support the Mundt amendment.
Respectfully,
GUSTAVE CHARLEBOIS.

THORNE, N. DAK.
We believe agricultural appropriations should be increased and full support be given the Mundt amendment.
Mr. and Mrs. ALFRED ENNO.

I believe agricultural appropriations should be increased and full support be given the Mundt amendment.
ANNA MONGEON.

I believe agricultural appropriations should be increased and full support be given the Mundt amendment.
PIERRE MONGEON.

JUNE 5, 1953.
Hon. Senator LANGER:
We believe that the agricultural appropriation should be given your full support as it passed the House. The Mundt amendment is also praiseworthy.
Yours truly,
Mr. and Mrs. EUGENE MONGEON.

BELCOURT, N. DAK.
I fully support the Mundt amendment and believe that agricultural appropriations should be increased.
ALLEN H. STEN.

THORNE, N. DAK.
I believe agricultural appropriations should be increased and full support be given the Mundt amendment.
Mrs. FLORENCE MARCIL.

THORNE, N. DAK.
We believe agricultural appropriations should be increased and full support given the Mundt amendment.
THERESA BUSHAW.

BELCOURT, N. DAK., *June 5, 1953.*
Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Washington, D. C.
DEAR SIR: We believe agriculture appropriations should be increased and full support be given the Mundt amendment.
Sincerely,
Mr. and Mrs. J. M. AUFEDT,

LANGDON, N. DAK., *June 5, 1953.*
SENATOR LANGER: I urgently request your support of appropriation for farm program at least equal to last year.
Yours truly,
JOHN GUSIN.

TIMMER, N. DAK., *June 11, 1953.*
Honorable Senator LANGER,
Washington, D. C.
DEAR SENATOR: I urge you to support farm appropriations recommended by the Senate subcommittee including $250 million for ACP.
Very truly yours,
NICK SCHMIDT.

SOLEN, N. DAK., *June 10, 1953.*
Hon. Senator LANGER.
DEAR SENATOR: I urge you to support farm appropriations recommended by the Senate subcommittee, including $250 million for ACP.
Yours truly,
G. F. HENDERSON.

BREIEN, N. DAK., *June 10, 1953.*
Hon. Senator LANGER,
Washington, D. C.
DEAR SENATOR: I urge you to support farm appropriations recommended by the Senate subcommittee, including $250 million for ACP.
Very truly yours,
Mr. and Mrs. EARL CHADWICK.

TIMMER, N. DAK.
DEAR SENATOR: I urge you to support appropriations recommended by the Senate subcommittee, including $250 million for ACP.
Yours truly,
J. D. BREWSTER.

SOLEN, N. DAK., *June 10, 1953.*
HON. SENATOR LANGER: I urge you to support farm appropriations recommended by the Senate subcommittee, including $250 million for ACP.
Very truly,
Mr. and Mrs. JERRY RHONE, Sr.

BREIEN, N. DAK., *June 10, 1953.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.
DEAR SIR: I urge you to support farm appropriations recommended by the Senate subcommittee, including $250 million for ACP.
Very truly yours,
MAX POTTER.

BREIEN, N. DAK., *June 10, 1953.*
Hon. Senator LANGER,
Washington, D. C.
DEAR SENATOR: I urge you to support farm appropriation recommended by the Senate subcommittee, including $250 million for ACP.
Very truly yours,
LAWRENCE ISAACS.

BREIEN, N. DAK., *June 10, 1953.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.
DEAR SIR: I urge you to support farm appropriation recommended by the Senate subcommittee, including $250 million for ACP.
Very truly yours,
A. L. HENDERSON.

TIMMER, N. DAK., *June 11, 1953.*
Hon. Senator LANGER,
Washington, D. C.
DEAR SENATOR: I urge you to support farm appropriation recommended by the Senate subcommittee, including $250 million for ACP.
Very truly yours,
TOM BUCKLEY.

BREIEN, N. DAK., *June 10, 1953.*
Hon. Senator LANGER,
Washington, D. C.
DEAR SENATOR: I urge you to support farm appropriation recommended by the Senate subcommittee, including $250 million for ACP.
Very truly yours,
JOHN J. HIEFRIH.

SALEM, N. DAK., *June 10, 1953.*
Hon. Senator LANGER,
Washington, D. C.
DEAR SENATOR: I urge you to support farm appropriation recommended by the Senate subcommittee, including $250 million for ACP.
Very truly,
Mr. and Mrs. ANTON GEISS.

SOLEN, N. DAK., *June 10, 1953.*
Hon. Senator LANGER,
Washington, D. C.
DEAR SENATOR: I urge you to support farm appropriations recommended by the Senate subcommittee including $250 million for ACP.
Very truly yours,
Mr. and Mrs. JOHN P. HATZENBUHLER.

SOLEN, N. DAK., *June 10, 1953.*
Hon. Senator YOUNG,
Washington, D. C.
DEAR SENATOR: I urge you to support farm appropriations recommended by the Senate subcommittee, including $250 million for ACP.
Yours truly,
JOE MATHERNS.

LANGDON, N. DAK., *June 5, 1953.*
DEAR SENATOR LANGER: I urgently request your support of appropriations for farm program at least equal to last year which was absolute minimum.
OLE L. E. OLSON.

LANGDON, N. DAK., *June 4, 1953.*
SENATOR WILLIAM LANGER: Please support appropriations for farm programs at least equal to last year.
Yours truly,
GEO. J. KAISKY.

LANGDON, N. DAK., *June 4, 1953.*
SENATOR LANGER: I urgently request your support of appropriations for farm program at least equal to last year which was absolute minimum.
L. M. PETERSON.

LANGDON, N. DAK., *June 4, 1953.*
Senator LANGER:
DEAR SIR: I urgently request your support of appropriation for farm program at least equal to last year which was absolute minimum.
Sincerely,
Mrs. WALTER MYERS.

LANGDON, N. DAK., *June 4, 1953.*
DEAR SIR: I urgently request your support of appropriations for farm program at least equal to last year which was absolute minimum.
Sincerely,
Mrs. HAROLD PENGILLY.

DRESDEN, N. DAK., *June 4, 1953.*
Senator LANGER,
Washington, D. C.
DEAR SIR: I urgently request your support of appropriation for farm program, at least equal to last year which was absolute minimum.
Sincerely,
Mrs. R. C. DOMRES.

THORNE, N. DAK.

I believe agricultural appropriations should be increased and full support be given the Mundt amendment.

ADRIEN MONGEON.

DRESDEN, N. DAK.

Senator WILLIAM LANGER:

I sincerely hope you will support the farm program at least equal to last year which was the absolute minimum.

FRANK GERTH.

LANGDON, N. DAK., *June 4, 1953.*

DEAR MR. LANGER: I sincerely hope you will support the farm program, at least equal to last year's, which was absolutely a minimum.

ED CHAPUT.

LANGDON, N. DAK.

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: We urge your support of appropriations for farm program.

Yours truly,

OTTO GERTH.

LANGDON, N. DAK., *June 4, 1953.*

DEAR SIR: We want full price support for our farm products through 1958.

Yours truly,

ED CHIRBONNES.

LANGDON, N. DAK., *June 5, 1953.*

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: I urgently request your support of farm prices for 100 percent full parity for farm programs. At least equal to last year which was absolute minimum.

Yours truly,

HOWARD NUILLE.

LANGDON, N. DAK., *June 5, 1953.*

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: I earnestly beg you to support appropriations for farm program at least equal to last year which was absolute minimum.

Yours truly,

WILFRED CHAPUT.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] has expressed some sentiments with which I find myself in agreement, particularly when he states that if we are going to cut down expenses we must find spots where to do it, and not raise the appropriations in every bill.

Mr. President, the subject before the Senate has been erroneously referred to as a soil-conservation program. We have had previous discussions of this so-called soil-conservation program when we were trying to cut down ACP payments.

There is a vast difference between the Soil Conservation Service of the Department of Agriculture and the ACP payments. We are dealing here with ACP payments, and they are not connected in any way with the Soil Conservation Service of the Department of Agriculture.

Recently the Richmond Times-Dispatch carried an article entitled "Brain Washing Congress With Limestone Water?" In the course of the article reference is made to a letter sent out by Mr. Robert M. Koch, executive secretary of the National Agricultural Limestone Institute, Inc., with national headquarters in Washington, D. C. The letter is dated April 20, 1953, and carried the injunction: "Be sure and keep this letter confidential." It refers to the program which Secretary Benson had recommended to Congress calling for an appropriation of $140 million for soil conservation and the elimination of the limestone program. The letter reads:

Briefly, it—the Benson program—puts an end to our national ACP (conservation) limestone program. From now on we would have to sell our own product.

Think of it, Mr. President, the organization would have to sell its own product.

In my opinion the total purchased would not exceed 2 million tons, and probably would only be half this amount. You would have to market the other 26 or 27 million tons without any financial assistance.

We are in a last-ditch fight, and only Congress can save this program now. To offset the tremendously well-planned tactics of the Farm Bureau we need extensive grassroots support.

TABER is wielding a big club * * * his battle cry, "Not 1 more cent than Benson wants." I am trying to get directives written into the report of the committee to block the Benson policy of having no lime program. Be sure and keep this letter confidential.

Mr. President, I am glad to help Mr. Koch in not keeping his letter confidential. This has been going on for a long, long time. If we could eliminate the lime-program portions of the agricultural program I believe we could take care of our agricultural needs pretty well. I think it is bad to have it mixed up with the limestone program. I think it is bad to mix up the lime program with the soil-conservation program.

Speaking about grass roots, it was my pleasure last fall to address a meeting of the State Farm Bureau Federation in my State. I pointed out that I had tried to cut the agricultural conservation appropriation to $150 million. I felt it should be cut to $100 million, because I think there is a justification for a $100 million appropriation. I pointed out that I had been unsuccessful, and I stated why I had been unsuccessful. The Farm Bureau Federation adopted a resolution setting forth that they were strongly opposed to continuation of the agricultural conservation program payments, but would favor some type of program for long-term credits for farmers who wished to put into effect permanent conservation practices.

In continuing the development of grass-roots sentiment, those farmers took that resolution to the Seattle meeting of the American Farm Bureau Federation. I attended that meeting, in Seattle, last December; and I addressed that convention. Again I was pleased to see the farmers, without any help from any other source, come to the conclusion that they did not want the former agricultural conservation program payments continued; they wanted them sharply reduced.

Mr. President, the Farm Bureau Federation is not the only farm organization that holds that view; the Grange also shares it. The American Farm Bureau Federation represents 1,450,000 families; the Grange represents approximately 450,000 families. Eighty percent of all the farm families of the United States believe this program should be cut out, and they said so, through their organizations. Yet we constantly hear statements to the effect that we must make these appropriations in the interest of soil conservation.

Mr. President, I receive many letters on this subject. On May 14, I received a letter from a farmer in Carlinville, Ill. I should have referred the letter to my friend, the Senator from Illinois.

The letter reads as follows:

MAY 14, 1953.

Hon. CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
Senate Committee on Agriculture,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Secretary Benson, whom I hold in high esteem, is constantly making the statement, "No real American wants to be subsidized." How such an honest man as he can justify this statement is more than I can figure out.

Why should the Federal Government spend millions of dollars to subsidize the butter producers, if these "real Americans do not want to be subsidized"?

Surely it is not fair either to the average citizen, to the producers of oleo, or even to the dairyman himself to take this tax money and give it to any one class.

Then take farm subsidies. In our county some $100,000 is given each year to our farmers in subsidies. Two men and four women are employed to pay this money out to the farmer, and all this when our farmers have never been so prosperous.

We own 2 farms, a total of 436 acres. In '51, one of these farms paid us as our share of the crops, a little over 40 percent on the cost of the land, and the past year over 30 percent. The larger farm, 319 acres, paid us almost 22 percent, and this net gain after taxes and all expenses. Yet, notwithstanding, Uncle Sam sends us each year a nice check to help us poor farmers out of the depression.

Why should all other groups of our citizens be taxed for the benefit of this one class?

Why the high cost of living? Largely due to the farm prices supported by Government subsidies.

Why should the people of New Mexico be taxed for the benefit of the farming States?

Is there nothing that can be done about this and done now?

Is the farm vote more important than justice?

Cordially yours,

WILLIAM M. HUDSON,
President Emeritus, Blackburn College.

P. S.—We have just received a check from the Treasurer of the United States for $130.19 helping us pay for lime and phosphate. How kind.

Mr. President, I believe the proposal made by the committee goes farther than we should go. I agree with the Senator from Vermont that probably we should not go that far.

I prefer the appropriation suggested by the Senator from Delaware, namely $140 million. Certainly if Congress wants to bring about any economy at all, it cannot afford to provide more than an appropriation of $195 million for agricultural conservation payments.

So I hope the amendment of the Senator from Georgia will be rejected.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, in order to facilitate the handling of the work at the desk, and since consideration of the new reports on the executive calendar will involve an interruption for not more than 2 minutes, I now move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business. There are only two new reports on the Executive Calendar.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

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

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

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

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

Jacob S. Temkin, of Rhode Island, to be the United States attorney for the district of Rhode Island; and

Clarence H. Spence, of Delaware, to be United States marshal for the district of Delaware, vice Paul B. Messick, resigned.

By Mr. BRICKER, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

Charles E. Slusser, of Ohio, to be Public Housing Commissioner.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar under the heading "New Reports."

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Ralph H. Demmler, of Pennsylvania, to be a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Amos J. Peaslee, of New Jersey, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Australia.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, it gives me great pleasure, and I am highly gratified, to support the nomination as Ambasasdor to Australia of my old friend, and a distinguished lawyer of New Jersey, Amos J. Peaslee. I have known him for many years. He is a most outstanding citizen of my State. It is a great honor to all who live in New Jersey to have him nominated as the United States Ambassador to Australia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

The nomination was confirmed.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of these confirmations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATIONS, 1954

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], on page 32, in lines 2 and 3, in the nature of a substitute for the amendment of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I wish to say a few words in support of the pending amendment.

I believe in economy, and I believe in a balanced budget. But, Mr. President, I cannot in good conscience take the Senate floor and defend a budget cut which will ultimately work to the detriment of our people. It is for this reason that I support the pending amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], for himself and others, including myself.

False economy, Mr. President, is a danger we must always guard against. As I stated earlier, I believe in true economy, and I have taken the Senate floor on many occasions in an attempt to assist our President in carrying out his campaign pledge of a balanced budget. Be that as it may, I also know that one of the most pressing tasks our Nation faces today is to conserve and preserve our most precious natural resource, our agricultural lands. For without these lands, Mr. President, future generations of Americans will be forced to reduce today's standard of living, and learn to live as citizens of a "have-not" nation. The danger signal is fully apparent today, that unless we take steps to preserve our land, to conserve our God-given natural resources, then generations yet unborn will surely know hunger and agricultural proverty.

The $225 million this amendment seeks to make available to the Department of Agriculture will go a long way toward achieving this end, Mr. President. It is a necessary end, a vital end, and we must not lose sight of it. We must not sacrifice the long-range welfare of our Nation in a hasty and ill-advised attempt to balance our budget.

Today our Nation has 462 million acres of cropland, and with that much cropland we are supporting a population of over 158 million people. If we are to provide our future generations—the people who will live in our country by 1975—the same amount of food and fiber, and make available to them the same standard of living we of the United States enjoy today, we are going to require 530 million acres of cropland to meet that goal. How will we obtain that 530 million acres; how will we obtain 68 million more acres of land than we now have? Fifteen million acres of it will come from land that now is being used to grow feed crops for work animals; 30 million acres will come by way of reclaiming our deserts and other presently unsuitable lands. But, these two sources total only 45 million acres. If we deduct those 45 million acres from the required acreage of 530 million, it is easy to see that by 1975 our Nation will still be short some 23 million acres of cropland. We shall be lacking some 23 million acres necessary in order to produce the food and fiber required by our population in 1975—needed if our people 22 years hence are to be fed and clothed on the same standard that our present population is being fed and clothed.

Mr. President, we have done a great job of soil conservation by teaching our farmers how to use fertilizer properly and abundantly; how to do contour plowing; and how, in various other ways, to preserve our croplands. At the same time, our agriculture has been able to produce from the same number of acres, 40 percent more food and fiber than in pre-soil-conservation days.

For instance, let us consider the situation in the case of cotton: 12 years ago, 42 million acres of land were required to produce approximately 12 million or 13 million bales of cotton. Today our cotton growers are able to produce 14 or 15 million bales of cotton on 27 million acres of land. We have increased our production by nearly one-third, but, at the same time, reduced the acreage required by almost one-half. Land formerly devoted to cotton can now be used for other agricultural purposes. That change resulted primarily as a result of the soil-conservation program. I, for one, in face of the progress we have made, and the progress we must yet make, am not willing to abandon that plan and program at this time. We have but scratched the surface in that direction, Mr. President.

I hold in my hand a table showing, percentagewise, the number of farms throughout the United States that have followed and adopted wise soil-conservation practices. In my own State of Louisiana, only 32 percent of the farmers have taken advantage of the soil-conservation program. Put another way 68 percent of my State's farmers could be induced to join the movement and thereby further increase soil-conservation methods. We are losing productive acres at the rate of 500,000 per year and it is most essential that we find ways and means to stop this dissipation of our precious topsoil. We should find other ways and means of conserving our land and that cannot be accomplished by reducing the program. I say that soil conservation should be extended, not so much for the benefit of our present generation, as for generations as yet unborn. I wish to have America thrive, in 1975 at least, to the extent that she is thriving today. I want to assure to my children and grandchildren the same abundant food and clothing that I know today. I do not want our country to be in the position of Persia. Several years ago it was my privilege to visit that country. In the great Valley of Mesopotamia, between the Tigris and the Euphrates Rivers, the land formerly had sufficient fertility to produce enough food and fiber to supply the needs of 15 million people. At that time, Persia had

sufficient land resources to feed 105 million people—much more than her population at that time. Today, however, the situation has changed very greatly. Mesopotamia, lying between the Tigris and the Euphrates Rivers, can barely sustain a population of some 3 million people; and in all of Persia, including the great Tigris-Euphrates valley, barely 15 million people can find a living. That change has resulted because of no soil conservation many centuries ago. The precious topsoil has been permitted to find its way down the rivers, into the Red Sea, and thence into the ocean. The fertile fields of Persia now exist in great swamps, extending into the sea from the mouths of the Tigris and Euphrates Rivers. I do not want such a condition ever to face our country.

Mr. President, up to the present time we have treated, through the soil conservation program, a total of 175 million acres of land. A soil conservation plan is now being developed for 315 million acres. It strikes me very forcibly that it will be shortsightedness on our part to cut this program to a point where a vital sustaining soil conservation program will be discouraged. If we should do so, we violate the trust of future citizens. I hope the Senate will go on record in support of the proposed appropriation of $225 million, in accordance with the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia in which I joined him, together with others. While it is an increase over the revised budget estimates, it nevertheless represents a cut of 10 percent in the 1953 appropriation. If we make a reduction of 10 percent in the appropriation made last year, I think the Nation's farmers will have done their share in helping balance the budget. We must remember that the Federal budget is a vital thing, and while it must be reduced, that reduction should be achieved with the skill of a surgeon. In cutting appropriations for necessary programs, we must not approach the problem as a butcher with cleaver in hand. I ask the Senate to adopt today a course of prudence. Let us not proceed hastily to deprive our children and our children's children of the abundance we Americans of 1953 have come to accept as never-ending. Let us realize that the future presents tremendous problems, and that a successful solution of these future problems requires today's wisdom.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I wonder whether the Senator, as a former distinguished chairman of the committee, could tell us regarding the distribution of the benefits, under the $140 million appropriation, as compared to the $225 million, in accordance with the proposal submitted by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. ELLENDER. In some States it will cut the program over 50 percent below the 1953 program, as in my State. In Arkansas, my recollection is it will cut the program over 40 percent. In my opinion it would simply mean that, if there is projected into the future, such a plan as the one now being advocated by Mr. Benson, it will destroy the entire program.

In this connection, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks a table indicating the use to which the $140 million requested by the Secretary of Agriculture for the Agricultural Conservation program for fiscal year 1954 would be put. I believe this table will provide the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] and other Senators with a full picture of the reduced program.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed, as follows:

Distribution of funds among States, 1953, and tentative estimate for 1954 [1]

[Thousands of dollars]

State	1953 program [2]	Amount 1953 allocation resulting from needs for permanent type practices [3]	Tentative 1954 program estimate [4]
Alabama	5,946	1,333	3,025
Alaska	27	12	14
Arizona	1,446	941	1,669
Arkansas	4,574	1,020	2,327
California	4,986	2,453	4,798
Colorado	3,248	1,570	2,619
Connecticut	487	140	258
Delaware	327	33	166
Florida	2,219	757	1,654
Georgia	6,897	1,514	3,508
Hawaii	182	35	93
Idaho	1,645	683	1,300
Illinois	7,936	2,065	4,297
Indiana	5,086	1,424	2,951
Iowa	8,605	2,593	5,271
Kansas	6,381	1,721	3,254
Kentucky	5,851	1,147	2,976
Louisiana	4,035	885	2,053
Maine	917	210	466
Maryland	1,278	309	650
Massachusetts	527	131	268
Michigan	4,549	1,131	2,407
Minnesota	5,496	1,904	3,796
Mississippi	6,253	1,808	3,525
Missouri	8,737	2,112	4,444
Montana	3,455	1,588	3,003
Nebraska	5,969	1,707	3,393
Nevada	281	195	427
New Hampshire	477	106	243
New Jersey	711	115	362
New Mexico	1,775	1,028	1,843
New York	4,635	1,268	2,360
North Carolina	6,042	932	3,073
North Dakota	4,460	1,124	2,269
Ohio	5,280	1,876	3,776
Oklahoma	7,208	1,980	3,791
Oregon	2,103	990	1,821
Pennsylvania	4,923	1,576	2,772
Puerto Rico	820	254	488
Rhode Island	82	19	42
South Carolina	3,184	539	1,620
South Dakota	4,645	1,626	2,760
Tennessee	5,166	994	2,628
Texas	18,455	5,518	11,001
Utah	1,259	712	1,279
Vermont	1,021	153	519
Virgin Islands	12	5	9
Virginia	4,091	1,312	2,619
Washington	2,322	620	1,230
West Virginia	1,549	408	788
Wisconsin	5,167	1,194	2,628
Wyoming	1,949	1,089	1,970
Total	[5] 194,676	56,859	[5] 116,503

[1] Based on formula contained in 1953 appropriation act.

[2] Based on conservation needs for practices included in 1953 program.

[3] This column indicates the extent to which conservation needs for permanent-type practices as a part of total conservation needs entered into 1953 allocations.

[4] Based on conservation needs for practices included in tentative list of permanent-type practices being used as guide at State, county, and community levels informulating recommendations for the 1954 National ACP. Final list not to be determined until after these local recommendations are received at national level and final determination made as to the practice to be included in the 1954 program. This tentative distribution assumes the application of the full 15-percent adjustment toward conservation needs as permitted by the allocation formula.

[5] Does not include costs of administration, funds for small payment increase, naval stores conservation program payments, transfer of funds for printing, aerial photography, Treasury, etc.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Is it true that, under the program as submitted by Mr. Benson, the State of Utah and other arid States would receive more money than they would receive under the $225 million, which the Senator is supporting?

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Is that not a rather odd result? I wonder whether the Senator will tell us how he arrives at such a conclusion.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am not sure, but I might suggest to my good friend from Arkansas that the reason probably lies in the fact that Utah, being a semiarid State, normally engages in a higher percentage of the so-called permanent-type conservation practices than the State of Arkansas, or, for that matter, my own State of Louisiana. By permanent-type practices, I refer to the building of small dams and the construction of ponds and the like, as opposed to the recurring practices of spreading lime, for example. It would seem to me that since the percentage of permanent practices is normally higher in Utah than in Louisiana, the elimination of recurring-type practices from the program would leave semiarid States, such as Utah, in a better position moneywise than some of the other States. What they are trying to do—at least, what Mr. Benson is trying to do—is to discourage the use of fertilizer and things of that kind, as my good friend from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] has just suggested.

Mr. ANDERSON. I mentioned lime; not fertilizer.

Mr. ELLENDER. Lime is a fertilizer, as I understand.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It is a soil food.

Mr. ELLENDER. It is a soil food; there is no doubt about that, just as nitrogen is a soil food. What is going to happen, in my opinion, as I have just indicated, is that if the appropriation is put on the basis of need, the program as a whole will soon fade out. That is what is going to happen. The farmers will soon lose interest.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. May I ask the Senator, Is it not very odd that a new program for the distribution of these funds should be developed so that the States in which certain Senators are so greatly interested would receive increases at the expense of all the other States of the Union?

Mr. ELLENDER. It is odd, but I do not believe it was done for the purpose of helping the State of Utah, in particular, simply because Secretary Benson is from that State. I hope not, anyway.

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. Mr. President, I shall not be able to discuss some of the figures because I am not on the Committee on Agriculture, but I have listened with interest to what has been said here. But, above and beyond that, I had an opportunity last summer to observe at firsthand some of the things mentioned by the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]. I visited the ancient, once great land of Greece, from which have come some of our very fine citizens. I saw the denuded hills which had once produced sustenance and at least a livelihood for the people of that great nation. Last summer I saw hills denuded and barren of vegetation in many spots, with only

a slight growth of vegetation in other spots.

I talked to two county agents from North Carolina who were sent by the United States Government to Greece to help improve the agricultural situation of that nation in order that she might again become self-sustaining, so far as possible, in the production of foodstuffs. I heard these men tell what they were doing, or what they were trying to do, to restore the soil of that ancient land, destroyed by erosion and through lack of attention.

I voted last year for the $250 million appropriation for the soil-conservation program, and, Mr. President, when I looked about me in Greece, I was glad that I voted with those in the Senate who had had the foresight to see that what had befallen that great nation might someday befall the United States.

I was impressed just now when the great Senator from Louisiana told about the situation in the Euphrates and Tigris River Valleys, which once produced food for 100 million persons. I believe his statement was that today about 15 million people are able to find sustenance from that land. I saw a little of the land in that area of the world and I know that erosion and the lack of protection of the soil had well-nigh destroyed a large part of the civilization there. I said, when I gazed upon those scenes last summer, that I was glad I had stood with those who did not believe that the soil-conservation program should be ripped and torn apart.

I have heard much said about the American Farm Bureau. Ordinarily I have great faith in its views about matters pertaining to agriculture. But I also know that members of the Farm Bureau and of the Grange came to see me last year to explain this matter to me and to urge that this program be not curtailed, as it was then planned. So I do not believe that we should take away from this program the funds with which to carry it on successfully.

I understand there have been abuses. Conditions which lead to abuses ought to be rooted out; and it should be possible to eliminate them. Certainly we should not take $30 million away from those who would build up our soil, when we think of the millions, yes, the hundreds of millions, indeed, the billions, we are scattering all over the earth. I do not know how much we are spending in Greece, for instance, or in Italy, or in other parts of the earth, for soil conservation, but it seems to me that if we are to spend hundreds of millions and even billions of dollars throughout the world, we ought to spend some of our money to protect our own soil and aid our own farmers who may be struggling with the problem of preserving their soil against destruction by erosion. I do not believe it would be wise to cut the appropriation in order to save $30 million.

I voted for practically all of the proposals to cut appropriations, and I expect to continue to do so; but when I see Senators stand here, as I shall see them do within the next week or two, arguing for enormous appropriations to be spent all over the world, I cannot help thinking it is very unwise to do that and yet at the same time reduce the appropriations for soil conservation right in our own midst and among our own people.

Last summer I met some Americans in Paris. There are so many Americans over there that one can hardly go a block without seeing some of them. What are they doing? They are spending our Government's money in all sorts of schemes and proposals, some of which perhaps are good, but many of which are, it seems to me, silly. Yet we talk about reducing a worthwhile appropriation by $30 million. In the minds of those who oppose the program, perhaps that might do some good, though some of those who perhaps know more about it believe it would do a great deal of harm to cut this appropriation while letting many other exorbitant proposals pass.

One other thing, Mr. President, and I shall be through. I understand from those who know the figures—and I believe the information was repeated a few moments ago by the distinguished Senator from Louisiana—that under this planned $140 million appropriation, Utah, New Mexico, and a few other States will receive far more than they get now. Where is it coming from? I was told by the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] just now that 75 percent of his State's appropriation will be cut. He tells me that the amounts for my own State of North Carolina will be cut about 50 percent, and that those for other States will likewise be cut.

What is fair about that, Mr. President? I hope we shall carry on this work, and that we will root out every bit of infamous crookedness and abuse, but that we will not take away the $30 million, which may mean the difference between keeping or not keeping in good condition some of the soil of America, which in the years to come we will need in order to sustain the population, which is constantly growing.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I wish to speak in opposition to the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], in which he is joined by other Senators from agricultural States, notably, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], and other Senators. I believe the Government can spend the $225 million very wisely on soil conservation; but I also believe $195 million represents a very good compromise between the position taken by the Department of Agriculture in favor of $140 million and the position taken by the House of Representatives. The vote on the House side was very close in raising the funds from $140 million to $195 million. I think there was a difference of only 3 votes.

Mr. President, in order to get soil conservation there are other things which are even more important than are soil-conservation payments. I have reference to the income of various farmers. No farmer can do a decent job of conserving and maintaining his soil alone unless he has adequate farm income. Farm price supports are far more important than is even this program. There is a sizable amount in the bill, and there probably will be more next year, for price-support operations. We have raised funds for agricultural research, which is equally important if not more important. All in all, Mr. President, I think this is a very good bill, and I believe the farmers of the Nation will be quite happy with the appropriation of $195 million for the ACP program, even though they would perhaps like to have more.

I strongly oppose the amendment to reduce the fund to $140 million, and I also oppose raising it to $225 million.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, I have been listening to the speakers as amendments have been proposed, and I desire to say that the statement which has just been made by the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] represents the way in which I look at the question.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, in view of the tremendous prestige of the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] in agricultural matters, I desire to refer very briefly to a statement made by him.

It may be, Mr. President, that it is erroneous for the Government to assist farmers in obtaining fertilizers which will bind up the soil and prevent erosion from dust storms and from water by giving the soil a heavy cover of grass, but there is nothing new in that program. We have had it for many years. We all have a right to change our minds.

The distinguished Senator from New Mexico served ably as Secretary of Agriculture. At the time he did so more money was provided for soil conservation than the amount which is requested in this amendment. Substantially the same program was being carried out at that time. The Department purchased huge quantities of lime and phosphates, some of which were furnished by the manufacturers who wrote the letter from which the Senator from New Mexico read. I do not think the letter has much bearing on the question, one way or the other.

The former Secretary of Agriculture appeared before the committee and urged the committee not to reduce the appropriation. Shortly after that he became a Member of the Senate, and has since been a very valuable Member of this body.

In 1951 when the same program was in effect, an effort was then made to reduce the appropriation. That effort had the support of the Farm Bureau Federation. The hierarchy of the Farm Bureau Federation has fought this program for a number of years.

The Senator from New Mexico, having very recently come from the office of Secretary of Agriculture, addressed himself to the question, and I should like to read a few excerpts from his statement. He said:

> The committee is trying to make the amount $280 million, which I think is low enough. There is no place where money is more needed than in this conservation program. I think it would be absolutely unwise to reduce the appropriation recommended by the committee. I have not hesitated in the slightest to cast my vote against amendments that would reduce it, because I remember the experiences of 1947.

In 1947 the Congress of the United States, in an economy wave, decided to trim the conservation program, and it reduced the amount to $150 million, and served notice that that would be the last year there would be a conservation program. It was then my responsibility, as Secretary of Agriculture, to go before the committees of the Congress and plead with them not to reduce the appropriation and not to leave a death sentence hanging over the agriculture conservation program.

* * * * *

The Department of Agriculture made its fight, but we lost, and an economy-minded Congress destroyed a part of the soil-conservation program. I remember that some of the Members who helped to destroy it paid the penalty the next time they went back to their constituents and talked to them. I am wishing everyone well in his body, but the quickest way for Senators to hurt themselves and their communities is to destroy the agricultural conservation program.

Mr. President, I submit that every word of that statement is as true and as applicable today as it was in 1951. I, too, remember the experiences of 1947, when the House eliminated the agricultural-conservation program in its entirety, and, after many long and tedious days of conflict, we finally managed to restore $150 million. That was $10 million more than was sought by Mr. Benson.

Mr. President, we learn nothing from history, particularly political history, except that we learn nothing from history, particularly political history.

I desire to point out that the condition of the American farmers is more acute at this hour than it was in 1947. Farm income in 1947 was better than it is in 1953. Let those who will, delude themselves with the idea that the upper hierarchy of the Farm Bureau Federation is speaking for millions of farm families in urging a cut in this appropriation. Let them contend against a workable program such as is provided for in the amendment of which I am one of the authors, and they will find, possibly, as the Senator from New Mexico said in 1951, that the quickest way for Senators to hurt themselves is to destroy the agricultural-conservation program.

I urge the Senate now, when farm income is sliding down, not to add insult to injury by pinching pennies on this program which is so vital to the welfare of all the American people in maintaining agricultural production.

Mr. President, I regard this as one of the most significant farm issues before the country, and, therefore, I ask for the yeas and nays on this amendment.

The yeas and nays are ordered.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I think I have some time remaining.

In the year 1947 we had just come out of the war. There were hundreds of thousands of acres of land which had been ripped up from pastures and put into row crops. We were trying to get the row crops back into pastureland again. We felt that the farmer was entitled to money for reconversion. How many years does it take to get it? Do the same factors apply year after year?

I hope the Senator from Georgia recognized, when he was reading from my statement, that in 1951 we thought we had reached the point where we would be operating in the black. We started into the red in 1951 and got into it more deeply in 1952 and 1953.

There is a difference between what men can do when they have money in their pockets and when they have deficits of many million dollars a year.

Mr. President, I am glad the Senator from Georgia pointed out that the Farm Bureau Federation was on one side of the picture and I was on the other side. I have supported them when I thought they were right and I have been against them when I thought they were wrong. I think that is what we should do, and not take dictation from them.

We recognize that the program cannot go on forever; it has to end sometime. Therefore, Mr. President, I say I do not believe in destroying the program, but I do believe in bringing it down to reasonable figures, and I believe $140 million is sufficient.

I believe eventually $100 million will be plenty. I do not think the program would be destroyed further. The money might be given to the lime peddlers in Washington, but the program would not be destroyed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CARLSON in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], for himself and other Senators, as a substitute for the amendment of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS]. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] on behalf of himself and other Senators, as a substitute for the amendment of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], to the amendment of the committee. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ANDERSON (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], who is absent. If he were present and voting he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

Mr. FREAR (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with my distinguished seat mate, the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR]. If he were present and voting he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. PASTORE (after having voted in the negative). On this vote I have a live pair with the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON]. If he were present and voting he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote I would vote "nay." Accordingly, I withdraw my vote.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] are absent on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] would each vote "nay."

I also announce that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official committee business and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] is necessarily absent.

On this vote the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] was paired with the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] was paired with the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY].

If present and voting, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] would vote "nay," and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] would vote "yea." The Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] would vote "nay," and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] would vote "yea."

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

I further announce that the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are absent by leave of the Senate.

If present and voting the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] would vote "yea."

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

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

The Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] is absent on official business.

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

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

The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. If present and voting, the Senator from Washington would vote "yea," and the Senator from Illinois would vote "nay."

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL]. If present and voting, the Senator from Montana would vote "yea," and the Senator from Kansas would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 38, nays 37, as follows:

YEAS—38

Carlson	Hennings	McCarran
Chavez	Hoey	McClellan
Clements	Humphrey	Monroney
Cooper	Jackson	Mundt
Daniel	Johnson, Colo.	Neely
Eastland	Johnson, Tex.	Russell
Ellender	Johnston, S. C.	Smathers
Fulbright	Kefauver	Smith, N. C.
George	Kilgore	Sparkman
Gillette	Langer	Stennis
Gore	Long	Thye
Green	Mansfield	Wiley
Hayden	Maybank	

NAYS—37

Aiken	Dworshak	Millikin
Barrett	Ferguson	Payne
Beall	Goldwater	Potter
Bennett	Griswold	Purtell
Bricker	Hendrickson	Robertson
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Saltonstall
Bush	Holland	Smith, Maine
Butler, Md.	Jenner	Smith, N. J.
Butler, Nebr.	Kennedy	Watkins
Byrd	Knowland	Williams
Cordon	Kuchel	Young
Douglas	Malone	
Duff	McCarthy	

NOT VOTING—21

Anderson	Hunt	Murray
Capehart	Ives	Pastore
Case	Kerr	Schoeppel
Dirksen	Lehman	Symington
Flanders	Magnuson	Taft
Frear	Martin	Tobey
Hill	Morse	Welker

So the amendment offered by Mr. RUSSELL, for himself and other Senators, to Mr. WILLIAMS' amendment, to the amendment of the committee, was agreed to.

Mr. HUMPHREY subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have placed in the RECORD immediately after the vote on the Russell amendment a statement which I have prepared.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUMPHREY IN SUPPORT OF ADEQUATE FUNDS FOR CONSERVATION WORK

Preservation of our soil is of vital importance to all of us—it is our insurance of future food and fiber supplies for our rapidly growing population.

If this Congress fails to provide adequate funds for technical assistance to our locally organized soil-conservation districts through the Soil Conservation Service, and reduces the incentive share-the-cost payments of the agricultural conservation program, it assumes a grave responsibility of risking our Nation's future food and fiber supply.

In my opinion, educational guidance, technical assistance, and financial incentive are all needed to speed up the job that needs to be done toward conservation farming in America. Each supplements the other, and each has an important role that cannot be ignored. Each must be adequately supported and provided for by the Congress.

AN ALARMING FACT

I should like to call attention to some significant information that came forth in the course of hearings in the House on the Soil Conservation Service appropriations for 1954.

In response to questions by Hon. FRED MARSHALL, Congressman from the Sixth District of my State, Dr. Robert M. Salter, Chief of the Soil Conservation Service, disclosed an alarming fact.

Dr. Salter told the subcommittee that despite the advances made thus far in the field of soil and water conservation, the productivity of our soil in this country is still going downhill faster than it is being built up.

Dr. Salter says we know how to reverse this trend. He believes it will take about 30 years to complete a once-over conservation job but it will be at least 10 or 12 years, at our present rate of progress, before we can even reach a balance point between soil deterioration and soil improvement.

Research leading to better crop varieties, fertilizers, farm equipment, and similar advances have helped offset that declining soil fertility thus far. But, at the same time that we are improving our yields and maintaining a high national level of farm production, we are still overdrawing on our basic soil bank account.

Only 23 years from now, according to authoritative estimates, this Nation will be 70 million acres short of the cropland needed to meet the food needs of our population unless something is done.

Can we afford to wait until we are short of land to do something to start an upward trend in soil productivity? Can we even afford to wait for 10 or 12 years to begin to break even?

The farmers and ranchers of this country bear the primary responsibility. They are not only the users of the land but the guardians as well. But they need help of certain types in order to do the kind of a job that will reverse the downward trend of soil fertility.

THE JOB FOR SCS

One of the things they need most is assistance with some of their technical problems in soil and water conservation. That's what our Soil Conservation Service is doing, just as rapidly as it can. But it's not fast enough yet, obviously, in spite of the fact that SCS has made organizational improvements and established better and faster methods of planning and applying conservation. It is now largely a manpower problem. There just aren't enough technical people available to help farmers as fast as they want the help.

In the face of this need—possibly our most urgent national need—some are proposing this year to cut back these technical services to farmers rather than to accelerate them. The budget reductions proposed for the Soil Conservation Service would mean that next year every 5 soil-conservation districts in the country would have to do with 1 man less. SCS originally estimated it would need $66,491,000 to keep up with the increasing demand for its services. The revised budget cut this back more than $6 million. The House restored slightly less than $1 million.

We are all determined to operate our national programs as economically as possible. But I question the economy of saving $6 million in 1954 when that means retarding our entire national program of soil and water conservation—a program that soon returns more than it costs, and upon which our national well-being rests so heavily.

LET'S SPEED UP, NOT CUT BACK

Should we not attempt to increase the operating rate of this program rather than reduce it or even maintain its present rate?

I hold that we should not only restore the $6 million which have been cut from the 1954 budget, but in addition should augment it to a reasonable degree. We should begin to accelerate this program if we are to lighten the ultimate cost to the Nation of soil loss and deterioration. I should like to see what the Soil Conservation Service could do to step up this rate of accomplishment if it received $70 million in 1954. I am convinced that we can save the Nation millions in the long run by speeding up this work now. Every year that we fail to step it up means just that much more loss, and that much more delay.

At Omaha, Nebr., last fall, General Eisenhower said:

"The Soil Conservation Service is a competent technical agency * * * the only trouble with this kind of conservation work is that it is moving too slowly."

You don't speed it up by cutting down on its funds for technical assistance. Minnesota has had new districts in the past year which the SCS could not service, because they lacked the funds. We are hoping to have more new districts in the year ahead. We want to be sure we can have SCS technicians available to work with our farmers.

KEEP THE ACP

Our farmers in Minnesota have been disturbed over proposals to cripple and render ineffective the agriculture-conservation program, the program of sharing costs of approved conservation practices. Experience has proven that we just won't get as much conservation accomplished without this program.

It's foolish for critics to say farmers shouldn't be assisted in carring out practices that a good farmer should carry out anyhow. We've known for a long time about the benefits of certain practices, and the dangers of others. Knowledge alone hasn't brought about general adoption of sound conservation farming. We've needed these incentives.

The question isn't what a farmer should do—it's what he would do. And all of us have a stake in what he would do, or wouldn't do, toward conserving our valuable topsoil.

I'm glad the House refused to go along with Secretary Benson's reckless proposal to cut ACP authorizations for 1954 to $140 million. Instead, the House has voted $195 million advance authorization. I feel it should be kept at $250 million level, which is itself a drastic reduction from the level at which this program started. I do not think it should be cut further.

I urge this committee to recognize these conservation programs as a necessary investment in the Nation's future. The farmer cannot bear the burden alone of insuring food for the rest of us. The farmer gets less than half of the food dollar—why shouldn't the rest of the economy share in the cost of keeping our farms productive?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. RUSSELL. As I understand, the Williams amendment has not yet been agreed to. The vote just had was on the adoption of the substitute, I believe.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator is correct.

The question now recurs on the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], as amended. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. A vote in the affirmative would be a vote for an amount of $225 million, would it not?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is correct—$225 million as against $195 million.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The adoption of the amendment of the Senator from Georgia has changed the figure in my amendment from $140 million to $225 million.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator is correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I trust that the slight alteration in the Senator's amendment does not dispose him to vote against his own amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I have not changed my opinion that when we vote on appropriations we are in effect voting on a tax cut.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. As I understand, the amendment of the Senator from Delaware has now been amended by the action taken by the Senate on the substitute offered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL].

A negative vote on the substitute as amended would leave the figure as it came from the Appropriations Committee, would it not?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from California is correct.

The roll call will proceed.

The legislative clerk resumed the call of the roll.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. YOUNG. A "yea" vote, as I understand, is a vote for the figure of $225 million.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A "yea" vote is a vote for $225 million.

Mr. AIKEN. And a "nay" vote is a vote for $195 million.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A "nay" vote is a vote for $195 million. The rollcall will proceed.

The legislative clerk resumed and concluded the call of the roll.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, on this vote I have a pair with the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON]. If he were present and voting he would vote in the affirmative. If I were at liberty to vote I would vote in the negative. Accordingly I withhold my vote.

Mr. FREAR (after having voted in the negative). Mr. President, I believe I am recorded, am I not?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator is recorded as having voted in the negative.

Mr. FREAR. It was my understanding that my pair with the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] related to the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] as a substitute for the amendment of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS]. Therefore it now becomes incumbent upon me to announce a pair with the senior Senator from Oklahoma and to void my negative vote. If the senior Senator from Oklahoma were present and voting he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote I would vote "nay." I therefore withdraw my vote.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] are absent on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] would each vote "nay."

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] are absent by leave of the Senate. If present and voting, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] would vote "yea," and on this vote the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is paired with the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] would vote "nay," and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] would vote "yea."

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] are necessarily absent. On this vote the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] is paired with the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Kansas would vote "nay," and the Senator from Montana would vote "yea."

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

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

The Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] is absent on official business.

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

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

The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. If present and voting, the Senator from Washington would vote "yea," and the Senator from Illinois would vote "nay."

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is paired with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL]. If present and voting, the Senator from Montana would vote "yea," and the Senator from Kansas would vote "nay."

I also announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 38, nays 38, as follows:

YEAS—38

Carlson	Gillette	Johnson, Tex.
Chavez	Gore	Johnston, S. C.
Clements	Green	Kefauver
Cooper	Hayden	Kilgore
Daniel	Hennings	Langer
Eastland	Hoey	Long
Ellender	Humphrey	Mansfield
Fulbright	Jackson	Maybank
George	Johnson, Colo.	McCarran
McClellan	Russell	Stennis
Monroney	Smathers	Thye
Mundt	Smith, N. C.	Wiley
Neely	Sparkman	

NAYS—38

Aiken	Duff	McCarthy
Anderson	Dworshak	Millikin
Barrett	Ferguson	Payne
Beall	Goldwater	Potter
Bennett	Griswold	Purtell
Bricker	Hendrickson	Robertson
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Saltonstall
Bush	Holland	Smith, Maine
Butler, Md.	Jenner	Smith, N. J.
Butler, Nebr.	Kennedy	Watkins
Byrd	Knowland	Williams
Cordon	Kuchel	Young
Douglas	Malone	

NOT VOTING—20

Capehart	Ives	Pastore
Case	Kerr	Schoeppel
Dirksen	Lehman	Symington
Flanders	Magnuson	Taft
Frear	Martin	Tobey
Hill	Morse	Welker
Hunt	Murray	

So Mr. WILLIAMS' amendment, as amended, was rejected.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, the committee amendment is still open to amendment, as I understand.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The original text of the bill is open to amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask that it be stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 32, line 2, it is proposed to strike out "$195,000,000" and to insert in lieu thereof "$145,000,000."

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I shall not take the time of the Senate to debate the issue. It has been debated at length. The amendment is offered to give the Senators an opportunity to vote on the lower figure. Because of the parliamentary situation Senators voted either for $195 million or $225 million. Senators who wish to support the lower figure, which has been recommended by the administration and endorsed by both the National Grange and the Farm Bureau will now have an opportunity to vote on the amendment calling for the lower figure.

I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

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

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from South Dakota will state it.

Mr. MUNDT. I believe the yeas and nays were previously ordered on the Williams amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That amendment has been voted on.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I renew my request for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER], are absent on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from Vermont

[Mr. FLANDERS] would vote "nay" and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] would each vote "yea."

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] are necessarily absent. If present and voting the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] would each vote "nay," while the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] would vote "yea."

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] are absent by leave of the Senate. If present and voting, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] would vote "nay."

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

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], and the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] are absent on official business.

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

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

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

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] would each vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 22, nays 51, as follows:

YEAS—22

Anderson	Douglas	Potter
Beall	Duff	Purtell
Bennett	Ferguson	Saltonstall
Bricker	Frear	Smith, Maine
Bridges	Kennedy	Watkins
Bush	Kuchel	Williams
Butler, Md.	Pastore	
Byrd	Payne	

NAYS—51

Aiken	Hendrickson	Mansfield
Butler, Nebr.	Hennings	Maybank
Carlson	Hickenlooper	McCarthy
Clements	Hoey	McClellan
Cooper	Holland	Monroney
Cordon	Humphrey	Mundt
Daniel	Jackson	Neely
Dworshak	Jenner	Robertson
Eastland	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Ellender	Johnson, Tex.	Smathers
Fulbright	Johnston, S. C.	Smith, N. J.
George	Kefauver	Smith, N. C.
Gillette	Kilgore	Sparkman
Gore	Knowland	Stennis
Green	Langer	Thye
Griswold	Long	Wiley
Hayden	Malone	Young

NOT VOTING—23

Barrett	Hunt	Morse
Capehart	Ives	Murray
Case	Kerr	Schoeppel
Chavez	Lehman	Symington
Dirksen	Magnuson	Taft
Flanders	Martin	Tobey
Goldwater	McCarran	Welker
Hill	Millikin	

So the amendment of Mr. WILLIAMS was rejected.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which lies at the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 25, in line 22, it is proposed to strike out "$7 million" and to insert "$12 million.".

On page 26, in line 13, it is proposed to strike out "$6,286,329" and to insert "$11,248,000."

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, this amendment is offered in an effort to restore the original budget figures on upstream flood control.

There are 11 projects, most of which have been authorized since 1940 and 1944, to provide for agricultural flood-prevention work. These 11 projects are largely a part of main-stem flood prevention control, and are a phase of a new type of flood control and flood prevention. We might say this upstream flood control is the "farmers' method" of flood prevention.

All of us have heard that it would be fine if we could build dams on top of the hills, instead of building them in the rich river valleys. Fundamentally, that is exactly what upstream flood-control projects do. In the 11 projects that have been authorized during more than 10 years, the Soil Conservation Service not only is providing for comprehensive and complete soil conservation by means of farm terracing, contour plowing, and grassing the runoffs, but it also is providing control in the upstream reaches of the creeks and streams, so that one of the main land resources of the Nation, namely, the valley lands of the rivers, creeks, and streams, will be preserved.

Upstream plugs are built to control the runoffs in the upper reaches of the rivers and creeks and thus prevent the water from ever reaching the main stems of the rivers.

The 11 authorized projects have been provided for that purpose. As a result, not only is the Government able to avoid purchasing hundreds of thousands of acres of fertile bottom land, but Uncle Sam gets a free ride in the case of the water-retention reservoirs.

The Federal Government does not have to invest large sums of money in the purchase of land for the water retention reservoirs, because the farmers give the Government easement rights on them. The Government constructs small earthen dams, with a discharge culvert placed vertically, which empties the water from most of the dams within 24 hours.

Because only a small amount of water is left in the pool, for stock water purposes, the farmer naturally grasses most of the land that is covered in time of flood. So most of the funds used for upstream control are devoted to the construction of works, not to the purchase of land.

Careful studies of this program have been made. From the time when it began until 1944, the maximum time of construction was supposed to be from 15 to 20 years from start to finish. But under the reduced appropriations that have been made for this program and for other programs during the years, the range of time will not be from 15 to 20 years, but will stretch up to 65 or 70 years, at the present rate of appropriations.

Because $1 will have the value of $2, in the case of upstream control versus main-stem construction, and because the work can be done by small operators using bulldozers and other small equipment, this program offers the maximum amount of flood control for the minimum expenditure of dollars.

By proceeding with this comprehensive program of upstream-flood control, we are buying millions of acres of soil conservation of the most comprehensive and perfect type. The money used for this program will not go into the purchase of limestone or the purchase of fertilizer. It will go into work on the land; and this program gears into a comprehensive river flood control system, so that the water is held where it falls. Thus we take advantage of the sinking in of the water, rather than to try to rush the water through the land and off to the sea. Instead, the moisture is permitted to soak into the land on which it falls.

Mr. President, if we are able to develop this program and if we can complete a few of the projects, which will serve as guinea pigs, I believe they will show that we are now spending much more on rushing the water to the sea than we should be spending, and are receiving far less in the way of return on the expenditures, than in the case of trying to hold the water where it falls.

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

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to my distinguished friend from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. I want to be sure I understand the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma. As I understand his amendment, it deals with projects authorized under the Flood Control Act of 1936.

Mr. MONRONEY. That is correct.

Mr. CARLSON. It does not have reference to projects which were in the bill and were, I contend, authorized under Public Law 46.

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator is correct, and I personally would vote to support the amendment in which the Senator from Kansas is interested, to provide $5 million for new pilot starts on a number of streams in 21 States.

I think we are spending far too little for the comprehensive flood-control program, soil conservation methods. But my amendment applies to the 11 authorized projects. We have the projects listed.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in my remarks at this point two tables, the first of which

deals with watersheds, the second with flood-prevention appropriations, Department of Agriculture.

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

Watershed	Estimated total Federal cost as of June 30, 1952	Cumulative Federal obligations through fiscal year 1953	Percent of total Federal cost obligated through fiscal year 1953	Proposed years to complete	Years to complete at present rate of appropriations [1]
Buffalo Creek, N. Y.	$5,278,837	$1,282,716	24	18	29
Colorado (Middle), Tex.	5,466,790	1,113,407	20	20	34
Coosa, Ga.	2,491,230	685,912	28	20	25
Little Sioux, Iowa	8,838,200	5,172,858	57	15	12
Little Tallahatchie, Miss.	7,739,340	2,336,006	31	20	23
Los Angeles, Calif.	19,490,795	5,887,709	32	10	23
Potomac, Pa.-W. Va.-Md.-Va.	1,619,160	621,304	38	24	18
Santa Ynez, Calif.	2,156,870	1,514,882	70	10	10
Trinity, Tex.	64,943,540	7,150,458	11	15	65
Washita, Okla.	22,823,290	6,158,696	27	15	26
Yazoo, Miss.	34,382,330	3,241,348	9	20	74
Totals	175,230,382	35,951,895			

[1] Based on average of appropriations fiscal years 1947 through 1953.

Flood prevention appropriations, Department of Agriculture

Watershed	Fiscal year 1952	Fiscal year 1953	Original estimates, 1954	Revised estimates, House and Senate committee, 1954	Amount cut from original estimates, 1954	Percent cut
Buffalo Creek, N. Y.	$158,372	$188,111	$565,000	$248,000	$317,000	66
Colorado (Middle), Tex.	163,900	188,284	639,000	294,000	345,000	54
Coosa, Ga.	32,177	135,413	167,000	167,000		
Little Sioux, Iowa	510,784	760,240	750,000	750,000		
Little Tallahatchie, Miss.	385,678	518,300	734,000	596,500	137,500	19
Los Angeles, Calif.	294,902	398,447	953,000	578,583	374,417	39
Potomac, Pa.-W. Va.-Md.-Va.	34,840	39,338	56,000	56,000		
Santa Ynez, Calif.	157,904	173,267	170,000	170,000		
Trinity, Tex.	590,352	914,968	3,926,000	1,314,000	2,612,000	66
Washita, Okla.	533,574	866,035	2,089,000	1,197,246	891,754	43
Yazoo, Miss.	438,303	739,713	1,199,000	915,000	284,000	24
Total	3,300,786	4,922,116	11,248,000	[1] 6,286,329	4,961,671	

[1] Total of $7 million includes $500,000 for preliminary investigations and surveys, and $178,671 for general basin investigations.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, since we are interested in soil conservation, since this appropriation will help to give comprehensive soil conservation to every acre in the whole watershed of the 11 projects, and also since the projects have been approved since 1940, I believe that we could well spare $5 million in order that these projects may be completed faster, and we may realize the advantage of upstream flood control. In other words, cultivatable land is added by upstream flood control. The little creek valleys which are overflowed once, twice, and three times a year, are not now cultivatable; and those areas form much of our very best land. All of these little creekbeds are subject to cultivation, and subject to having controlled discharge of water, so that the streams will never overflow. Instead of wiping out hundreds of thousands of fertile acres of bottom land by main-stem-dam methods, hundreds of thousands of fertile acres of bottom land which could not otherwise be used are brought under cultivation.

Mr. President, I know of the Army engineers' program proposing only large dams for flood control, but I do not believe it possible to put every foot into the same size shoe. Neither do I think it possible to oversimplify the flood-control problem by building only massive main-stem dams. I think this upstream flood control is a program that is well prescribed to fit certain watersheds. The Government has spent millions of dollars on every type of agricultural research, and now it is asked to spend a few million dollars on flood-control research, in a practical way, which will give us a dollars-and-cents return in soil conservation for every dollar we spend; and there will be full benefits of flood control completely in addition to that.

This farmer's method of flood control, as we might call it, has been given only about 1 cent out of every dollar that is being spent. Yet, if one goes about and talks to the farmers, every one of them will say, "Can we not hold the water where it falls? Can we not save some of our bottom land? Why can we not make this soil-conservation, flood-prevention program work?"

I say to you, Mr. President, we could well increase the meager amount of $7 million, which is allowed in the pending bill, to the budget figure of $12 million, which was recommended after careful study by the Department of Agriculture, the Bureau of Soil Conservation, and the Budget.

Certainly we do not want to short-change the farm program on flood control—that is the farmers' method of flood control—while we are appropriating $404 million, as we did last year in the Army civil-functions bill, for the main-stem type of dams. These huge dams ultimately will silt up. There should be protection for these huge main-stem dams through the upstream works against siltation, and the holding back of the silt that erodes from the farmlands, holding it back on the hills, in the upstream area, through terracing, contour plowing, and check-dams.

It will far more than pay off, in the protection of our main-stem dams. So, Mr. President, I hope that the Senate will consider restoring the budget figure of $11,248,000 which was recommended for this vital program for the 11 projects that have been authorized since 1940 and 1944.

If this is not done, the program will be cut almost $5 million, as the cut in the budget estimate is $4,961,671. That is a terrific cut on this very important development of upstream flood control. I think the time has come when the Senate should go on record as to whether we believe in what we preach about flood control through soil conservation. The amendment restores only $5 million of the funds that have been cut out, and puts the appropriation back at the original budget figure.

Mr. President, I hope the amendment will be agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I shall speak very briefly in opposition to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma. These watershed programs are good programs, but the total cost of all programs that have been requested, and that have been planned, amounts to something over $300 billion. For the 11 particular watershed programs that have been authorized, there was recommended last year $7,750,000. What the Senator from Oklahoma is asking for is $12 million, or an increase of $4,250,000.

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

Mr. YOUNG. I will yield in a moment. We have already eliminated $5 million for 49 other watershed projects that have great merit. It would be most unfair to all those projects if we were to increase these particular funds to $12 million under flood prevention and cut the other item out completely. I now yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. What did the distinguished Senator say the cost of the projects would be?

Mr. YOUNG. The estimated cost of all watershed programs envisioned by the Department of Agriculture is in excess of $300 billion.

Mr. MONRONEY. I believe the distinguished Senator is quoting Army engineers' figures. The cost of the 11 projects we are working on now is $175 million. That was the estimated cost as of June 30, 1952. We have spent only $35 million of the $175 million estimated for the projects. Obviously, if we are to do a complete job of going back into every creek, as suggested by the Army engineers, to complete this entire nationwide program, embodying this new idea in flood control, we will probably arrive at a $300 billion figure. But certainly the development proposed in my amendment affects only $175 million of construction.

Mr. YOUNG. That is correct.

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

Mr. YOUNG. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. CORDON. The Senator from Oregon was present during the hearing on the agricultural bill—not this year—when the representative of the Department of Agriculture made the statement, in answer to a question, that the total cost of all the agricultural watershed or upstream tributary programs in the United States was estimated at $300 billion. That was the statement made by the Department of Agriculture, and those figures were based upon original estimates which were made a number of years prior to that time.

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

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. HENNINGS. I had the pleasure and privilege of serving on the Missouri Basin Survey Commission with the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, and during the course of our labors and studies lasting more than a year, we learned a great deal about the complexity and intricacy, and, as the Senator from Oregon has pointed out, a great deal about the expense of a program which may ultimately be achieved in order to reach something like a solution of our water-control problems, including conservation, flood control, and reclamation, as well as the subsidiary parts of the programs. I am wondering why only 11 projects are included in the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma. I am asking, for enlightenment, whether the chairman of the subcommittee knows of others which some of us might consider equally important in the terms of watersheds, and to which we gave great consideration in the preparation of the report, with which the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee is so familiar. I wondered why the committee took this action.

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

Mr. HENNINGS. I am asking for information.

Mr. MONRONEY. I had discussed the question of submitting one amendment to include all these projects, and a proposal of $5 million for the unauthorized projects which were placed in the bill by the House. I supported those also.

The distinguished Senator from Kansas stated he did not wish to press his amendment, but he expressed sympathy for this project, too, because it covers a wide area. We want more upstream flood control, not less, and the quicker we can proceed with these projects, which are being starved to death, the quicker we can then expand to the other areas, with which the distinguished Senator is so familiar, areas in the Missouri Valley and other places. But if we are to continue to starve all these programs, there is no use in our starting any new ones. It is in complete sympathy and in complete agreement with the sponsors of the House provision that I am submitting my amendment. Unfortunately, the two are under different authorizations, and in different sections of the bill.

Mr. YOUNG. I may say to the Senator that I believe all of these are good projects. I think, however, we ought to go easy on them, particularly at this time, when we are not making starts on many new programs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY].

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

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY].

Mr. AIKEN. I am strongly in favor of upriver flood control development programs. I think altogether too much emphasis has been placed on the construction of great dams across wide river valleys, dams which sometimes destroy more land than they protect as the Senator from Oklahoma has said.

However, I am skeptical of an amendment which adds $5 million to the bill. All of us hope there may be an honorable armistice or truce signed in Korea, followed eventually by peace, but we should realize that as soon as an armistice is signed, public opinion will be asserting itself very vigorously. If an armistice is signed, and there develops a hope of peace which may last for some time, we may expect a recession in business as a result of industrial conversion. The public will then put pressure on Congress and the administration, and successfully, for a renewal of a public works program. There will be a very insistent public demand for renewal of some programs which have been held in abeyance during the past few years, and very properly so, I believe.

One of the means we shall have with which to soften a recession while conversion is taking place from war production to civilian production will be the development of upriver valleys and the application of flood control methods. At that time we shall not be talking in terms of $5 million. When that point is reached, I believe some ciphers will be added to the figure.

Much as I should like to support the Senator from Oklahoma, I shall not vote for his amendment. As has been said, there is a question as to the authority for an appropriation for all these projects.

I observe that the Senator from Oklahoma is on his feet.

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

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. The projects affected by my amendment have been authorized by an act of Congress. There is no question about the authorization of the projects, which the House added, but which were eliminated from the bill by the Senate committee. The Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] was the sponsor of these projects, but some question was raised as to their authorization.

Mr. AIKEN. I did not understand that the Senator had deleted these projects from his amendment.

Mr. MONRONEY. At the request of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], my amendment, as offered, now affects 11 projects which have been authorized since 1940 and 1944, and on which work has been dragging along at a painfully slow pace. It will take 75 years to complete some of the projects.

The new pilot projects, which the Senator from Kansas proposed, and which were included by the House, were stricken from the bill by the Senate committee, which raised a question as to their authorization, but those projects are not affected in any way by my amendment.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Oklahoma has improved the situation materially. However, it seems to me that we might do well to pass over the amendment at this time. There will be a conference with the House, and I assure the Senator from Oklahoma that I shall give full consideration to his proposal in the conference. But I believe that very shortly it will be necessary for Congress to consider the matter on a much broader scale than that proposed by the Senator from Oklahoma, which affects only 11 upstream river developments.

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

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. I appreciate what the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has said. He has been a great supporter of upstream flood control.

One of the purposes of trying to develop the 11 pilot or guinea-pig operations would be to gain experience, so that if the time comes for additional construction, we will not be wasting money on false starts or because of lack of technical information. Therefore, as I have said in proposing the amendment, the research value alone in moving these projects further along will pay off big dividends if we can speed up these 11 pilot projects at this time.

Mr. AIKEN. Even though I shall vote against the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma, I shall, in conference give thoughtful consideration to his proposal. I believe I am required by law to be a member of the conference committee, and there I shall give even more

thoughtful consideration to a broader program, on which I feel we must be working in order to be able to take advantage of any recession which may develop as a result of the hoped-for truce.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I have received a letter from Mr Chester Wilson, Conservation Commissioner of Minnesota. In his letter Mr. Wilson states:

> I have just received a message from Washington stating that the Senate committee has deleted an item of $5 million in the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill (approved by the House Appropriations Committee) for carrying out 50 small watershed projects under the supervision of the United States Soil Conservation Service.

If I were to read the entire letter, Senators would learn that the Commissioner of Conservation in Minnesota is very much disturbed about this deletion. He says further in his letter:

> This news is very disturbing to this department, and I am sure that it will be received with much concern by the members of the State Soil Conservation Committee, soil conservation district supervisors, and by conservationists generally around the State.

May I ask if that is the item that is in question?

Mr. YOUNG. No. The item about which the Senator from Oklahoma is talking refers to 11 authorized projects under the flood prevention program. The reason the Senate committee on Appropriations struck out the $5 million under watershed protection was that there was a serious question as to proper authorization. It is a question which can best be ironed out in conference with the House.

Mr. THYE. In other words, it was stricken out for no other purpose than to have a question for discussion when the Senate and House conferees meet?

Mr. YOUNG. That is correct.

Mr. THYE. The matter is one which worries many honest, sincere conservationists. If the Senate committee did not have a mind to appropriate some of this amount, what will happen in conference? That is the question and the fear expressed by Mr. Wilson. The situation may be quite poorly understood, because if the Senate does nothing, it will appear that we are not conservation minded. To me, that is a disturbing factor, because it seems that we are considering the problem in the wrong ways. If the Senate strikes out this amount for the purpose of having a question to discuss, persons who are unfamiliar with the situation will read the appropriation bill, when we have finished with it on the Senate floor, and think that we did not have any intention of trying to improve the run-off or conservation program.

I would much rather have had the $5 million increase agreed to; then there would have been something to discuss in conference. The item would not have been stricken entirely from the bill. If it is stricken out entirely, the action will be misunderstood.

Mr. YOUNG. I think many who sent letters like the one just read would better understand the problem if they studied the law itself. The question is one of appropriate authorization. If a vote were to be taken on the Senate floor, the proposal would be lost entirely, and there would be no possibility of later bringing it up in conference. As matters now stand, there is a possibility of considering the question in conference. If we were to assume that the particular projects were properly authorized there would still be a question whether they were to be temporary or experimental in character.

There is more than $5 million involved. The total cost of these projects is $29 million, and not $5 million, which is the figure in the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments offered by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], which are being considered en bloc.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I renew my request for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the demand for the yeas and nays sufficiently seconded?

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I shall not take 15 minutes to make my brief statement, but I wish to make a slight contribution to this discussion.

The first committee meeting I ever attended after I came to the Senate was a 1944 meeting of the Commerce Committee, which reported the 1944 Flood Control Act. I have been interested in this particular approach to flood prevention from that time until today.

I am one of those who believed then, and still believe, that certain of these projects should be carried forward to completion in order that we might have some experience upon which to determine whether this is the sound approach. However, one of the questions which bothers me is this: One of the original approvals was that of the Santa Ynez River Basin in California. That is just over the mountains from Santa Barbara. I made inquiry in the hearings this year as to what was being done with reference to the Santa Ynez River Basin, and I was told that very satisfactory progress was being made with it.

Since we approved that project, or that type of flood prevention, the Bureau of Reclamation has built a dam across the Santa Ynez River. They are still praying that they will get enough water to fill the reservoir behind it. Since that time ownership in that area—the upper Santa Ynez Basin—to the extent of more than 40,000 acres, has gone to one man. I have made inquiry in the area, and I cannot find where a dollar was ever spent in the area. From the answers to my questions this year there is grave doubt in my mind as to whether the Department of Agriculture is yet aware that a dam was built across the Santa Ynez River within 20 or 30 miles of the place where it flows into the Pacific Ocean.

If that is a sample of what has been done, I think we should be a little careful when we add any more money than the amount in the bill at this time, which is some $1½ million or so more than was appropriated last year. The appropriation of last year was $5,700,000. The bill this year carries an appropriation of $7 million. Assuming that there is no more knowledge than there appeared to be in the hands of the Department of Agriculture, I doubt if we could expect intelligent expenditure of any such additional funds.

In view of the fact that the overall anticipated estimated expenditure is the highest of any single type of project I have known in the internal history of the United States—it now runs somewhere between $400 billion and $500 billion—I think we should go a little carefully at this time and suggest to the Department of Agriculture that it should know precisely what it is doing, or at least keep track of the monstrous reclamation dams which are being built across some of the streams, and which, so far as the upper areas are concerned, make any type of upstream flood prevention utterly useless, and any type of flood prevention below wholly unnecessary.

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

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator does not discount the value of preventing siltation by upstream flood-control treatment for the benefit of dams which may be far downstream, does he?

Mr. CORDON. There is nothing like that involved in this project.

Mr. MONRONEY. I am not at all familiar with the project to which the Senator refers, but I am familiar with the Washita project, which is to control the entire river watershed, and at the same time prevent the siltation of the Denison Lake on Red River, which will probably add 20 or 30 years to the useful life of that project.

Mr. CORDON. I do not for a moment depreciate the values which are involved. I invite the attention of the Senate to one instance which came to my attention. It was sufficient to hang a red lantern on this proposal, so far as I am concerned, until we know that the Department knows more about just how and where it expects to spend the money. I should like to see some of the projects tested, so that we can gain valuable experience, but I do not like to see money spent on a proposal such as this. I would rather spend the money in the Senator's part of the country on a project which could be finished.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments offered by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], which are being considered en bloc. The yeas and nays have been asked for.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments offered by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY]. [Putting the question.] The "noes" seem to have it.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I ask for a division.

On a division the amendments were rejected.

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

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Utah will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 24, after line 8, it is proposed to insert the following:

SPECIAL ACTS

For the acquisition of land to facilitate the control of soil erosion and flood damage originating within the exterior boundaries of the Cache National Forest, Utah, in accordance with the provisions of the act of May 11, 1938 (Public Law 505), as amended, $10,000.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, this amendment deals with such a small sum that I feel like apologizing for bringing it before the Senate. It relates to a program inaugurated back in 1938, when the Congress authorized the appropriation of a small sum from the receipts from the national forest, to be used for the purchase of private lands which were checkerboarded within the national forest. The national forest to which I am now referring is the Cache National Forest, in north-central Utah. This forest is upon ground upon which water is deposited through snows and rains, to supply the cities of Brigham City, Utah, Ogden, and other communities.

The communities themselves have been cooperating with the Government since 1938. They have been putting in money of their own and helping to buy these lands, improve them, and take care of them so that they will become a very fine part of the national forest. We have gone along year after year. The Government has been putting up $10,000 out of receipts from the national forest until this year, when the item was dropped.

The people of the local communities now have their part of the money ready. They are willing to go along, and they want to continue this very fine program. There are still other lands to be bought.

I should invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that under the law as it now exists, 25 percent of the income from the national forests goes to the communities in which the national forests are located. The $10,000 item here is from forest receipts, but 25 percent of that would belong to the counties. They are willing that that amount be appropriated, because it all goes into the Treasury. They are willing to have that amount appropriated as well, which, in effect, would mean an actual appropriation of $7,500 from the receipts of the national forest which would reach the Public Treasury and remain there for other purposes.

It seems to me we should encourage cooperation such as we are getting from these cities and communities. We have been talking in terms of a great many millions of dollars. This is a cooperative agreement that was started a number of years ago and has been carried on until this year. Communities and counties are cooperating with the Government in a very splendid fashion. I see no reason why the item should not be accepted by the committee.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, it is only a small project, and I have discussed it with several members of the Committee on Appropriations. I think it will be agreeable to take the amendment to conference, to see what can be worked out.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HENDRICKSON in the chair). The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] is willing to take the amendment to conference. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD immediately following the action of the Senate a statement which I have prepared justifying the amendment.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WATKINS

PURCHASE OF LANDS WITHIN THE CACHE NATIONAL FOREST, UTAH, TO PREVENT SOIL EROSION AND FLOOD DAMAGE

By an act approved May 11, 1938 (52 Stat. 347), and amended by the act of May 26, 1944 (58 Stat. 227), Congress has authorized the Secretary of Agriculture to purchase lands within the boundaries of the Cache National Forest in the State of Utah to assure that such lands will be managed, with nearby national forest lands, so as to minimize soil erosion and damage from floods. This act also authorizes appropriation by the Congress of the receipts from the Cache National Forest in Utah to pay for the lands acquired under the act. Proposed purchases must be approved by the National Forest Reservation Commission as established by section 4 of the Weeks law of March 1, 1911. This Commission is comprised of two Members of the Senate, Senators BRIDGES and STENNIS, two Members of the House of Representatives, Mr. COLMER, of Mississippi, and Mr. D'EWART, of Montana, the Secretary of War (or the Chief of Engineers as his alternate), and the Secretaries of Interior and Agriculture.

A primary purpose of this law is to facilitate protection and improvement of watersheds within the Cache National Forest on which many communities depend for domestic water and on which a substantial farm area depends for irrigation water. Purchase of critical watershed lands permits reduction or termination of grazing use, assures utilization of timber under good forestry practices, and permits the restoration of an adequate vegetative cover through reseeding, terracing, and similar measures, if such are necessary, in conjunction with like activities on other national-forest lands in the vicinity.

The west slopes of the Wasatch Mountains and the watersheds of the Ogden and Weber Rivers, all in northern Utah, descend steeply to the relatively level lands which adjoin the Great Salt Lake on its east side. Water from the streams that rise in this mountain area supports the cities and towns at the foot of the mountains and the irrigation agriculture which utilizes the fertile flat lands. Ogden, Willard, Brigham, and other towns depend on these short and swift streams for their water supplies. These streams are also the sole source of irrigation water for farms. In relation to need, water resources in this area are limited and careful conservation and use is essential.

A good part of these watersheds is within the Cache National Forest. Intermingled with the national forest lands are substantial acreages of privately-owned range and timberland of high watershed importance. The area of privately-owned lands, which are not subject to national forest administration, is proportionately greater in those parts of the national forest established in more recent years, as the Wellsville Mountain area which was added to the forest in 1937.

Some of these privately-owned lands have been abused through over-grazing, overcutting of timber, and destructive fires. As a consequence, on such lands, the vegetative cover often has been destroyed or seriously impaired, soil has been gullied or eroded away, and the water absorptive capacity of the topsoil has been reduced. Private owners often are under economic pressure to obtain maximum returns from their lands and find it difficult to decrease or terminate grazing or other use in the interest of watershed betterment. In many instances the use and value of these lands for watershed purposes, which is of overriding importance to the public, is of little direct concern to the owners. Also, private owners often are unable to install and maintain the restoration measures which are needed to stabilize the more seriously depleted land and to reduce downstream damages.

Deterioration of the steep, erodible mountain watersheds in this area has in the past resulted in serious flash floods affecting the valuable lowlands. The dangers of this situation were demonstrated in 1936 when a flood and resultant mud flow, directly attributable to watershed impairment, descended upon the town of Willard and nearby areas. It destroyed or damaged many homes, caused two deaths, destroyed the local power plant, damaged irrigation and municipal water systems, orchards, and crops, and otherwise caused a material loss of property. Costs of removing the mud and rock flows from the highways, irrigation systems and other facilities, and repairing the damage were, of course, large. Similar floods of varying degrees have affected other areas along the base of this mountain range.

The need for action to avoid repetition of such floods led to formation of two local nonprofit organizations, the Weber County Watershed Protective Corporation and the Wellsville Mountain Area Project Corporation, to aid in rehabilitation and protection of these critical watershed areas. These organizations, financed by local contributions, have cooperated closely with the Forest Service in promoting protection and better use of watershed areas in the national forests. A considerable acreage of land has been acquired and donated for national forest purposes and other land has been purchased and conveyed to the United States at cost.

Since enactment of the act of May 11, 1938, above referred to, Congress has appropriated funds thereunder each year, beginning with fiscal year 1940, except for the years 1943 to 1946, inclusive. Since 1947 and through the current fiscal year (1953), Congress has each year appropriated $10,000 from the receipts of the Cache National Forest for purchase of lands in accordance with the act. This money has been used to acquire lands for which public ownership was deemed necessary to accomplish the purposes of the act and which the owners were willing to sell at a reasonable price. The parts of these appropriations not used to buy essential lands were returned to the Treasury for distribution in the same way as other national forest receipts.

The counties wherein the Cache National Forest is located would ordinarily have received 25 percent of the funds so appropriated, in accordance with legislation providing for contributions to local governments on account of national forests. Hence, in addition to the work of the local nonprofit organizations described above, the local governments are in effect contributing 25 percent of the cost of land purchased.

The appropriation bill for the Department of Agriculture for fiscal year 1954, as approved by the House of Representatives and as recommended by the Appropriations Committee of the Senate, does not include an appropriation under this act.

There have been purchased or approved for purchase under this act since 1940 about 19,000 acres of land. About 11,500 acres have

been acquired since 1947, when appropriations were again made available after the war. There remains as much or more privately owned land within these watersheds in similar condition. Critical areas are a relatively small portion of the watersheds, but they have been and can again be the cause of destructive floods and a continuing source of damaging sediments in irrigation reservoirs and canals.

In 1947 the people of Weber County, Utah, organized the Weber County Watershed Protective Corp. This corporation solicits and receives contributions from municipal and private sources with which to acquire lands in Weber County for inclusion in the Cache National Forest. In some instances the lands are directly included; in other instances land exchanges are negotiated; in other cases the corporation's funds are used to encourage and assist private owners in conservation and watershed protection work. Funds are subscribed by Weber County, by water companies, and by service clubs. Each year Weber County communities put on drives for public contributions.

It simply is not right for the Federal Government to walk out on its commitment to these people. The assignment of $10,000 of Cache National Forest funds should by all means be continued during the fiscal year 1954.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, a few minutes ago the Senate decided not to increase the funds for soil conservation; in other words, not to support the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. I think it is well for the Senate to keep in mind, as it votes on the agricultural appropriation bill, particularly with reference to the items dealing with vital services, the following dispatch which has been taken off the ticker in the cloakroom. It is from the United Press, and reads:

CHICAGO.—A wild selling wave hit major grain markets today and sent wheat prices tumbling today to some of the lowest levels in 3 years.

At Minneapolis, wheat for delivery in September and December fell the full 10-cent limit for a single day's trading, and cash wheat fell as much as 16½ cents a bushel.

At Chicago, July wheat dropped 9⅝ cents a bushel, and sold for $1.89 to $1.88½ cents a bushel.

Wheat for immediate delivery, known as cash wheat, sold more than 12 cents lower on the Chicago market.

At Kansas City, the selling wave sent July wheat tumbling 9 cents a bushel.

At Chicago, other grains followed the downward trend, July and September corn hitting new lows for the season.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I should also like to call attention to another bulletin, also from Chicago. It reads:

Wheat was 2⅛ to 2¾ cents lower than the previous finish, July $1.95⅝; corn was 1½ to 1¾ cents lower, July $1.51⅝; and oats were ½ to ¾ cent lower, July 71⅛ cents. Soybeans were down ¾ to 1¼ cents, July $2.85¼, and lard was unchanged to 3 cents a hundred pounds higher, July $9.25.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair respectfully calls the Senator's attention to the fact that he will have to offer an amendment before he is entitled to hold the floor.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] may be permitted to finish his statement.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Vermont. I wish to call attention to one other dispatch, which reads:

CHICAGO (Associated Press).—Wheat futures dropped sharply today on heavy selling influenced by the fact that the new crop is being harvested in the Southwest and there is a lack of space to store it.

The dispatches indicate that the measures we are dealing with, particularly as they affect vital services to American agriculture, are of the utmost importance.

I am very happy to make note of the fact that the Senators who have lent so much of their time and energy to the work of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry are familiar with these facts, and are directing their efforts toward taking care of the situation.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. It seems to me that the farmers are about to receive a great deal of bad news in 1 day. As the Senator from Minnesota has stated, we have failed to increase the funds for the soil-conservation payments. I should like to point out that the amendment which I offered, in my own behalf and on behalf of several other Senators, including the Senator from Minnesota, would have provided for a reduction of $25 million in the amount available to the farmers this year. I shall await with interest the explanation to be made to the farmers by the Farm Bureau Federation leaders, who have told Congress that they would be able to pay for the soil conservation practices, at the same time the farmers get the news that the cash market for wheat has dropped 16 cents in 1 day. I wonder whether they will receive the news very enthusiastically.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. I wish to make the RECORD perfectly clear that the amendment I was referring to, the so-called Russell amendment, even if it had been adopted, as the Senator has pointed out, would have left the amount of money for the soil-conservation payments under the so-called ACP program below what was originally recommended. What we are able to do was merely to sustain the figure of $195 million, which is approximately $55 million below the amount recommended by the outgoing administration.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, was that the amount recommended by the present administration?

Mr. RUSSELL. The present administration made a much smaller recommendation. I believe the amount was about $140 million.

Mr. MAYBANK. I thank the Senator. I wanted to have that statement in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be offered, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I call up my amendment, which is lying on the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 38, line 17, after the word "program", it is proposed to insert the following: "*Provided*, That the additional amounts for the rural electrification program may be distributed in any State or Territory, in addition to the sums which such State may otherwise receive, except that not more than 20 percent of such additional amounts may be distributed to any one State."

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I make the point of order that the amendment is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I move that the rule be suspended. I have been authorized to make the motion by the Committee on Appropriations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is in order. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota will state it.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, what happened to the point of order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed by the Parliamentarian that notice has been given. Therefore the motion to suspend the rule is in order.

The Chair would remind the Senator from North Dakota that he may speak 15 minutes on the motion if he desires to do so.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, the amendment is offered in accordance with the request of the Department of Agriculture, contained in the justifications sent to the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations.

In substance, I should like to say that, of the amount appropriated for REA under the present law, 50 percent is set aside, based on the needs of the individual States; and the other 50 percent is divided among the several States, provided that not more than 10 percent may be used in any one State.

The amendment would change the 10-percent provision to 20 percent. It is believed by REA that such a provision is needed. Of course, all the projects would, as heretofore, still have to be approved by the REA.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] pointed to the drastic break in the grain markets of today. The reason the markets are in such a demoralized condition is because of the $3 billion worth of commodities which have been accumulated under the Truman administration, for which there is no market or use.

So far as the vote on the Russell amendment is concerned, I point out that the Russell amendment, which was rejected by the Senate, proposed to furnish more fertilizer, so farmers could improve their soil and thereby grow more wheat, to be put in storage, and to force the market down even further.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I cannot let that erroneous statement pass

without challenging it. If the Senator from Delaware knew anything about the conservation program, he would know that it is impossible to purchase 1 pound of fertilizer to increase the production of wheat.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator may be technically correct. On the other hand, the amendment furnishes lime and other fertilizers for the purpose of building up farms in order that they may produce more crops. If farms produce more crops, it means that more wheat and other crops will be grown. That is the argument used for the additional appropriations. It was a long-range program of making greater the productive capacity of the farms. I think the Senator from Georgia will agree that the huge surpluses that have been accumulated during the last few years are today, in effect, acting as a drag on the market.

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course, but that has nothing to do with the Senator's statement that the funds are to go to buy fertilizer for the increased production of wheat. The Senator from Delaware cannot point to a single case of that sort.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The money is to go to improve the productivity of the farms, in order that more cotton, wheat, corn, or other crops may be grown and that statement cannot be denied. Otherwise, what is the lime and fertilizer for?

Mr. RUSSELL. But the Senator from Delaware made the categorical statement that the money went to purchase fertilizer, so that more wheat would be produced. I challenge that statement, because it is not correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS. No; I say the purpose of the amendment is to improve the productivity of the farms, so that more wheat, more corn, and more other crops, which are in great surplus supply today, will be produced.

Mr. RUSSELL. The farms are more productive than they have been; but the surpluses are due to the failure of the administration to apply the controls that are authorized by law to be applied, in the case of the crops to be marketed from each farm.

If the Senator from Delaware wishes to pursue a policy of depleting the soil, so that it cannot produce, that is another matter. But he should not hide such a purpose behind a statement that the funds are used for the purchase of fertilizer, so that more wheat will be produced, because that is not correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS. These funds are used to increase the productive capacity of the farms.

I agree with the Senator from Georgia that a large part of the trouble today is due to the failure of the past administration to put into effect the acreage controls which automatically follow a rigid 90-percent support program.

Mr. RUSSELL. I agree, and that is the only correct statement the Senator from Delaware made in connection with this matter.

The other point the Senator from Delaware urges is, in effect, a crop-reduction program to be based upon depleting the soil of the Nation. I am not in favor of a program which would deplete the soil of the Nation, with the result that adequate production would be impossible.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is not true. I believe that the statement of the Senator from Georgia was answered very well by both the president of the American Farm Bureau Federation and by the legislative representative of the National Grange, when both of them pointed out very emphatically that they did not believe the funds requested by the committee amendment were needed to carry on a sound program to preserve the farms.

The continued accumulation of billions of dollars worth of agricultural commodities under the high support program can only lead to ultimate disaster. I have repeatedly warned that this would happen under the shortsighted policy of the past administration. The leaders of our great farm organizations likewise have recognized this danger and for that reason have opposed the 90-percent fixed support. After today's vote I shall incorporate in the RECORD a letter from the Director of the Budget showing the direct cost of this program.

Of course, the cost to the consumer and the long-range damage to our farmers is incalculable.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Delaware has correctly stated that the heads of the American Farm Bureau Federation urged, as they have for 3 or 4 or 5 years, that the appropriation be reduced. We have now heard from the leadership of the American Farm Bureau Federation, and the Senate has voted to follow the views of that leadership. This matter will now be appealed to the membership of the American Farm Bureau Federation, and we shall await their decision at the polls in 1954.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Of course, we had a decision in 1952, in which they repudiated the past administration.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes, but they did not repudiate the past administration on this program. In 1947 we had a clear-cut issue on this program, when there was in power in Congress the party that is in power today. That party cut the heart out of this farm program. In my judgment, that had more to do with the results of the 1948 election than did any other single item.

Having heard from the leaders of the American Farm Bureau Federation and having followed their views, as I have said, Senators now can tell the membership of that federation that the views of its leadership have been followed on this issue; and then we shall see how such Senators fare in the elections in the agricultural States.

Of course, our friends from the highly industrialized areas had no difficulty regarding this matter, for the population of their States is industrial, and very little farming is done in those areas.

However, sometimes I think that from the standpoint of the overall welfare of the party, it is a little wise to give some consideration to the effect such a policy will have on the members of the party who happen to live in agricultural areas.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Many Members of Congress from the South and the Midwest often think the East is not an agricultural area. However, with all due respect to the Senator from Georgia, and to agriculture in Georgia, I point out that the county in which I live ranks fifth in the United States, and outranks any other county east of the Mississippi and south of the Mason-Dixon Line in production. They have reached this goal without any Government subsidy. In fact, the high-support program penalizes them.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, if the Senator from Delaware will yield to me——

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. THYE. Let me inquire in what respect Delaware ranks fifth.

Mr. WILLIAMS. In the output of farm commodities in dollar volume—a goal reached without Government supports.

Mr. THYE. I would agree with the Senator from Delaware, in respect to the production of broilers; but those who engage in that production must go to the great Grain Belt of the Midwest to get the grain they need. Price supports affect most definitely the grain-producing areas, and thus are of vital importance to those who produce broilers, because the decision on the whole question of price supports determines whether those who produce broilers will be able to obtain at bargain prices the feed they have to obtain from the breadbasket of the Nation.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I commend the Senator from Minnesota for the statement he has made and for his attitude on farm problems. He views them on a nationwide basis.

I point out to him that, no doubt, as a result of the news which has just been received, the producers of broilers will be singing paeans of praise over the news that the wheat market in Minneapolis has broken 16⅔ cents a bushel. No doubt that is good news for those who produce broilers, but it is not good news for the farmers who produce wheat.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from North Dakota to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI.

The affirmative votes of two-thirds of the Members present are required, if the motion is to be agreed to.

Senators who are favoring the motion will please rise and be counted.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present. The question is on the motion of the Senator from North Dakota to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I merely submit that it seems to me this is clearly legislation on an appropriation bill. It has been so ruled by the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has so ruled.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Under the rules, the distinguished Senator who is acting as chairman of the subcommittee is, of course, privileged to move to suspend the rules. But it seems to me that when a basic change is being made in legislation it should be referred to the proper legislative committee; and unless the situation is of such overwhelming urgency that it cannot be taken care of except in some other way, it seems to me that that is the more orderly way to proceed. I have generally in the 8 years I have been in the Senate supported the rural electrification program. I think it is a good program. I think it entirely possible that if this proposal were referred to the proper legislative committee, and reported favorably, I would support it. But I question very much the advisability of trying to write it into the appropriation bill at this time. For that reason I shall not support the motion to include in the bill the language proposed by the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I should like to explain the amendment a bit further. This has no particular application to my own State. I doubt whether we need it at all. It is being asked for by many who are interested in REA and by the Department of Agriculture. Let me read a part of the justification presented to the Senate Appropriations Committee:

In some States, under the allotment formula, the maximum amount that can be loaned is likely to be less than the amount required to meet loan needs. In recent years contingent loan authorizations, subject to the same limitations as the basic authorization, were provided in the necessary amount to increase the limitations in States where urgently needed for increasing capacity of lines and facilities. Since the additional amounts were subject to the allotment formula, it has been necessary for the Congress to provide additional borrowing authorization in excess of the amounts required for actual lending. In order to avoid this situation in 1954, it is proposed that the contingency funds be made available directly as needed in the various States, except that not more than 20 percent of such additional amounts may be loaned, in any one State. On this basis, a contingent authorization of $60 million, in addition to the basic authorization of $95 million is required to meet loan needs for fiscal year 1954.

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

Mr. YOUNG. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. I should like to ask the Senator from North Dakota a question. One reason for the change in the language is that some of the older associations have found their lines to be inadequate to carry the load now placed on them, and they would like to borrow additional money to reconstruct the lines in order that the lines may be adequate for that purpose. Is not that the reason?

Mr. YOUNG. That is correct; and there is more need in the older States than in my own State.

Mr. THYE. There are some associations in Minnesota whose members, at the time they constructed their units, thought they had ample capacity to meet all future load requirements. They now find the loads stepped up by from 15 to 100 percent, and, as to some of the lines, by more than 100 percent. The units are not so constructed that they can carry the load, and it will be necessary to reconstruct, as well, the transforming stations.

They are therefore faced with a serious situation as to whether they can borrow sufficient money to enable them to reconstruct their lines so that they can carry the present-day load.

I think it is a good amendment, though, like the Senator from California, I think it is legislation on an appropriation bill. But in this particular case, because I doubt whether we would have sufficient time to enact the necessary legislation, I believe we would be warranted in waiving the question, so as to permit the language to be written into the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from North Dakota to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI. On this question a two-thirds vote is necessary in order that the motion may be agreed to. The Chair requests a division.

The Senate divided.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion having failed to receive two-thirds of the votes of Members of the Senate present and voting, the motion is not agreed to.

Mr. HUMPHREY subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have placed in the RECORD at the point where loan funds and administrative funds for REA were considered a statement which I have prepared in connection with that subject.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUMPHREY IN SUPPORT OF ADEQUATE LOAN FUNDS AND ADMINISTRATIVE FUNDS FOR REA

Few Government programs have proven of sounder value to the entire Nation than that of the Rural Electrification Administration.

The amazing progress in electrifying rural America over a comparatively short span of years has not only contributed greatly to better rural living, it has also helped revolutionize farm production and opened vast new markets for American industry.

I'm afraid there is some misunderstanding, however, as a result of the pride we take in the fact that electricity is now available to about 90 percent of our farms, compared to around 9 percent when REA was created.

Just because we have made such great progress doesn't by any means indicate the job is finished. Much remains to be done. We not only must complete the area coverage so electricity is available to all farmers, we must make sure our existing electric cooperatives can keep up with the increasing demands for power. That means we must have adequate financing for "heavying up" existing REA co-op lines wherever necessary, to make sure they can accommodate the heavier loads required by the increasing use of electricity in our farm production.

The REA program is an excellent example of the Government helping farm people to help themselves. Contrary to what some people think, the Government doesn't own or control these rural electric cooperatives, they belong to the farmers themselves. All the Government has done has been to make the necessary credit available, so the people could band together and provide themselves with electric service.

REA itself operates no rural electric or telephone facilities, and the program involves no grants or subsidies. REA serves principally as a banker. Its main functions are to lend money, and to give technical advice and counsel where needed in the construction and operation of the borrowers' facilities.

PAYING OWN WAY

REA borrowers repay the loans with interest, from their operating revenues. The record of REA borrowers justifies full confidence of the Congress in this program. They are repaying their loans, and interest, ahead of schedule.

I'm proud of Minnesota's record in this regard. All of Minnesota's REA co-ops are paying their own way. As of last year, they had paid about $22½ million in principal and interest on their REA loans, including nearly $3 million paid on principal ahead of schedule.

The entire program has been a good investment, on the Government's part.

If we cut off the source of credit for the co-ops, however, we are not only preventing improvements in service but also endangering the investment we already have in these electric systems.

REA now has a backlog of some $140 million in unfilled loan applications. There has been good evidence that our Nation's electric cooperatives will seek additional loans of some $200 million during the next 18 months, bringing a total estimated credit need up to $340 million.

The Administration's budget estimates only called for $95 million in loan funds. It should appear obvious that if such a drastic slash in available credit was made, many existing cooperatives will have to be deprived of necessary credit and further expansion and improvement of rural electrical service will be seriously crippled.

About one-third of the new loan requests are contemplated to "heavy up" existing lines, to enable them to carry the increased loans required to meet the demands of farmers for increasing amounts of electric power, reflecting the greater use of electrical equipment in performing farm production and farm household tasks. What's going to happen when the demand exceeds what existing facilities can provide, if credit is shut off for increasing the capacity of present lines?

SOUND INVESTMENT

The House of Representatives wisely recognized that Secretary Benson's recommendation was unsound. They have provided for loan authorization amounting to $135 million, the amount originally requested in the Truman budget.

In my opinion, it would be good business to go even further and make available an amount closer to the estimated needs for REA loans during the coming fiscal year, as indicated by the rural electric co-ops themselves. This isn't any giveaway—it is a sound business investment. Cutting loan funds isn't economy, for nothing is saved. Whatever amount the Congress provides will be repaid with interest. I urge this committee to make sure adequate loan funds are available so as to avoid any crippling of REA services, but in any event not to go below the amount the House has determined is the bare minimum.

In regard to administrative funds for REA, the House has provided only $7,775,000—the amount Secretary Benson estimated he could get by with. I appreciate the economy-objective of Members of the other House, and it is understandable that they should tell the Secretary of Agriculture to go ahead and try getting along with less as long as he thinks he can.

I must warn, however, that others have had more experience through the years with the REA program than the new Secretary of Agriculture. They are deeply concerned that such a reduction in administrative expenses would necessarily mean a curtailment of services to the rural electric cooperatives, and lack of adequate safeguards over the big investment we now have in REA loans. I must point out that more is involved than just administration of the new loan funds provided; continued servicing and supervision over all the existing loans is also involved in this budget item. I respect the judgment of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association that REA needs $10 million to adequately administer the program without cutbacks in essential operations. I urge this committee to reexamine the administrative fund estimates and increase them to a safe level.

EXPAND TELEPHONE PROGRAM

I am also seriously concerned with the new rural telephone program upon which we are just making a start. The Administration has only asked for $50 million, and that is all the House has provided.

That should at least be doubled, if we are going to go ahead with extending rural telephone service in this country. Farmers need telephones, need them even more than people living closer together in the cities. They need such facilities for handling their business, and for protecting the lives of their loved ones. We aren't going to get telephone service extended over rural America by little dribs and dabs. We aren't going to get the job done unless we are willing to make adequate loan funds available so that rural people don't have to be turned down. REA has reported that 483 telephone loan applications totaling $95,626,661 were pending as of March 27, 1953. It appears obvious that REA needs at least $100 million in loan authorization for the telephone program, just to catch up with the requests now on hand. It will need more to do the full job in the year ahead.

I want to warn this committee what postponing rural telephone service will mean in some areas. It won't just mean a delay in getting telephones—it may mean some farmers won't ever get such service. If the rural telephone program of REA is "put on the shelf" until private telephone companies have skimmed the cream of the rural areas by starting service only to the most thickly populated districts—the most profitable ones to serve—it will become economically unfeasible in the future to work out sound projects for the sparsely settled remote districts.

Telephone loan funds are available to private companies just as they are to telephone cooperatives, as long as they offer a sound plan of extending rural service. Let's not delay this sound program any longer. Again, it is not a matter of economy for all loans are repayable with interest.

Lip service to the objectives of rural electrification and rural telephone programs will not mean very much if the programs are squeezed out of existence via appropriations. Both political parties have gone on record in support of REA's contribution to rural progress, and pledged continuing support. I urge this committee to see that adequate funds are made available to continue the great work that has already been accomplished.

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

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

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

The bill was read the third time.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I desire to invite the attention of the Senate to an item or two in the bill, to which I shall not offer an amendment, but which I think deserve further consideration by the Appropriations Committee. I refer particularly to the item for agricultural research.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would ask the Senator from Mississippi whether he proposes an amendment at this point.

Mr. STENNIS. No, Mr. President, it was not my purpose to offer an amendment at this time. I understood that the bill had been read the third time, and I was speaking to the bill itself.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Texas yield time to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the Senator from Mississippi such time as he may desire.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from Texas. I beg the Chair's pardon. I did not know the time had to be yielded.

Mr. President, the current appropriation for agricultural research in the fiscal year 1953, is $56,482,000. The amount in the revised budget submitted after President Eisenhower came into office was $58,879,000. The House appropriated $57,604,000, and the amount carried in the bill as reported to the Senate is $59,004,000, an increase of $1,400,000 over the House appropriation. It is, however, less than the amount recommended in the budget which was submitted to the Congress during the first part of the year.

I do not have a detailed breakdown of the agricultural research program, but I think one is urgently needed and that we should have it at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. President, I have testimony here from Dr. Shaw, who is ill today and has been for some days. The testimony to which I refer was taken before the House committee. He sets forth the need for funds. He is the head of the Agricultural Research Organization, and he is of the opinion that the funds for the agricultural research program should be doubled, and that there should be an immediate fund of from $10 million to $15 million in addition to the appropriation proposed.

I have before me a breakdown according to the general subject matter, which appears on page 259 of the House hearings, from which I shall read a few items:

THE PLACES IN RESEARCH WHERE INCREASED ACTIVITY MAY BE NEEDED MORE THAN ELSEWHERE

It is difficult to single out particular areas of research that are more in need of strengthening than others. We make a concerted effort to maintain a balanced program within whatever funds are available to us. Actually most agricultural research will have to be strengthened if the Nation's needs for agricultural products and services are to be satisfied in the years ahead. In my opinion, the increases in the fiscal year 1954 budget for research provide for expanding the No. 1 priority items. In developing the budget within the funds allowed, I selected these items on the basis of their urgency. If additional areas of research could be expanded I would place emphasis on the following items:

1. Diseases and insects affecting both plants and animals. Wheat smut in the Northwest and vesicular exanthema disease of hogs are examples of the problems.

2. Plant, animal, and human nutrition. Basic physiological studies of nutrient uses and requirements are needed.

3. Soils and irrigation. Water will set the ceiling on crop yields. We need to develop methods of soil and watershed management to increase the efficiency of water use in both humid and arid regions.

4. Farm mechanization. Labor-saving devices for farm operations are of critical importance to farmers.

5. Food and feed preservation. We can bring greater stability to agriculture if we can develop methods of converting perishables into acceptable products that may be stored.

6. New and improved uses of agricultural products. Agricultural markets are getting away from us because we are not developing and improving our products as fast as competitive products are being developed and improved.

7. Marketing. Additional studies are needed to cope with current problems arising as the result of declining foreign markets, accumulating or impending surpluses, and falling prices for agricultural products.

8. Survey of soil and forest resources. An accurate knowledge of our resources is required for efficient management.

Mr. President, I wish to refer to the report of the Advisory Committee which operates under the Agricultural Research Act. In the report there are submitted programs which will require an additional $31 million. The committee was established under the Agricultural Research Act of 1946. I have a report on the figures recommended for research in 1954 by the State experiment stations and research bureaus, which total $7,512,000.

These facts, Mr. President, are indicative of the carefully surveyed needs which are now urgent and demanding and with reference to which a high authority, an expert research scientist has given his opinion and his conclusions.

It is a matter in which President Eisenhower is vitally interested. He mentioned the subject several times in his campaign speeches, and has emphasized and reemphasized it. As late as last week, at Beltsville, Md., where there is located one of the major experiment stations, he was qouted in the press as saying:

Let any man who is opposed to agricultural research appropriations come out to Beltsville.

I commend him for his statements. I do not bring the question up for any other reason than to point to the need and to the fact that we have not responded according to the need and according to the general recommendations of the President of the United States.

Mr. President, if there were available this afternoon a breakdown which I thought would be sufficient to place before the Senate, with definite explanations of how the money is to be spent, I would offer an amendment providing

for at least $6 million or $8 million of additional funds to carry on the program. I believe such a proposal would have the approval of the subcommittee, and I am confident if the figures were broken down adequately, that it would receive the approval of the Senate.

I wish to serve notice, Mr. President, that as soon as such a breakdown is available, I intend to offer a program, along with any other Senator who will join me, the first time there is a reasonable opportunity after the committees have had an opportunity to go over the matter and make a recommendation to this body.

I especially invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that the funds are inadequate. The amount we are spending for agricultural research at this time has not been increased since 1940.

The program is really going backward, as a general proposition, because of its inability to move forward with the funds which have been appropriated. So, Mr. President, at the first opportunity the program will be presented, and I hope the very fine subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, of which the Senator from North Dakota is so ably serving as chairman, will go into the subject further and will join in bringing the matter to the attention of the Senate, even through a supplemental appropriation bill, if that can be done. But let us get the research program going before it lags any further.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. The members of the committee feel exactly as does the Senator from Mississippi. The committee has received more than 100 telegrams from farm organizations and others urging that we raise the agricultural research appropriation approximately $17 million more than has been appropriated.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator very much. I think a breakdown will be submitted shortly.

RURAL TELEPHONE SERVICE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield to the junior Senator from Texas 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The junior Senator from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may address a few questions to the distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] concerning the Rural Electrification Administration appropriation.

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

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, with respect to the appropriation for the rural telephone program, of course, we know the act prescribes the terms under which the administrator can approve applications for telephone service. I note that in the House report it is stated that it is the consensus of the committee that REA should advance Federal funds for telephone service in rural areas when private enterprise cannot or will not provide adequate service.

That has given considerable concern to some of my constituents who have written me, feeling that the language in the House report might be interpreted to mean that the Administrator is being directed to withhold his approval of a telephone loan until he determines that there is no private enterprise willing or able to provide such service.

I am glad to say that the Senator's committee has not used such language in its report; but is it the intention of the Senate committee that the REA Administrator shall comply with any such interpretation as that which I have suggested?

Mr. YOUNG. I would say to the distinguished Senator from Texas that the language in the Senate committee's report was designed to counteract and clarify certain language contained in the House report. I think the majority of the members of the committee feel it may be necessary in certain instances for the REA Administrator to contact private concerns in the telephone business, as well as mutuals and independents. In cases where such concerns have filed plans for serving a particular area they should be given consideration by the Administrator. By that it is not meant that the program of bringing telephones to the farmers of the United States should be unduly delayed by unreasonably prolonged negotiations. Existing companies have had nearly 3 years after the necessary legislation was enacted in which to provide service. In fact, they had many years even before the Telephone Act was passed to provide such service.

It seems to me that the REA Administrator should proceed to make loans to cooperatives who seek to provide service if the existing companies do not wish to do so.

Mr. DANIEL. There is just such an instance in Texas. The Hill County Telephone Co., Inc., located at Fredericksburg, serving nine counties, and several of the small exchanges in cities such as Ingram and Comfort, Tex., have given options to sell their exchanges. They are willing to sell to cooperatives. They have had 3 years in which to apply for loans themselves. As I understand, it is the interpretation of the Senator's committee that they have no such preference rights as would require the Administrator to say that they would have to apply for a loan before permitting the application to go through and be approved.

Mr. YOUNG. I think that is correct. I wish to read from the report of the Senate Committee on Appropriations:

> The committee is advised that approximately 60 percent of the farms of the country remain without telephone service of any kind and that a large proportion of those presently served suffer from inadequate service. The committee urges REA to move as fast as consistent with good business methods with its loan and construction program in order to eliminate delays which have occurred in the past.

Mr. DANIEL. I call attention also to the last sentence in the last paragraph of that part of the committee's report which refers to rural telephones, which would seem to mean that the committee does not believe the Administrator should give such preference rights to local companies which have not exercised their right to apply for loans for rural telephone service. That sentence, on page 14, is as follows:

> It is recognized that in many instances the program cannot move forward except by the farmers in a community doing the job for themselves by forming their own organization and, where necessary, acquiring the existing exchange in their local trade centers as the nucleus for economic and efficient service.

From that statement in the report, it would appear to me that the Senator's committee clearly recognized that in some instances it would be necessary for farmers in sparsely settled areas to acquire certain local exchanges within the area, in order to have a feasible program. Is not that correct?

Mr. YOUNG. That is exactly correct. In most areas, I believe that REA cooperatives could operate to the best advantage by working with existing companies, particularly with respect to switchers and telephone exchanges. But if existing companies were permitted or encouraged to furnish only partial service to a limited number of farmers, then the remaining farmers in the area, in most cases, would not have an opportunity to receive good telephone service without overall cooperative coverage.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair respectfully reminds the Senator from Texas that his time has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, does my colleague desire additional time?

Mr. DANIEL. May I have 2 minutes?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield 2 minutes to the junior Senator from Texas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The junior Senator from Texas is recognized for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. DANIEL. Then, sofar as the view of the Senator's committee is concerned, is there any reason for further delay on applications when the Administrator has already determined that there is an area in which local exchanges have granted options, and are willing to sell, in order that a rural telephone cooperative may be set up? Is there any reason for further delay in order to ascertain whether private exchanges desire to apply for loans themselves?

Mr. YOUNG. I should not think there was any reason for further delay. If the existing companies wanted to furnish the service, certainly by now they would have filed their plans with the REA administrator. In the absence of such plans, I think the administrator should proceed to approve applications.

Mr. DANIEL. As I understand, there is a movement on foot to have the REA administrator require members of telephone cooperatives to pay as much as $100 each as equity payments on the purchase of stock in a cooperative, before he will approve a loan. Has that matter come before the Senator's committee? Only $50 payments have been required in the instance I mentioned a moment ago. I wondered if there was any discussion before the Senator's committee of the plan to increase payments.

Mr. YOUNG. There was no discussion of that kind, so far as I can recall.

Mr. DANIEL. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The bill (H. R. 5227) was passed.

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

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. YOUNG, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. HAYDEN, and Mr. MCCARRAN conferees on the part of the Senate.

OVERALL RESULTS OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION OPERATIONS SINCE 1933

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, on January 12, 1953, I requested from the Director of the Budget the file of information as to the overall results of the Commodity Credit Corporation operations since its inception in 1933. At this point I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a letter received from the Director of the Budget under date of March 3, 1953, outlining the total expenditures under that program, and the losses.

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

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D. C., March 3, 1953.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: This is in further reply to your letter dated January 12, 1953, requesting information regarding losses of the Commodity Credit Corporation and the manner in which the Corporation receives its funds.

The Commodity Credit Corporation is capitalized for $100 million in capital stock owned by the United States and as of December 31, 1952, there was a deficit of $179,959,760.89. A brief statement of the losses and appropriations, note cancellations, and repayments to the Treasury follows:

Net operating loss exclusive of wartime consumer subsidy	$1,128,999,783.32
Wartime consumer subsidy	2,102,119,071.46
Total operating losses	3,231,118,845.78
Less:	
Net restoration of capital from U. S. Treasury	2,494,919,661.78
Recovery from Secretary of Treasury, Public Laws 389 and 393, 80th Congress	56,239,432.11
Reserve for postwar price support and of agriculture	500,000,000.00
Total recoveries	3,051,159,093.89
Net deficit Dec. 31, 1952	179,959,760.89

The net operating loss of $1,128,999,783, excluding the wartime consumer subsidy, reflects a net realized program loss of $737,319,500, a net amount of $158,813,865 in reserves for losses, and a net amount of $232,866,418 for administrative expenses, interest, etc.

The following item-by-item reply to your specific questions will show the manner in which the corporation has been reimbursed by the United States Treasury for such losses, as well as other funds which have been paid to the corporation pursuant to specific legislation:

1. The paid in capitalization of the corporation is $100 million held by the United States.

2. As of December 31, 1952, the corporation's books showed a deficit of $179,959,760.89.

3. Appropriations have been made to the corporation as follows:

(a) For restoration of capital impairment pursuant to the act of March 8, 1938:

Appraisal of—	Appropriation act	Amount
Mar. 31, 1938	June 25, 1938 (52 Stat. 1114, 1148).	$94,285,404.73
Mar. 31, 1939	Aug. 9, 1939 (53 Stat. 1301, 1325).	119,599,918.05
Mar. 31, 1941	July 3, 1941 (55 Stat. 451, 563).	1,637,445.51
Mar. 31, 1943-44	Apr. 12, 1945 (59 Stat. 77, 90).	256,764,881.04
June 30, 1951	July 5, 1952 (66 Stat. 335, 354).	109,391,154.00
Total appropriations for restoration of capital impairment.		581,678,803.33

(b) Pursuant to the act of February 18, 1946 (Public Law 301, 79th Cong.), $500 million was paid to the Corporation as a reserve for postwar price support of agriculture. Price-support losses during fiscal years 1947, 1948, and 1949 were charged against this reserve, thereby reducing the amounts required for restoration of capital impairment during those years.

4. Payments of surplus were made to the United States Treasury pursuant to the act of March 8, 1938, as follows:

Appraisal of—	Date of payment	Amount
Mar. 31, 1940	June 1940	$43,756,731.01
Mar. 31, 1942	June and September 1952.	27,815,513.68
June 30, 1947	April 1948	17,693,492.14
June 30, 1948	June 1949	48,943,010.36
Total payments of surplus to U. S. Treasury.		138,208,747.19

5. Notes of the Corporation have been canceled by the United States Treasury as follows:

(a) For restoration of capital impairment pursuant to the act of March 8, 1938:

Appraisal of—	Appropriation act	Amount
June 30, 1945	July 20, 1946 (60 Stat. 586, 593).	$921,456,561.00
June 30, 1946	May 26, 1947 (61 Stat. 106).	641,832,080.64
June 30, 1949	Sept. 6, 1950 (64 Stat. 595, 677).	66,698,457.00
June 30, 1950	Aug. 31, 1951 (65 Stat. 225, 245).	421,462,507.00
Total notes canceled by U. S. Treasury for restoration of capital impairment.		2,051,449,605.64

(b) Pursuant to Public Laws 389 and 393, 80th Cong., the Secretary of the Treasury was authorized to cancel notes of the Corporation in an amount not to exceed $57,500,000 for costs of commodities furnished by the Corporation for foreign relief and assistance. During fiscal years 1948 and 1949, a total of $56,239,432.11 of the Corporation's notes were cancelled by the United States Treasury, thereby reducing the amounts required for restoration of capital impairment during those years.

Summary of recoveries of losses through June 30, 1951

Appropriations:		
Capital impairment	$581,678,803.33	
Reserve for postwar price support	500,000,000.00	
Total appropriations		1,081,678,803.33
Deduct: Payments to Treasury		138,208,747.19
Note cancellations:		
Capital impairment	$2,051,449,605.64	
Foreign aid	56,239,432.11	
Total note cancellations		2,107,689,037.75
Total recoveries of losses from U. S. Treasury through June 30, 1951		3,051,159,093.89

6. Section 32 funds are made available to the Department for the removal from the market of commodities in surplus supply. These funds do not accrue to the Corporation except to the extent that they are in payment for commodities purchased by section 32 from the Corporation. These purchases by section 32 are reflected as sales by the Corporation, and the funds go into the general funds of the Corporation together with funds derived from sales to all other private or governmental entities. The amount of sales to section 32 cannot be readily summarized as all sales to domestic purchasers are reported to Washington as a consolidated item. This information is obtainable from the field offices and can be secured if necessary, but this would involve a considerable expenditure of time and money.

7. Other funds which have accrued to the Corporation are as follows:

(a) Pursuant to the International Wheat Agreement Act of 1949, the United States has agreed to supply wheat or wheat products to participating nations at a specified price. The Corporation is utilized for this activity and is authorized to use its general borrowing authority to pay current obligations and to be repaid therefor from appropriations made specifically to cover the costs of the agreement. Following is a list of reimbursements to the Corporation and manner of reimbursement:

Program year	Appropriation act	Amount
1950	Public Law 135, 82d Cong., Aug. 31, 1951 (appropriation to the Secretary).	$78,808,000
1951	Public Law 451, 82d Cong., July 5, 1952 (note cancellation).	182,162,250
	Total reimbursements for International Wheat Agreement.	258,970,250

(b) Pursuant to Public Law 271, 80th Congress, approved July 30, 1947, and subsequent Department of Agriculture appropriation acts, funds of the Corporation have been transferred to the appropriation "Eradication of foot-and-mouth and other contagious diseases of animals and poultry." Following is a list of the reimbursements made to the Corporation and the manner of reimbursement:

Appropriation act:	*Amendment*
Public Law 785, 81st Cong., June 25, 1948 (appropriation to the Secretary)	$25,400,000
Public Law 343, 81st Cong., Oct. 10, 1949 (appropriation to the Secretary)	34,000,000
Public Law 135, 82d Cong., Aug. 31, 1951 (note cancellation)	32,700,000
Public Law 451, 82d Cong., July 5, 1952 (note cancellation)	11,240,532
Total reimbursements for transfers to eradication of foot-and-mouth disease	103,340,532

The reimbursements shown under this item are not included in the realized losses of the Corporation, as the intent of the respective legislation was that the Corporation would be reimbursed for any unrecovered costs under these activities.

(c) Section 391 (c) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, required the Corporation to lend to the Secretary of Agriculture during each fiscal year, such sums, not to exceed $50 million, to make advances for the purchase of conservation materials from January 1 to June 30 of each year. Repayment to the Corporation is usually made during the succeeding fiscal year from funds appropriated to the Secretary for the conservation program. These loans and repayments are handled on the books of the Corporation through its usual loan accounts.

In addition to the foregoing, the Corporation has authority to borrow up to $6,750,000,000 from the Treasury and/or from private lending agencies. At December 31, 1952, $2,800,778,475 of this borrowing authority was committed, leaving $3,949,221,525 yet available.

The figures contained in this reply to your letter have been furnished by the Department of Agriculture.

Sincerely yours,

JOS. M. DODGE,
Director.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, immediately following that, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a second letter, dated March 16, 1953, from the Director of the Budget, in which he outlines the expenditures for these programs under section 32. I ask unanimous consent that both these letters appear in the RECORD immediately following the vote on the agricultural appropriation bill. These letters show an overall cost of more than $5 billion.

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

EXECUTIVE OFFICE
OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D. C., March 16, 1953.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: This has reference to your letter of March 5, 1953, regarding the funds available for section 32 programs and the expenditures of such funds. The answers to your questions are as follows:

1. How much money has been made available to the Department of Agriculture during the past 20 years (broken down by years) under section 32?

The surplus removal program, commonly known as section 32, was not authorized until August 24, 1935. For the fiscal years 1936 through 1953, however, a total of $2,573,671,819 has been made available by (1) the permanent appropriation of an amount equal to 30 percent of customs receipts, and (2) various supplemental appropriations. In years prior to 1948, various portions of the annual appropriations remained unobligated at the end of the fiscal year for which they were originally available, and several of these unobligated balances, amounting to $117,617,178, have been reappropriated.

An analysis of sources of funds, obligations, and disposition of balances for fiscal years 1936–54 is attached as schedule I.

2. How much of these funds has been spent by the Department of Agriculture either through the Commodity Credit Corporation or by direct purchases during this same interval?

For the fiscal years 1936 through 1952, a total of $2,057,618,939 was obligated, and total expenditures would be approximately the same amount. Of this total, $610,693,914 represents purchases of surplus commodities for direct distribution, $104,627,120 for diversion of surplus commodities to new uses, $260,131,250 for encouraging exports of surplus commodities, $285,972,494 for the financing of various stamp plans, $136,694,622 for the school-lunch and milk programs, $57,224,648 for administrative expenses, $41,239,560 for allotments and transfers to cooperating agencies, and $561,035,331 for transfers to other uses authorized by legislative action. In addition to the foregoing, obligations for the fiscal year 1953 through January 31, 1953, have amounted to $44,437,655, and expenditures for the same period were $46,265,965.

An analysis showing obligations by projects, allotments, and transfers, unobligated balances, and total funds available for fiscal years 1936–54 is attached as schedule II.

In regard to your question concerning assurance that section 32 funds are being spent in accordance with the law, before any section 32 programs are authorized, the proposal is thoroughly considered by the Department, the legality of the program is reviewed by the Office of the Solicitor, and a formal docket is prepared to authorize the program. Funds are then obligated under the standard obligation procedures, and the vouchers which authorize the actual expenditures of funds are, of course, audited by the General Accounting Office.

I regret that the information furnished in response to your previous letter did not meet your needs.

Sincerely yours,

JOS. M. DODGE, *Director.*

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

TRANSFER OF PRICE-SUPPORT WHEAT TO PAKISTAN

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 2112, calendar No. 407, which is the Pakistan wheat bill. It is not intended to proceed with the bill tonight, but to make it the unfinished business for consideration tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from California.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2112) to provide for the transfer of price-support wheat to Pakistan, which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with amendments.

ORDER FOR RECESS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business this afternoon, it recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

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

REDUCTION OF INDIVIDUAL INCOME TAXES

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland obtained the floor.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. MALONE. Two of the top campaign issues last year were a return to constitutional government and a reduction of taxes.

Today I am introducing a bill to provide for individual income-tax reduction for the calendar year 1953 by moving back 6 months the termination date of the individual income-tax increases imposed under the Revenue Act of 1951. The individual emergency-income tax would then expire on June 30, 1953, on the same date the excess-profits tax is scheduled to expire.

On April 2, 1953, I introduced a bill to repeal all war-emergency excise taxes on transportation, telephone and telegraph, and entertainment, and the excise tax on luggage, handbags, and miscellaneous articles.

The Revenue Act of 1951 provided an emergency increase in individual income-liability of about 11 percent of the then existing tax. Under present law, this increase will terminate on December 31, 1953. The bill which I am about to introduce moves the termination date back to June 30, 1953. One-half of the reduction under the present law for 1954 is made effective for the entire calendar year 1953.

The bill would reduce the withholding tax rate from from 20 percent to 18 percent as of July 1, 1953. Thus for those subject to withholding, the full reduction schedule for January 1, 1954, would become effective July 1, 1953.

Because of spiraling inflation and excessive taxation and free trade, the principle of free enterprise, upon which this country is built, is being destroyed. The high cost of living and excessive tax burdens are inflicting great hardships on many people. Individuals in the lower income groups carry the greatest share of the tax burden, and they are the ones who need immediate relief. It is only fair and just that individual citizens be given a tax reduction on June 30, 1953, to coincide with the scheduled termination of the excess profits tax on the same date. The excess profits tax will expire on June 30, 1953. I am opposed to the extension of this so-called emergency tax for the same reason that I am for the simultaneous repeal of the emergency excise and individual income taxes.

So long as we are planning to give more than $5 billion to foreign countries which have themselves reduced income taxes, I certainly believe that the American people should be given some consideration in this matter and should have relief from the excessive taxes which they now pay.

No one objects to paying high taxes when they are necessary for the welfare and defense of our country but when billions of the taxpayers' money are sent to foreign nations to build up their production potential in competition with the American taxpayers, then it is only fair the people of our country be given some tax relief.

The individual income tax at present rates is stifling initiative and preventing business expansion. Even in the lowest individual income-tax bracket, almost one-fourth of any additional earnings must be paid to the Government in the form of taxes and the increases continue until in the highest brackets, 92 cents of every dollar must be turned over to the Treasury. In the case of corporations, existing Federal income taxes may take as much as 82 percent of additional

dollars earned. This discouragement of individual and business incentive will lessen the normal increases in productivity and the willingness to take business risks. If continued, this policy of excessive taxes would result in lower income, lower revenues and eventually lower standards of living.

It is well known that individuals and business organizations are unable, under the present arrangement of taxes, to build up a reserve to tide them over anticipated poor business periods, or to aid in the proper expansion of business.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a bill which I introduced on April 2, 1953, to repeal certain emergency excise taxes.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1566) to terminate the war rates of certain excise taxes, to repeal certain excise taxes, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MALONE on April 2, 1953, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) effective with respect to the period after June 30, 1953, the following sections and subchapters of the Internal Revenue Code are hereby repealed:

(1) section 1650 (war tax rates of certain miscellaneous taxes);

(2) section 1651 (retailers' excise tax on luggage, etc.);

(3) section 3406 (a) (10) (manufacturers' excise tax on electric light bulbs and tubes);

(4) subchapter B of chapter 30 (taxes on telegraph, telephone, radio, and cable facilities); and

(5) subchapter C of chapter 30 (taxes on transportation of persons).

(b) The "rate reduction date" defined in section 1659 of the Internal Revenue Code shall be July 1, 1953.

SEC. 2. (a) Section 2400 of the Internal Revenue Code (tax on jewelry, etc.) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "The tax imposed by this section shall not apply to articles sold at retail for less than $50."

(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) of this section shall apply only to articles sold on or after July 1, 1953.

SEC. 3. (a) Section 3406 (a) (4) of the Internal Revenue Code (manufacturers' excise tax on photographic apparatus) is hereby amended by striking out "20 percent" and inserting in lieu thereof "10 percent."

(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) of this section shall apply only to articles sold on or after July 1, 1953.

SEC. 4. Effective with respect to amounts paid after June 30, 1953, for the use of any safe-deposit box, chapter 12 of the Internal Revenue Code (tax on safe-deposit boxes) is hereby repealed.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to reduce the individual income tax. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD, as part of my remarks.

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

The bill (S. 2140) to reduce the individual income tax, introduced by Mr. MALONE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Individual Income Tax Reduction Act of 1953."

SEC. 2. Reduction in individual surtax rates.

(a) Rates of surtax for individual not head of household.—

(1) Paragraph (1) of section 12 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to rates of surtax for individual not heads of households) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(1) Calendar year 1953: In the case of a taxable year beginning on January 1, 1953, and ending on December 31, 1953, there shall be levied, collected, and paid for such taxable year upon the surtax net income of every individual (other than a head of a household to whom subsection (c) applies) the surtax shown in the following table:

"If the surtax net income is:	The surtax shall be:
Not over $2,000	18.1% of the surtax net income.
Over $2,000 but not over $4,000.	$362, plus 20.3% of excess over $2,000.
Over $4,000 but not over $6,000.	$768, plus 25% of excess over $4,000.
Over $6,000 but not over $8,000.	$1,268, plus 29% of excess over $6,000.
Over $8,000 but not over $10,000.	$1,848, plus 33% of excess over $8,000.
Over $10,000 but not over $12,000.	$2,508, plus 37% of excess over $10,000.
Over $12,000 but not over $14,000.	$3,248, plus 42% of excess over $12,000.
Over $14,000 but not over $16,000.	$4,088, plus 47% of excess over $14,000.
Over $16,000 but not over $18,000.	$5,028, plus 50% of excess over $16,000.
Over $18,000 but not over $20,000.	$6,028, plus 53% of excess over $18,000.
Over $20,000 but not over $22,000.	$7,088, plus 56% of excess over $20,000.
Over $22,000 but not over $26,000.	$8,208, plus 60% of excess over $22,000.
Over $26,000 but not over $32,000.	$10,608, plus 61% of excess over $26,000.
Over $32,000 but not over $38,000.	$14,268, plus 64% of excess over $32,000.
Over $38,000 but not over $44,000.	$18,108, plus 67% of excess over $38,000.
Over $44,000 but not over $50,000.	$22,128, plus 71% of excess over $44,000.
Over $50,000 but not over $60,000.	$26,388, plus 73% of excess over $50,000.
Over $60,000 but not over $70,000.	$33,688, plus 76% of excess over $60,000.
Over $70,000 but not over $80,000.	$41,288, plus 79% of excess over $70,000.
Over $80,000 but not over $90,000.	$49,188, plus 81.5% of excess over $80,000.
Over $90,000 but not over $100,000.	$57,338, plus 84.5% of excess over $90,000.
Over $100,000 but not over $150,000.	$65,788, plus 86.5% of excess over $100,000.
Over $150,000 but not over $200,000.	$109,038, plus 87.5% of excess over $150,000.
Over $200,000	$152,788, plus 88.5% of excess over $200,000."

(2) Paragraph (2) of such section 12 (b) is hereby amended (A) by striking out the heading and inserting in lieu thereof "Other taxable years beginning before July 1, 1953.—", and (B) by striking out "January 1, 1954" and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1953 (other than the calendar year 1953 to which paragraph (1) applies)".

(3) Paragraph (3) of such section 12 (b) is hereby amended by striking out "DECEMBER 31, 1953" and "December 31, 1953" and inserting in lieu thereof, respectively, "JUNE 30, 1953" and "June 30, 1953".

(b) Rates of surtax for head of household.—

(1) Section 12 (c) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to rates of surtax for heads of households) is hereby amended by renumbering paragraphs (1), (2), (3), (4), and (5) thereof as paragraphs (2), (3), (4), (5), and (6), respectively, and inserting before paragraph (2) (as so renumbered) the following:

"(1) Calendar year 1953: In the case of a taxable year beginning on January 1, 1953, and ending on December 31, 1953, there shall be levied, collected, and paid for such taxable year upon the surtax net income of every individual who is the head of a household the surtax shown in the following table:

"If the surtax net income is:	The surtax shall be:
Not over $2,000	18.1% of the surtax net income.
Over $2,000 but not over $4,000.	$362 plus 19.2% of excess over $2,000.
Over $4,000 but not over $6,000.	$746 plus 23% of excess over $4,000.
Over $6,000 but not over $8,000.	$1,206 plus 24% of excess over $6,000.
Over $8,000 but not over $10,000.	$1,686 plus 29% of excess over $8,000.
Over $10,000 but not over $12,000.	$2,266 plus 31% of excess over $10,000.
Over $12,000 but not over $14,000.	$2,886 plus 35% of excess over $12,000.
Over $14,000 but not over $16,000.	$3,586 plus 39% of excess over $14,000.
Over $16,000 but not over $18,000.	$4,366 plus 41% of excess over $16,000.
Over $18,000 but not over $20,000.	$5,186 plus 43% of excess over $18,000.
Over $20,000 but not over $22,000.	$6,046 plus 46% of excess over $20,000.
Over $22,000 but not over $24,000.	$6,966 plus 49% of excess over $22,000.
Over $24,000 but not over $28,000.	$7,946 plus 51% of excess over $24,000.
Over $28,000 but not over $32,000.	$9,986 plus 54% of excess over $28,000.
Over $32,000 but not over $38,000.	$12,146 plus 58% of excess over $32,000.
Over $38,000 but not over $44,000.	$15,626 plus 61% of excess over $38,000.
Over $44,000 but not over $50,000.	$19,286 plus 65% of excess over $44,000.
Over $50,000 but not over $60,000.	$23,186 plus 67% of excess over $50,000.
Over $60,000 but not over $70,000.	$29,886 plus 69% of excess over $60,000.
Over $70,000 but not over $80,000.	$36,786 plus 73% of excess over $70,000.
Over $80,000 but not over $90,000.	$44,086 plus 74% of excess over $80,000.
Over $90,000 but not over $100,000.	$51,486 plus 77.5% of excess over $90,000.
Over $100,000 but not over $150,000.	$59,236 plus 81% of excess over $100,000.
Over $150,000 but not over $200,000.	$99,736 plus 84.5% of excess over $150,000.
Over $200,000 but not over $300,000.	$141,986 plus 87.5% of excess over $200,000.
Over $300,000	$229,486 plus 88.5% of excess over $300,000."

(2) Paragraph (2) (as renumbered) of such section 12 (c) is hereby amended (A) by striking out the heading and inserting in lieu thereof "Other taxable years beginning before July 1, 1953.—", and (B) by striking out "January 1, 1954" and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1953 (other than the calendar year 1953 to which paragraph (1) applies)."

(3) Paragraph (3) (as renumbered) of such section 12 (c) is hereby amended by striking out "DECEMBER 31, 1953" and "December 31, 1953" and inserting in lieu thereof, respectively, "JUNE 30, 1953" and "June 30, 1953."

(c) Limitation on tax.—

(1) Paragraph (1) of section 12 (f) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to limitation on tax of individuals) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(1) Calendar year 1953: In the case of a taxable year beginning on January 1, 1953, and ending on December 31, 1953, the combined normal tax and surtax shall in no event exceed 87.5 percent of the net income for the taxable year."

(2) Paragraph (2) of such section 12 (f) is hereby amended (A) by striking out the heading and inserting in lieu thereof "Other taxable years beginning before July 1, 1953.—", and (B) by striking out "January 1, 1954" and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1953 (other than the calendar year 1953 to which paragraph (1) applies)."

(3) Paragraph (3) of such section 12 (f) is hereby amended by striking out "DECEMBER 31, 1953" and "December 31, 1953" and inserting in lieu thereof, respectively, "JUNE 30, 1953" and "June 30, 1953."

(d) Proration for fiscal year taxpayers: Subsection (j) of section 108 of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to fiscal year taxpayers) is hereby amended—

(1) by striking out so much thereof as precedes paragraph (1) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(j) Certain taxable years of individuals beginning before July 1, 1953: In the case of a taxable year of a taxpayer, other than a corporation, beginning before July 1, 1953, and ending after June 30, 1953 (other than one beginning on January 1, 1953, and ending on December 31, 1953), the tax imposed by sections 11 and 12, section 400, or section 421 (a) (2), shall be an amount equal to the sum of—";

(2) by striking out "January 1, 1953" and "January 1, 1954" in paragraph (1) and inserting in lieu thereof, respectively, "July 1, 1952" and "July 1, 1953"; and

(3) by striking out "January 1, 1954" and "December 31, 1953" in paragraph (2) and inserting in lieu thereof, respectively, "July 1, 1953" and "June 30, 1953."

(e) Effective date: Except as provided in section 5, the amendments made by this section shall apply only with respect to taxable years ending after June 30, 1953.

SEC. 3. Individuals with adjusted gross income of less than $5,000.

(a) Tax for calendar year 1953: Section 400 of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to optional tax on individuals with adjusted gross income of less than $5,000) is hereby amended by striking out table I and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"TABLE I.—*Taxable year beginning Jan. 1, 1953, and ending Dec. 31, 1953*

If adjusted gross income is—		And the number of exemptions is—				If adjusted gross income is—		And the number of exemptions is—											
								1		2			3						
At least	But less than	1	2	3	4 or more	At least	But less than	And taxpayer is single or married filing separately	And taxpayer is head of household	And taxpayer is single or married filing separately	And taxpayer is head of household	And a joint return is filed	And taxpayer is single or married filing separately	And taxpayer is head of household	And a joint return is filed	4	5	6	7	8 or more
		The tax shall be—						The tax shall be—											
$0	$675	$0	$0	$0	$0	$2,325	$2,350	$317	$317	$191	$191	$191	$64	$64	$64	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
675	700	4	0	0	0	2,350	2,375	322	322	195	195	195	69	69	69	0	0	0	0	0
700	725	9	0	0	0	2,375	2,400	327	327	200	200	200	74	74	74	0	0	0	0	0
725	750	13	0	0	0	2,400	2,425	332	332	205	205	205	78	78	78	0	0	0	0	0
750	775	18	0	0	0	2,425	2,450	336	336	210	210	210	83	83	83	0	0	0	0	0
775	800	23	0	0	0	2,450	2,475	341	341	214	214	214	88	88	88	0	0	0	0	0
800	825	28	0	0	0	2,475	2,500	345	345	219	219	219	93	93	93	0	0	0	0	0
825	850	32	0	0	0	2,500	2,525	350	350	224	224	224	97	97	97	0	0	0	0	0
850	875	37	0	0	0	2,525	2,550	355	355	228	228	228	102	102	102	0	0	0	0	0
875	900	42	0	0	0	2,550	2,575	360	360	233	233	233	107	107	107	0	0	0	0	0
900	925	47	0	0	0	2,575	2,600	365	365	238	238	238	112	112	112	0	0	0	0	0
925	950	51	0	0	0	2,600	2,625	370	370	243	243	243	116	116	116	0	0	0	0	0
950	975	56	0	0	0	2,625	2,650	374	374	248	248	248	121	121	121	0	0	0	0	0
975	1,000	61	0	0	0	2,650	2,675	379	379	252	252	252	126	126	126	0	0	0	0	0
1,000	1,025	66	0	0	0	2,675	2,700	384	384	257	257	257	131	131	131	4	0	0	0	0
1,025	1,050	70	0	0	0	2,700	2,725	389	389	262	262	262	135	135	135	9	0	0	0	0
1,050	1,075	75	0	0	0	2,725	2,750	393	393	267	267	267	140	140	140	13	0	0	0	0
1,075	1,100	80	0	0	0	2,750	2,775	398	398	271	271	271	145	145	145	18	0	0	0	0
1,100	1,125	85	0	0	0	2,775	2,800	403	403	276	276	276	150	150	150	23	0	0	0	0
1,125	1,150	89	0	0	0	2,800	2,825	407	407	281	281	281	154	154	154	28	0	0	0	0
1,150	1,175	94	0	0	0	2,825	2,850	412	412	286	286	286	159	159	159	32	0	0	0	0
1,175	1,200	99	0	0	0	2,850	2,875	417	417	290	290	290	164	164	164	37	0	0	0	0
1,200	1,225	104	0	0	0	2,875	2,900	422	422	295	295	295	169	169	169	42	0	0	0	0
1,225	1,250	108	0	0	0	2,900	2,925	427	427	300	300	300	173	173	173	47	0	0	0	0
1,250	1,275	113	0	0	0	2,925	2,950	432	432	305	305	305	178	178	178	51	0	0	0	0
1,275	1,300	118	0	0	0	2,950	2,975	437	437	309	309	309	182	182	182	56	0	0	0	0
1,300	1,325	123	0	0	0	2,975	3,000	443	442	314	314	314	188	188	188	61	0	0	0	0
1,325	1,350	127	1	0	0	3,000	3,050	451	449	321	321	321	195	195	195	68	0	0	0	0
1,350	1,375	132	6	0	0	3,050	3,100	461	459	331	331	331	204	204	204	78	0	0	0	0
1,375	1,400	137	10	0	0	3,100	3,150	472	469	340	340	340	214	214	214	87	0	0	0	0
1,400	1,425	142	15	0	0	3,150	3,200	482	479	350	350	350	223	223	223	97	0	0	0	0
1,425	1,450	146	20	0	0	3,200	3,250	492	489	359	359	359	233	233	233	106	0	0	0	0
1,450	1,475	151	25	0	0	3,250	3,300	503	499	369	369	369	242	242	242	116	0	0	0	0
1,475	1,500	156	29	0	0	3,300	3,350	513	509	378	378	378	252	252	252	125	0	0	0	0
1,500	1,525	161	34	0	0	3,350	3,400	524	519	388	388	388	261	261	261	135	8	0	0	0
1,525	1,550	165	39	0	0	3,400	3,450	534	529	397	397	397	271	271	271	144	17	0	0	0
1,550	1,575	170	44	0	0	3,450	3,500	545	539	407	407	407	280	280	280	154	27	0	0	0
1,575	1,600	175	48	0	0	3,500	3,550	555	549	416	416	416	290	290	290	163	36	0	0	0
1,600	1,625	180	53	0	0	3,550	3,600	566	559	426	426	426	299	299	299	172	46	0	0	0
1,625	1,650	184	58	0	0	3,600	3,650	576	569	437	436	435	309	309	309	182	55	0	0	0
1,650	1,675	189	63	0	0	3,650	3,700	587	579	447	446	445	318	318	318	191	65	0	0	0
1,675	1,700	194	67	0	0	3,700	3,750	597	589	458	456	454	328	328	328	201	74	0	0	0
1,700	1,725	199	72	0	0	3,750	3,800	608	599	468	466	464	337	337	337	210	84	0	0	0
1,725	1,750	203	77	0	0	3,800	3,850	618	609	479	476	473	347	347	347	220	93	0	0	0
1,750	1,775	208	81	0	0	3,850	3,900	629	619	489	486	483	357	357	357	229	103	0	0	0
1,775	1,800	213	86	0	0	3,900	3,950	639	629	499	496	492	366	366	366	239	112	0	0	0
1,800	1,825	218	91	0	0	3,950	4,000	650	639	510	506	502	375	375	375	248	122	0	0	0
1,825	1,850	222	96	0	0	4,000	4,050	660	649	520	516	511	385	385	385	258	131	5	0	0
1,850	1,875	227	100	0	0	4,050	4,100	671	659	531	526	521	394	394	394	267	141	14	0	0
1,875	1,900	232	105	0	0	4,100	4,150	681	669	541	536	530	404	404	404	277	150	24	0	0
1,900	1,925	237	110	0	0	4,150	4,200	692	679	552	546	540	413	413	413	286	160	33	0	0
1,925	1,950	241	115	0	0	4,200	4,250	702	689	562	556	549	423	423	423	296	169	43	0	0
1,950	1,975	246	119	0	0	4,250	4,300	713	699	573	566	559	433	433	432	305	179	52	0	0
1,975	2,000	251	124	0	0	4,300	4,350	723	709	583	576	568	444	443	442	315	188	62	0	0
2,000	2,025	256	129	2	0	4,350	4,400	734	719	594	586	578	454	453	451	324	198	71	0	0
2,025	2,050	260	134	7	0	4,400	4,450	744	729	604	596	587	465	463	461	334	207	81	0	0
2,050	2,075	265	138	12	0	4,450	4,500	755	739	615	606	597	475	473	470	343	217	90	0	0
2,075	2,100	270	143	17	0	4,500	4,550	765	749	625	616	606	485	482	479	353	226	100	0	0
2,100	2,125	275	148	21	0	4,550	4,600	776	759	636	626	616	496	492	489	362	236	109	0	0
2,125	2,150	279	153	26	0	4,600	4,650	786	769	646	636	625	506	502	498	372	245	119	0	0
2,150	2,175	284	157	31	0	4,650	4,700	797	779	657	646	635	517	512	508	381	255	128	2	0
2,175	2,200	289	162	35	0	4,700	4,750	807	789	667	656	644	527	522	517	391	264	138	11	0
2,200	2,225	294	167	40	0	4,750	4,800	818	799	678	666	654	538	532	526	400	274	147	21	0
2,225	2,250	298	171	45	0	4,800	4,850	828	809	688	676	663	548	542	536	410	283	157	30	0
2,250	2,275	303	176	50	0	4,850	4,900	838	819	699	686	673	559	552	546	419	293	166	40	0
2,275	2,300	308	181	55	0	4,900	4,950	849	829	709	696	682	569	562	555	429	302	176	49	0
2,300	2,325	313	186	59	0	4,950	5,000	859	839	720	706	692	570	572	565	438	312	185	59	0"

(b) Technical amendments.—

(1) The heading of table II in such section 400 is hereby amended to read as follows:

"Table II

"Taxable Years Beginning After October 31, 1951, and Before July 1, 1953 (Other Than the Calendar Year 1953 to Which Table I Applies)"

(2) The heading of table III in such section 400 is hereby amended to read as follows:

"Table III

"Taxable Years Beginning After June 30, 1953"

(c) Effective date: Except as provided in section 5, the amendments made by this section shall apply only with respect to taxable years ending after June 30, 1953.

SEC. 4. Collection of income tax at source.

Section 1622 of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to income tax collected at source) is hereby amended—

(1) by striking out "January 1, 1954" wherever it occurs in subsection (a) and subsection (c) (1) (A) and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1953"; and

(2) by striking out "December 31, 1953" wherever it occurs in subsection (c) (1) (B) and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1953."

SEC. 5. Computation of tax in case of certain joint returns.

If a joint return of a husband and wife is filed under the provisions of section 51 (b) (3) of the Internal Revenue Code in a case where the husband and wife have different taxable years because of the death of either spouse, and the taxable year of the surviving spouse covered by such joint return began before July 1, 1953, and ended after June 30, 1953, the amendments made by this act shall apply in respect of such joint return as if the taxable years of both spouses covered by the joint return ended on the date of the closing of the surviving spouse's taxable year.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I am opposed to the continuation of the war-emergency taxes. I am not only opposed to the extension of the war-emergency so-called excess-profits tax, but I also favor, as provided in the proposed legislation which I have just introduced, setting back the expiration date of the emergency individual income taxes to coincide with the expiration date of the excess-profits tax.

J. DON ALEXANDER—VETO MESSAGE (S. DOC. NO. 51)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HENDRICKSON in the chair) laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying bill referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed:

To the United States Senate:

I return herewith, without my approval, the enrolled bill (S. 484) conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of Colorado to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of J. Don Alexander against the United States.

The bill confers jurisdiction on the United States District Court for the District of Colorado to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claim of J. Don Alexander, of Colorado Springs, Colo., against the United States for recovery of income tax paid by him for the year 1929, which covered the capital net gain for the sale of 9,000 shares of stock in the Alexander Industries, Inc., which stock was later held by the United States circuit court of appeals to be the property of Alexander Industries, Inc., and not of J. Don Alexander (69 F. 2d 610 (1934)). Section 2 of the bill provides that such suit may be instituted within 1 year after date of enactment of the act; that proceedings for the determination of the claim and review thereof and payment of any judgment thereon, shall be as in other cases under title 28, United States Code, section 1346 (a) (1); that nothing contained in the act shall be construed as an inference of liability on the part of the United States.

The Congress, in changing this bill from its original form to that of a jurisdictional bill, apparently believed that its action would provide a greater degree of protection to the interests of the United States. A review of the facts and of the decision of the circuit court of appeals convinces me that this action of the Congress has had quite the opposite effect from what was intended.

The opinion of the court in the case of *Alexander* v. *Theleman* referred to in the bill discusses in some detail (1) the relationship of Mr. Alexander to the corporation, in which he owned a considerable portion of stock, and (2) the question of the ownership of the 9,000 shares, the sale of which Mr. Alexander had assumed, in paying his income tax in 1930, gave rise to a capital net gain to him. Although the opinion raises some doubt whether equitable considerations are presented so as to justify a refund of the principal amount of the tax payment of $16,720.41, the bill, in conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of Colorado, provides for the payment of any judgment recovered in accordance with the provisions of law applicable to tax cases of which the court has jurisdiction. Accordingly, the bill might permit Mr. Alexander to recover, not only the amount paid by him, but also interest at the rate of 6 percent per annum for the period from 1930 to date of payment. Thus, in effect, Mr. Alexander might recover over $23,000 in interest alone.

The requirement that the United States pay interest on a refund is entirely proper where the Government has retained a taxpayer's money, notwithstanding the fact that by means of a timely refund claim the officials of the Treasury were put on notice and had an opportunity to examine the merits of the claim. Such circumstances do not exist in this case. No reason appears why the Government should pay in interest a sum far in excess of the original amount claimed by Mr. Alexander.

If the Congress should decide again to review Mr. Alexander's original claim and should resolve the equities in this case in favor of the claimant, I would be willing to give the case further consideration.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 15, 1953.*

CRITICAL SITUATION OF LEAD AND ZINC MINERS

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

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I shall be very happy to yield to the Senator from Utah, but I must catch a train. I will not yield for a 15-minute speech. How much time will the Senator require?

Mr. WATKINS. I do not think I shall require more than 3 minutes.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I am glad to yield.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, most of the lead and zinc mines in the State of Utah and elsewhere in the United States are now virtually shut down. During the past year 22 of Utah's 30 lead and zinc mines have ceased operations. By March 30, 1953, approximately 1,600 people in my State had lost their jobs as a consequence of the curtailment of lead and zinc mining operations.

The falling off of lead and zinc mining operations in the State of Utah and elsewhere in the United States is largely due to ruinous competition in the American market by lead and zinc producers from foreign producing areas.

Legislation has been proposed which would impose a sliding scale stabilization tax on importations of lead and zinc. I strongly favor this move. Obviously some form of protective action is necessary in order to restore the lead and zinc mining industry to a competitive status with foreign imports. It might be of some help to use the escape clause in our present tariff legislation. Up to the present time the executive department of the United States has failed to use the escape clauses in the reciprocal trade treaties to protect the American industries which are endangered.

I recently received petitions from various mining communities in the State of Utah bearing the signatures of several thousand citizens in stricken lead and zinc mining areas. On May 25, some of these communities observed "Preserve Your Community Day" for the purpose of organizing themselves and bringing to greater public attention the critical situation with which they are faced. They have appealed to the Congress of the United States for help, and in my view the Congress must take some immediate action to help relieve this desperate situation.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD immediately following my remarks the communications which I have received from the mayors of Eureka, Utah; Park City, Utah; Heber City, Utah; and Lark, Utah. I ask unanimous consent also that there be inserted in the body of the RECORD after my remarks a letter from the Tooele Mill and Smeltermen's Union, Local No. 55, of Tooele, Utah, together with a statement which appeared in various weekly newspapers throughout Utah during the week of June 1, 1953.

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

LARK, UTAH, *June 11, 1953.*

Senator ARTHUR V. WATKINS,
Washington, D. C.:

The community of Lark, Utah, depends entirely upon the lead-zinc mining industry. Three hundred and seventy-two signatures from the community of Lark ask you to support H. R. 5496 to help preserve the lead-zinc

mining industry. Copy of petition with list of signatures will follow.

J. A. COFFEY,
Chairman, Lions Club Committee.

EUREKA CITY CORP.,
Eureka, Utah, June 1, 1953.

Hon. ARTHUR V. WATKINS,
Senator From Utah,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WATKINS: Our Tintic mining district, one of the oldest and most productive districts of the West, has felt the full impact of the recent decrease in the price of lead and zinc. Mining activity has been reduced and we face the prospect of a complete shutdown of our major producers, which would mean a complete demoralization of our town which is entirely dependent on the continuing operation of the mines which support it.

As mayor of Eureka City, Utah, I proclaimed May 25, 1953, as "Preserve Our Community Day" and called upon all our citizens to join in petitioning you to give full support to the sliding scale stabilization lead-zinc import tax provisions of H. R. 4294.

This petition, signed by only a few of the many vitally affected, is transmitted to you with the plea that you do all in your power to help this American community to preserve its way of life and its essential role as a contributor of vital materials needed in time of national peril.

Respectfully submitted.

MAYNARD CRONIN.

PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORP.,
Park City, Utah, May 27, 1953.

The Honorable ARTHUR V. WATKINS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: You will be interested to know that May 25, 1953, was proclaimed as Preserve Your Community Day in Park City, Summit County, Utah. On this day all citizens were urged to sign a petition which supported the principle of House Resolution 4294 with respect to protections of the domestic lead and zinc industry through a sliding scale stabilization tax.

This noteworthy project was endorsed by the Park City Council and practically all civic organizations and citizens. The B. P. O. E. Lodge 734, Park City Kiwanis Club, Park City Lions Club, V. F. W. Post 3391, American Legion Frank E. Petersen Post 14, and Local Union 4264 Steelworkers of America were all active in obtaining signatures.

The feelings of the citizenry of Park City can be attested to by the fact that practically every adult in our city was happy to place his or her signature to this petition.

Sincerely yours,

EARLE W. RESEIGH,
Mayor.

HEBER CITY MUNICIPAL GOVERNMENT,
Heber City, Utah, May 27, 1953.

The Honorable ARTHUR V. WATKINS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: You will be interested to know that May 25, 1953, was proclaimed as Preserve Your Community Day in Heber City, Wasatch County, Utah. On this day all citizens were urged to sign a petition which supported the principle of House Resolution 4294 with respect to protections of the domestic lead and zinc industry through a sliding scale stabilization tax.

This noteworthy project was endorsed by the Heber City Council and practically all civic organizations and citizens. The Wasatch County Chamber of Commerce, Heber City Lions Club, V. F. W. Local 8885, American Legion Lockhart Post 23, Heber Valley Riding Club, and Local Union 4264 Steelworkers of America were all active in obtaining signatures.

The feelings of the citizenry of Heber can be attested to by the fact that practically every adult in our city was happy to place his or her signature to this petition.

Sincerely yours,

R. N. JIACOLETTI, *Mayor.*

UTAH HARD HIT BY FOREIGN BLOWS AT LEAD-ZINC PRICES

Utah's lead-zinc industry has been crippled by foreign governments and producers of strategic metals dumping their low priced products on the American market.

According to Paul H. Hunt, who recently testified in Phoenix for the Utah Mining Association before the House Committee on Small Business, of 30 Utah lead-zinc operators in 1952, only 8 are still active, 6 on a curtailed basis. By March 30, 1953, approximately 1,600 men had lost their jobs.

Mr. Hunt quoted S. H. Williston, chairman of the Strategic Minerals Committee, American Mining Congress, who summarized the situation by saying, "When we want and urgently need metals from abroad, we do not get them and when we do not need them, they come into the American market to depress prices and close down domestic plants."

Foreign metal dumping in the past 10 months forced the price of lead down from 19½ to 12 cents a pound, and zinc from 19½ to 11 cents. Mr. Hunt pointed out that most American mines cannot operate successfully at these prices.

DOMESTIC SHORTAGE

In tracing recent fluctuation of the lead-zinc market, Mr. Hunt recalled that in 1951 Government ceiling prices on zinc rose from 17½ to 19½ cents, while foreign producers were getting 31¼ cents on the western European market. This made it impossible to obtain zinc for American requirements and when use of zinc was curtailed, men in manufacturing industries lost their jobs.

In 1952, Mr. Hunt said, European demand for zinc fell off and the United States became a dumping ground. Prices dropped to 11 cents while imports in July rose to 60,000 tons. The year's total was 565,162 tons, an increase of 150 percent over 1951.

"Despite a smaller spread between foreign and domestic lead prices, the lead picture closely paralleled zinc. When supply caught up with demand, foreign sources unloaded and imports jumped from 257,900 tons in 1951 to 615,481 in 1952," Mr. Hunt said.

"Hope for the future of the industry in Utah and the entire country lies in H. R. 4294," Mr. Hunt said. He pointed out that this bill, recently introduced in Congress, through provisions that provide for a sliding scale of import taxes on lead and zinc, can strengthen and stabilize the industry to a point that will permit reopening of currently shutdown mines.

RESOLUTION OF TOOELE MILL AND SMELTERMEN'S UNION, LOCAL NO. 55, TOOELE, UTAH

Whereas we, the membership of Local 55, International Union of Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers, representing 350 employees of the International Smelting & Refining Co. at Tooele, Utah, who have just returned to work May 1, 1953, from a 4-month shutdown of concentrator and smelter caused from custom ore shortages resulting from existing low lead and zinc metal prices, feel very insecure as to future employment under existing metal price conditions; and

Whereas such interruption of employment as recently experienced causes serious economic loss to each of us and to this community as a whole: Be it

Resolved by the membership of this local union, That we as a group ask that assistance be given the lead-zinc industry in the manner proposed in H. R. 5496, sponsored by Representative RICHARD SIMPSON, now being considered by the House Ways and Means Committee under the chairmanship of Representative DANIEL A. REED.

HY JORDAN, *President.*
J. ROSS ROWBERRY,
Secretary.

THE GREAT SOCIALIST REVOLUTION

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, some weeks ago I delivered a speech in the Senate on the problem of policy-influencing personnel in Government, in which it was my purpose to emphasize the following premise:

While the majority of Federal employees are not only loyal and reliable but void of any desire or intent to bring about the great Socialist revolution * * * there does exist a significant minority of Federal employees who during the past two administrations have striven purposely and resolutely to effectuate such a transformation. Because of the strategic positions the members of this minority occupy and because of their skill and experience, gained by many years of practice, in subverting Federal authority to their own ends, it can be fairly said that as long as they constitute a force in the Government no legislation, no matter how wisely drafted to further Republican programs, can be expected to maintain its character or to attain its goals.

This minority is to be found, chiefly, in those departments and agencies of the Government whose actions and policies affect, directly or indirectly, the economic and social institutions of the Nation. The members of this group include, in particular, professional employees, such as lawyers, economists, information specialists, writers, personnel experts, public-relations people, and political- and social-science analysts. What percentage of professional or policy-influencing employees in the Government are members of the forces of that great Socialist revolution * * * it is impossible to say. But experience and observation suggest that the percentage is sufficiently large to warrant the immediate and thoughtful attention of the new Republican administration.

Some members of [these] Socialist forces * * * still hold top positions in the Government as presidential appointees, and since they may be expected to be replaced as a result of the change in administration, they are not a primary concern. Most of them, however, occupy positions below the top and out of the public eye, ranging from confidential assistants, division heads, and section chiefs to minor and obscure subordinates. These should be of utmost concern to the new Republican administration. It is upon them, unless replaced or neutralized, that the Republican appointees, who are necessarily less expert and experienced in Government, will have to depend to a great extent for information, advice, and assistance in the performance of the innumerable duties of their offices. Government today is a system of wheels within wheels, wherein the small and obscure wheels grind out in great part the vast bulk of the decisions and policies for which the major and known wheels are ultimately responsible. Hence, if the policies and decisions of the new Republican administration are not to be frustrated, it will be necessary to remove from the Government whom ever among the small and obscure wheels may duly and fairly be shown to be Socialists in ideology and purpose, and replace them with personnel who are free of any anticapitalist, procollectivist bias.

Mr. President, having thus attempted to accentuate the seriousness of the personnel problem which confronts the new Republican administration, I should now

like to discuss the manner in which such Government employees, whom I choose to describe as crypto-Socialists or collectivists, are continuing to influence policy under the new administration, are continuing to spread New Deal propaganda, and are consolidating and further entrenching themselves to work toward a return of the New Deal to power.

As an illustration, the Department of Labor, employing more than 6,000 persons, warrants immediate attention. The top echelon of the Department, in addition to the Secretary and Under Secretary, consists of four Assistant Secretaries, a number of assistants to the Secretary, numerous bureau chiefs, assistant bureau chiefs, confidential advisers, special assistants, information specialists, and the like. I need not point out that under the previous administration special care was exercised to insure that these positions were occupied by only the most militant and ideologically correct New Deal collectivists. It would be extremely difficult to find anywhere a group more thoroughly loyal to the New Deal or more completely devoted to the supposition that business and businessmen are bad and must necessarily be controlled and regimented by the Government, that private enterprise is selfish and corrupt, and that public ownership is essentially good and should increasingly supplant privately owned industries and institutions.

It is most disheartening to find that in spite of the emphatic repudiation of these ideas in the election of last November there has been virtually no change in the situation at the Department of Labor. The same individuals remain in the same jobs and carry on the same campaigns against the American free-enterprise system. The New Deal bureau chiefs, the New Deal special assistants, the New Deal information specialists and the New Deal lawyers and economists have been unaffected by the change of administration.

Just to give an example of the continual antiemployer propaganda which emanates from the Department of Labor, I call your attention to a speech which was made at the Maryland Federation of Labor convention a few weeks ago by a regional director of the Labor Department's Wage and Hour Division. The full significance of this speech, I feel, has been completely overlooked.

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

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I am very happy to yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, is the Senator from Maryland persuaded that none of those people can be converted to take the opposite point of view now?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I am completely so persuaded.

This official, a holdover from the previous administration, deplored the widespread violations by business enterprises of the minimum-wage, overtime-pay, and child-labor features of the wage-and-hour law. He charged that more than 50 percent of businesses inspected by the Wage and Hour Division are found in violation of the law, and said, "If we find these conditions when business is good, what is to be expected when the business cycle turns downward." In other words, this Labor Department spokesman was implying that businessmen are greedy and unscrupulous in good times as well as bad.

The fact is that these statistics on violations are completely false and misleading and are intended to put business and employers in the worst possible light. When a Wage-Hour investigator goes into a business establishment he carriers a voluminous stack of regulations of the Wage and Hour Division, and if he finds merely a technical violation of any of these highly complicated regulations affecting only one of possibly a thousand employees of the establishment, the entire establishment is recorded as in violation of the wage-and-hour law. In this way the Department of Labor accumulates and publicizes statistics about employer violations which, to the layman or uninitiated, are seemingly impressive. However, this type of antiemployer propaganda has been developed and extensively disseminated by the Department of Labor for many years under the New Deal-Fair Deal administrations, and this deliberate practice proceeds without the slightest interruption, since the same crypto-socialist group remains in the key positions in the Department.

Another demonstration of the anomalous results of continuing these New Dealers in positions of influence in the Department of Labor comes to light in connection with Taft-Hartley Act amendments currently being considered by the Congress. Ever since the enactment of the Taft-Hartley Act in 1947, the New Deal group in the Department of Labor has been bitterly and violently opposed to this act. They have made it clear time and again that they want total repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act and restoration of the Wagner Act. In 1949 they drafted a bill to accomplish this and used every known pressure and stratagem to obtain passage through the Congress. After this effort failed, they devoted themselves to writing inflammatory anti-Taft-Hartley speeches and articles, and in this way the Department of Labor became the central lobbying agency for repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act. The man who is now the Acting Solicitor of the Department of Labor even had the effrontery to launch an attack on the Taft-Hartley law before an international body, the International Labor Organization, in Geneva, Switzerland, in 1951. It is indeed an amazing spectacle to see an official, who is sworn to support and enforce the laws of the United States, brazenly denouncing a duly enacted law of the land for all the world to see and hear.

In the election campaign of 1952, the platform of the Republican Party called for support of the Taft-Hartley Act, with some modest amendments which would not affect the basic principles of the act. We now find the same New Deal group that has been bitterly fighting for Taft-Hartley repeal is advising the new administration as to what amendments should be made to the act. The press reports indicate that the proposals which this group is advocating as an administration position would amount to virtual repeal of all features of the act except those that were carried over from the Wagner Act.

Another shocking example of the perpetuation of New Dealers in influential positions in the Department of Labor surrounds the reduction in force now taking place in the Department as a result of the reduced appropriation which has been passed by the House. In executing the reductions in force, the hard-core New Dealers, most of whom are in the upper bureaucratic levels, have remained untouched and the cuts have been made almost exclusively among the lower grade employees. As an illustration, let me direct your attention to the proposed reorganization of the Solicitor's Office in the Department of Labor—a reorganization which has evolved from a budget reduction of $414,000 or approximately 23.7 percent.

Heretofore, the Solicitor's Office, the legal arm of the Department of Labor, has functioned with a Washington staff of 111 attorneys comprising 27 supervisory personnel and 84 in the nonsupervisory categories. With the completion of the pending reorganization, the Washington office will have a total payroll of 66 attorneys. On the surface, this would seem to be an effective reorganization with a reduction in force totaling 45 people.

But, let us look a little deeper. The new staff of 66 persons will be composed of 23 in the supervisory group and 43 in the nonsupervisory group. Reflect upon that point for a moment—23 supervisors and 43 workers—1 chief for less than every 2 Indians. In other words, a reduction of approximately 15 percent in supervisors, and nearly 50 percent in working attorneys.

Officials of the Department of Labor would undoubtedly claim that a desirable and practical reorganization will thus be achieved in the interest of the objectives of the Republican platform and policies, that the sanctity of civil service status has been preserved, and that there is legal justification for the disparity in numbers of supervisory and nonsupervisory personnel. They would, I am certain, neglect to allude to the deliberate and adroit manipulation of the unlimited or indefinite categories of civil service personnel for the specific intention of retaining people who are fully sympathetic to the New Deal and the socialistic tendencies which have prevailed during the past two administrations, most successfully in the Department of Labor. Parenthetically, let me state that many of those attorneys being retained are active members of the Americans for Democratic Action and are, or have been active in the National Lawyers Guild, organizations which are noted for New Deal-Fair Deal socialistic philosophies.

However, evidence that a pattern to continue these cryptosocialists in significant policy-influencing capacities has been established, is indusputable. The present reorganization of the Solicitor's Office was drafted with the obvious pur-

pose of protecting the collectivist bureaucrats who are unalterably wedded to the following thesis, which I mentioned in my earlier speech:

In the field of labor, which next to foreign affairs is the most sensitive and fertile field for Socialist infiltration, collectivist attitudes * * * manifest themselves primarily in a prounion, antimanagement bias. This prounion bias for labor does not spring, it must be stressed, from any real concern for wage earners or for the great free American labor movement as such. Labor unions are regarded by the crypto-Socialist not as integral and wholeseome factors in the national economy nor as legitimate voluntary organizations seeking the social and economic welfare of their members within the framework of the American system of private capitalism, but rather as instruments for attaining a Socialist state.

As long as these cryptosocialists are retained in such sensitive assignments, as in the Labor Department Solicitor's office, the legislative proposals of the new Republican administration and the Congress cannot meet with favorable and unbiased consideration. What hope is there for any effective cooperation or receptive liaison from the Department, as long as conditions such as these are prolonged.

The efforts of the New Dealers in the Labor Department to perpetuate New Deal control of policy influencing positions under the Republican administration extend not only to the Department of Labor but also to the other vital labor agency of the Government, the National Labor Relations Board. Ever since the NLRB was established in 1935, the staffs of the Board and its Office of General Counsel have been encumbered with persons of extreme left-wing attitudes. Naturally enough, the decisions of the NLRB have reflected a marked antiemployer bias. More than any other agency of Government, the NLRB has been criticized for the partisan character of its rulings and decisions. In view of these facts it has been the opinion of many experts in the field of labor-management relations that a remedy for the problems arising under the Taft-Hartley Act cannot be achieved without a drastic change in the personnel responsible for administering this law.

In line with this, a number of bills have been introduced in this session of the Congress to reorganize the NLRB and its staff with the objective of creating a genuinely public-minded and impartial agency. This proposed legislation would eliminate the present office of General Counsel and would substitute therefor an Administrator and a new staff. It is my understanding that this proposal has high priority on the list of the changes in the Taft-Hartley Act which the administration is now considering. The Department of Labor has, however, adamantly opposed any changes in the organization of the Board or its office of General Counsel unless provision is made for a transfer of the present staff without any loss of status to the reorganized agency. In other words the Department of Labor wants all of the New Deal cryptosocialists of the Labor Board kept right where they are so that they can continue to preserve the partisan direction of Board decisions. What more concrete proof is required that the primary objective of the New Dealers is to protect their own.

Certainly this is a "dead giveaway." The Department of Labor, in considering desirable changes in the Taft-Hartley law, has a legitimate interest in the substantive provisions of the law, but the question of retaining the present personnel of the Board goes beyond the substance of the law and gets into the area of the ideological attitudes of the individuals concerned. The motivation for the Department's insistence upon retention of the present staff can only be a desire to maintain New Deal control of the Board. This is scarcely in harmony with the desires of the new administration to bring into government people who will carry out the philosophy of the new administration and assist in reversing the socialistic trend of government for the past 20 years.

Again, I voice a vigorous word of caution to the new administration. It is becoming increasingly more difficult to accomplish any change in Government as long as these cryptosocialists are permitted to remain in sensitive policy-determining positions. The time for positive corrective action is now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. What is the pleasure of the Senate?

RECESS

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. In accordance with the order previously entered, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 29 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, the recess being under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Tuesday, June 16, 1953, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 15 (legislative day of June 8), 1953:

OFFICE OF DEFENSE MOBILIZATION

Arthur S. Flemming, of Ohio, to be Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

Subject to qualifications provided by law, the following for permanent appointment to the grades indicated in the Coast and Geodetic Survey:

To be commissioned commander

Charles A. Schoene — Fair J. Bryant
William N. Martin — Charles W. Clark
Harold J. Seaborg

To be commissioned lieutenant commander

William E Randall

To be commissioned lieutenant

Dewey G. Rushford
Gordon D. Scott

To be commissioned lieutenant (junior grade)

Julian W. Flint — William D. Barbee
David F. Romero — Robert A. Parker
Arthur R. Benton, Jr. — Herbert R. Lippold
Eugene A. Taylor — Roger F. Lanier

To be commissioned ensign

George W. Thompson
Floyd J. Tucker, Jr.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 15 (legislative day of June 8), 1953:

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Ralph H. Demmler, of Pennsylvania, to be a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission, for the term expiring June 5, 1957.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Amos J. Peaslee, of New Jersey, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Australia.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JUNE 15, 1953

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Reverend Joseph V. Sullivan, S. T. D., assistant superintendent of Catholic schools, diocese of Kansas City, Mo., offered the following prayer:

We pray Thee, O God of might, wisdom, and justice, through whom authority is rightly administered, laws are enacted, and judgment decreed, assist with Thy holy spirit of counsel and fortitude the President of the United States, that his administration may be conducted in righteousness, and be eminently useful to Thy people over whom he presides; by encouraging due respect for virtue and religion; by a faithful execution of the laws in justice and mercy; and by restraining vice and immorality. Let the light of Thy divine wisdom direct the deliberations of Congress, and shine forth in all the proceedings and laws framed for our rule and government, so that they may tend to the preservation of peace, the promotion of national happiness, the increase of industry, sobriety, and useful knowledge; and may perpetuate to us the blessing of equal liberty. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, June 11, 1953, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill and joint resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1273. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to incorporate the American University," approved February 24, 1893, so as to clarify the relations between the board of trustees of the American University and the board of education of the Methodist Church, and for other purposes; and

S. J. Res. 6. Joint resolution to provide for a continuance of civil government for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. CARLSON and Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition

of executive papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States numbered 53–10.

TREASURY AND POST OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the Clerk of the House, which was read:

JUNE 11, 1953.

The honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: Pursuant to authority granted on June 11, 1953, the Clerk today received from the Secretary of the Senate the following message:

That the Senate had passed without amendment H. R. 5174, entitled "An act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes."

Very truly yours,
LYLE O. SNADER,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

RESIGNATION OF NORRIS POULSON

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation of a Member:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., June 11, 1953.

Hon. JOSEPH MARTIN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I herewith inform you that I have this day transmitted to the Governor of California my resignation as a Repesentative in the Congress of the United States from the 24th Congressional District of California to take effect at midnight of this date.

Very truly yours,
NORRIS POULSON.

ROBERT T. ASHMORE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the Clerk of the House, which was read:

JUNE 15, 1953.

The honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: A certificate of election in due form of law, showing the election of the Honorable ROBERT T. ASHMORE as Representative-elect to the 83d Congress from the Fourth Congressional District of the State of South Carolina, to fill the vacancy caused by the death of the Honorable Joseph R. Bryson, has been received and is on file in this office.

Respectfully yours,
LYLE O. SNADER,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Mr. ASHMORE appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

CITY OF CINCINNATI, OHIO

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 4730) to provide for the conveyance by the United States to the city of Cincinnati, Ohio, of certain lands formerly owned by that city, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 8, strike out "14" and insert "5."
Page 2, line 5, strike out "primarily."
Page 2, line 8, strike out "purposes" and insert "purpose."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MINORITY VIEWS

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that we be permitted to file minority views on the bill H. R. 5710.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes today, at the conclusion of the legislative program and following any special orders heretofore entered.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

AMENDING NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION ACT OF 1950

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4689) to amend the National Science Foundation Act of 1950.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

CONSOLIDATION OF EXISTING LAWS RELATING TO COOPERATIVE AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION WORK

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4677) to repeal certain acts relating to cooperative agricultural extension work and to amend the Smith-Lever Act of May 8, 1914, to provide for cooperative agricultural extension work between the agricultural colleges in the several States, Territories, and possessions receiving the benefits of an act of Congress approved July 2, 1862, and of acts supplementary thereto, and the United States Department of Agriculture.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, on May 21, 1953, a bill, S. 1679, an identical bill passed the other body. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, for the present consideration of the bill (S. 1679) in lieu of the House bill, to repeal certain acts relating to cooperative agricultural extension work and to amend the Smith-Lever Act of May 8, 1914, to provide for cooperative agricultural extension work between the agricultural colleges in the several States, Territories, and possessions receiving the benefits of an act of Congress approved July 2, 1862, and of acts supplementary thereto, and the United States Department of Agriculture.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this bill deals with the cooperative agricultural extension work. It is a very important bill. I wonder if the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture could give us a brief explanation of the purposes and objectives of the bill and the changes made.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, this bill is in effect a consolidation and a rewriting of 10 laws now on the statute books relating to the extension service. All of them authorize some phase of the activities of the Extension Service. It was felt, in view of the fact that there are certain conflicts between the bills and certain overlappings and duplications, it would be better to draft one bill which would include all of the provisions and also take care of one or two features which have caused trouble from time to time with reference to the appropriations. That is the sole purpose of the legislation—to consolidate all of these laws into one law in order that the Congress and the Committee on Appropriations particularly might have a better idea of what we are appropriating for and the purposes for which the money is to be spent and also to take care of some of the overlapping and duplications in bookkeeping which occur under the present legislation.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I notice in going over the bill that there is reference to freezing of the Federal allocations to the States at the amount the States received in the 1953 fiscal year. Does that mean that the hands of the Appropriations Committee are going to be tied so that they have to give at least the amount that they gave in the fiscal year 1953 for each one of these various programs?

Mr. HOPE. I will be glad to answer the gentleman's question. He obviously is referring to the provisions of section 3, and particularly section 3 (b), which provides that "out of the sums which are authorized to be appropriated each State shall be entitled to receive annually a sum of"—and I am quoting from the bill now—"equal to the sums received from the Federal cooperative extension funds for the fiscal year 1953."

That language, of course, is modified by section 3 (a) which merely authorizes the appropriation of such sums as Congress may from time to time determine to be necessary. Then section 3 (e) says that out of such sums each State shall be entitled to receive a sum of money equal to the amount received this year.

That obviously means that it will be divided in the same proportion as was

provided this year. If the full amount is appropriated, then the allocation will be just the same. If less, it will be divided on the same basis. That provision was put in the bill for the reason that there has been some confusion in the past due to the fact that some allocations were made on the basis of rural population and some on farm population. So it was necessary for us to pass a bill in the last session of Congress to deal with that matter for the fiscal year 1953. That was dealt with in a satisfactory way; and all that this does is to say that in the future it shall be apportioned in the same way as in 1953 up to the full amount received by each State in 1953. Any sums appropriated above the 1953 amount will be divided according to the formula set out in subsection (c).

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. In other words, this freeze relates to the formula to be used in granting aid to the various States, but does not relate to the amount of funds that Congress shall be obligated to appropriate?

Mr. HOPE. That is correct. That is a matter which would have to be settled by the Appropriations Committee. There is no obligation in the bill which would compel the Appropriations Committee to appropriate any fixed amount.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. There is no guaranty to the States by this provision that they will always get at least the amount of money that they received in the final year 1953; is that correct?

Mr. HOPE. No. The only guaranty is that the same formula will be used in making the apportionments up to the amount received in 1953.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I am very much interested in the changed formula for the distribution of any funds appropriated. Will the gentleman state what the change is or will be? I notice it is 4 percent to each State and then 50 percent of the remainder is based on the farm population; and the other 50 percent on the rural population.

I was wondering just what effect that will have in relation to the allocation of heretofore appropriated funds.

Mr. HOPE. That language fixes the formula the same as the formula for 1953. Last year, under the formula which was then in effect, some States lost funds and some States gained, due to the figures under the census of 1950. We worked out a formula which provided that no State should lose any funds for this fiscal year due to the application of that formula. We continued that formula as the basis for distribution in the future.

This formula, I think has proven eminently satisfactory. And that is the reason for the language which I was just discussing with the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES]. So that each State will receive the same proportion percentagewise from now on of whatever funds are appropriated, as they received for the fiscal year 1953.

Mr. McCORMACK. But I am interested in what will be the effect of the changed formula from that which has existed heretofore. In other words, each State heretofore was guaranteed or assured $10,000 in the first instance.

Mr. HOPE. It does not affect that at all.

Mr. McCORMACK. This does not affect it?

Mr. HOPE. No.

Mr. McCORMACK. Not that I am thinking in terms of Massachusetts, because I like to think in terms of the Nation as a whole, but would the gentleman take the case of Massachusetts, which is an industrial State, and let us know what effect this particular bill will have upon the allocation of appropriated funds to Massachusetts under this bill, if it becomes law, and under the existing law?

Mr. HOPE. I will say to the gentleman that as far as Massachusetts is concerned, for the fiscal year 1953 the State of Massachusetts received $221,281.47. Under this bill the apportionment is frozen at those figures percentagewise as compared with the proportion which goes to other States; so that is the formula that we are freezing in the fund.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is frozen for 1 year; is that it?

Mr. HOPE. In other words, if the appropriations for future years are in the same amount as they were for this year that would be the amount Massachusetts would receive; if they are less for the future than for the current year, then Massachusetts would receive the same percentage that it received this year.

Mr. McCORMACK. I want to assure the gentleman publicly, as I have privately and to others behind his back, that I have deep respect for my friend and complete confidence in him. I am very proud of my association with him and I deeply respect him. Any bill that comes from his committee, particularly one with a unanimous report would make a strong prima facie case in my mind.

I am not opposing the bill, I am simply inquiring, because the thought probably will come to other Members as it did to me, and it will be in the minds of other people who read this bill—I am interested only to find out for the record what difference if any there would be between the allocation of appropriated funds under the law as it now exists and what it will be under the law if this bill is enacted. I am not talking about the freezing of the funds, I am talking only about the 4 percent as compared with the remaining 96 percent.

Mr. HOPE. I thought I answered the gentleman's question.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am sure the gentleman did, but it is rather difficult for me to understand agricultural matters, so would the gentleman explain it again?

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. The fact is that this bill does not change the formula one iota; the formula was changed last year. This freezes that formula.

Mr. McCORMACK. And the 4 percent and the remaining 96 percent is not changed. The existing formula is not changed.

Mr. HOPE. No, the formula which was fixed last year is continued under this bill. We are continuing that formula, and if the appropriations are the same in future years as they were for fiscal 1953 then the gentleman's State of Massachusetts would receive $221,281.47. If they are less it will be reduced proportionately under the formula, and if they are more it will be increased on the basis of the formula in subsection (c).

Mr. McCORMACK. In other words, if I understand my friend correctly, no matter what amount is appropriated, under this formula of distribution they will receive percentagewise what they receive now, not in terms of dollars but in terms of percentages.

Mr. HOPE. The percentage for fiscal 1953.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa to substitute the Senate bill for the House bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of May 8, 1914 (38 Stat. 372), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SECTION 1. In order to aid in diffusing among the people of the United States useful and practical information on subjects relating to agriculture and home economics, and to encourage the application of the same, there may be continued or inaugurated in connection with the college or colleges in each State, Territory, or possession, now receiving, or which may hereafter receive, the benefits of the act of Congress approved July 2, 1862, entitled 'An act donating public lands to the several States and Territories which may provide colleges for the benefit of agriculture and the mechanic arts' (12th Statutes at Large, p. 503), and of the act of Congress approved August 30, 1890 (26th Statutes at Large, p. 417 and ch. 841), agricultural extension work which shall be carried on in cooperation with the United States Department of Agriculture: *Provided*, That in any State, Territory, or possession in which two or more such colleges have been or hereafter may be established, the appropriations hereinafter made to such State, Territory, or possession shall be administered by such college or colleges as the legislature of such State, Territory, or possession may direct.

"SEC. 2. Cooperative agricultural extension work shall consist of the giving of instruction and practical demonstrations in agriculture and home economics and subjects relating thereto to persons not attending or resident in said colleges in the several communities, and imparting information on said subjects through demonstrations, publications, and otherwise and for the necessary printing and distribution of information in connection with the foregoing; and this work shall be carried on in such manner as may be mutually agreed upon by the Secretary of Agriculture and the State agricultural college or colleges receiving the benefits of this act.

"SEC. 3. (a) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the purposes of this act such sums as Congress may from time to time determine to be necessary.

"(b) Out of such sums, each State, Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Federal Extension Service shall be entitled to receive

annually a sum of money equal to the sums received from Federal cooperative extension funds for the fiscal year 1953, and such sums shall be subject to the same requirements as to furnishing of equivalent sums by the State, Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico as existed immediately prior to the passage of this act, except that amounts heretofore made available to the Secretary for allotment on the basis of special needs shall continue available for use on the same basis: *Provided,* That, in addition, Puerto Rico shall be authorized to receive the total initial amount set by the provisions of the act of October 26, 1949 (63 Stat. 926), and this amount shall be increased each succeeding fiscal year in accordance with such provisions until the total sum shall include the maximum amount set by the provisions of the act October 26, 1949, and Puerto Rico shall be entitled to receive such amount annually thereafter.

"(c) Any sums made available by the Congress for further development of cooperative extension work in addition to those referred to in subsection (b) hereof shall be distributed as follows:

"1. Four percent of the sum so appropriated for each fiscal year shall be allotted among the States, Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico by the Secretary of Agriculture on the basis of special needs as determined by the Secretary.

"2. Fifty percent of the remainder of the sum so appropriated for each fiscal year shall be paid to the several States, Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico in the proportion that the rural population of each bears to the total rural population of the several States, Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico, as determined by the census, and the remainder shall be paid to the several States, Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico in the proportion that the farm population of each bears to the total farm population of the several States, Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico, as determined by the census: *Provided,* That payments out of the additional appropriations for further development of extension work authorized herein may be made subject to the making available of such sums of public funds by the States, Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico from non-Federal funds for the maintenance of cooperative agricultural extension work provided for in this act, as may be provided by the Congress at the time such additional appropriations are made: *Provided further,* That any appropriation made hereunder shall be allotted in the first and succeeding years on the basis of the decennial census current at the time such appropriation is first made, and as to any increase, on the basis of decennial census current at the time such increase is first appropriated.

"(d) The Federal Extension Service shall receive such amounts as Congress shall determine for administration, technical, and other services and for coordinating the extension work of the Department and the several States, Territories, and possessions.

"SEC. 4. On or about the first day of July in each year after the passage of this act, the Secretary of Agriculture shall ascertain as to each State, Territory, or possession whether it is entitled to receive its share of the annual appropriation for cooperative agricultural extension work under this act and the amount which it is entitled to receive. Before the funds herein provided shall become available to any college for any fiscal year, plans for the work to be carried on under this act shall be submitted by the proper officials of each college and approved by the Secretary of Agriculture. Such sums shall be paid in equal semiannual payments on the first day of January and July of each year to the treasurer or other officer of the State, Territory, or possession duly authorized by the laws of the State, Territory, or possession to receive the same, and such officer shall be required to report to the Secretary of Agriculture on or about the first day of January of each year, a detailed statement of the amount so received during the previous fiscal year and its disbursement, on forms prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture.

"SEC. 5. If any portion of the moneys received by the designated officer of any State, Territory, or possession, for the support and maintenance of cooperative agricultural extension work, as provided in this act, shall by any action or contingency be diminished or lost or be misapplied, it shall be replaced by said State, Territory, or possession, and until so replaced no subsequent appropriation shall be apportioned or paid to said State, Territory, or possession. No portion of said moneys shall be applied, directly or indirectly, to the purchase, erection, preservation, or repair of any building or buildings, or the purchase or rental of land, or in college-course teaching, lectures in college, or any other purpose not specified in this act. It shall be the duty of said colleges, annually, on or about the first day of January, to make to the Governor of the State, Territory, or possession in which it is located a full and detailed report of its operations in extension work as defined in this act, including a detailed statement of receipts and expenditures from all sources for this purpose, a copy of which report shall be sent to the Secretary of Agriculture.

"SEC. 6. If the Secretary of Agriculture finds that a State, Territory, or possession is not entitled to receive its share of the annual appropriation, the facts and reasons therefor shall be reported to the President, and the amount involved shall be kept separate in the Treasury until the expiration of the Congress next succeeding a session of the legislature of the State, Territory, or possession from which funds have been withheld in order that the State, Territory, or possession may, if it should so desire, appeal to Congress from the determination of the Secretary of Agriculture. If the next Congress shall not direct such sum to be paid, it shall be covered into the Treasury.

"SEC. 7. The Secretary of Agriculture shall make an annual report to Congress of the receipts, expenditures, and results of the cooperative agricultural extension work in all of the States, Territories, or possessions receiving the benefits of this act, and also whether the appropriation of any State, Territory, or possession has been withheld, and, if so, the reason therefor.

"SEC. 8. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to make such rules and regulations as may be necessary for carrying out the provisions of this act."

SEC. 2. The acts or parts thereof enumerated below are hereby repealed:

The Capper-Ketcham Act of May 22, 1928 (45 Stat. 711), as amended by the act of March 10, 1930 (46 Stat. 83).

Section 21 of the Bankhead-Jones Act of June 29, 1935 (49 Stat. 438), as amended by section 2 of the act of June 6, 1945 (59 Stat. 233).

Section 23 of the Bankhead-Jones Act as added by the act of June 6, 1945 (59 Stat. 231), and as amended by the act of October 26, 1949 (Public Law 406, 81st Cong.).

The act of August 28, 1937 (50 Stat. 881).

The act of April 24, 1939 (53 Stat. 589), as amended by section 707 of the act of September 21, 1944 (58 Stat. 742).

The act of October 27, 1949 (Public Law 417, 81st Cong.).

The act of May 16, 1928 (45 Stat. 571), insofar as it relates to extension work.

The act of February 23, 1929 (45 Stat. 1256), insofar as it relates to extension work.

The act of March 4, 1931 (46 Stat. 1520), insofar as it relates to extension work.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

H. R. 4677 was laid on the table.

TO AMEND THE COLOR OF TITLE ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1308) to amend the Color of Title Act.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the part of section 1 of the act of December 22, 1928 (45 Stat. 1069; 43 U. S. C., 1946 ed., sec. 1068 et seq.), preceding the first proviso is amended to read as follows:

"That the Secretary of the Interior (a) shall, whenever it shall be shown to his satisfaction that a tract of public land has been held in good faith and in peaceful, adverse, possession by a claimant, his ancestors or grantors, under claim or color of title for more than 20 years, and that valuable improvements have been placed on such land or some part thereof has been reduced to cultivation, or (b) may, in his discretion, whenever it shall be shown to his satisfaction that a tract of public land has been held in good faith and in peaceful, adverse, possession by a claimant, his ancestors or grantors, under claim or color of title for the period commencing not later than January 1, 1901, to the date of application during which time they have paid taxes levied on the land by State and local governmental units, issue a patent for not to exceed 160 acres of such land upon the payment of not less than $1.25 per acre:".

SEC. 2. The following section is added to the act of December 22, 1928, supra:

"SEC. 3. If the claimant requests that the patent to be issued under this act not contain a mineral reservation and if he can establish to the satisfaction of the Secretary that the requirements of this act have been complied with by such claimant and his predecessors for the period commencing not later than January 1, 1901, to the date of application, no mineral reservation shall be made unless the lands are, at the time of issuance of the patent, within a mineral withdrawal or subject to an outstanding mineral lease."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONTRACTS WITH THE SIOUX INDIANS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2231) to authorize the negotiation and ratification of separate settlement contracts with the Sioux Indians of the Lower Brule and the Crow Creek Reservations in South Dakota for Indian lands and rights acquired by the United States for the Fort Randall Dam and Reservoir, Missouri River development; and to authorize an appropriation for the removal from the taking area of the Fort Randall Dam and Reservoir, Missouri River development, and the reestablishment of the Indians of the Yankton Indian Reservation in South Dakota.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, and the Secretary of the Interior, jointly represent-

ing the United States of America are hereby authorized and directed to negotiate separate contracts containing the provisions outlined in this act with the Sioux Indians of the Lower Brule Reservation, S. Dak., and with the Sioux Indians of the Crow Creek Reservation, S. Dak., acting through representatives of each tribe appointed for such purpose by its tribal council.

SEC. 2. The contract with each tribe negotiated pursuant to section 1 of this act shall—

(a) convey to the United States title to all tribal, allotted, assigned, and inherited lands or interests therein belonging to the Indians of the tribe, and title to all undivided interests in such allotted or inherited lands owned by non-Indians or by Indian nonmembers of the tribe, required by the United States for the reservoir to be created by the construction of the dams across the Missouri River in South Dakota, to be known as Fort Randall Dam, including such lands along the margins as may be required by the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, for the protection, development, and use of said reservoir: *Provided*, That the contract may provide for retention by the owners of any mineral interests in such lands that are not needed by the United States for the protection of such dam and reservoir;

(b) provide for the payment of—

(1) just compensation for the lands and improvements and interests therein conveyed by the contract;

(2) costs of relocating the tribe and its members who reside upon the lands conveyed by the contract in a manner that will reestablish and protect their economic, social, religious, and community life;

(3) costs of relocating Indian cemeteries, tribal monuments, and shrines located upon the lands conveyed by the contract.

(c) Provide a schedule of dates for the orderly removal of the Indians and their personal property from the taking area of the Fort Randall Reservoir within the reservation; and

(d) Provide for the final and complete settlement of all claims by the tribe and its members against the United States arising because of the construction of the Fort Randall project.

SEC. 3. The just compensation payable for the individual property of any person conveyed pursuant to subsection (a) of section 2 of this act shall be judicially determined, if such person rejects the compensation specified in the contract with the tribe, in proceedings instituted for such purpose by the Department of the Army in the United States district court for the district in which the lands are situated.

SEC. 4. To assist the negotiators in arriving at the amount of just compensation payable for the property conveyed pursuant to subsection (a) of section 2 of this act, the Secretary of the Interior and the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, shall cause to be prepared an appraisal schedule on an individual tract basis of the tribal, allotted, and assigned lands, including heirship interests therein, located within the taking area in each reservation. The appraisal schedule shall show the fair market value of the lands, giving full and proper weight to the following elements of appraisal, among others: Improvements, severance damage, standing timber, mineral rights, and the uses to which the lands are reasonably adapted. The appraisal schedule shall be transmitted to the representatives of the tribe appointed to negotiate a contract, and shall be used as a basis for determining the amount of just compensation to be included in the contract.

SEC. 5. The specification in section 2 of this act of certain provisions to be included in each contract shall not preclude the inclusion of other provisions beneficial to the Indians who are parties of such contracts.

SEC. 6. Each contract negotiated pursuant to this act shall be submitted to the Congress for approval. The Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, and the Secretary of the Interior are requested to submit such contract within 1 year from the date of approval of this act. In the event the negotiating parties are unable to agree on any provision in the proposed contracts such provision shall be included in an appendix to the contract, together with the views of each party, for consideration and determination by Congress. The contract shall not take effect unless, after determination of any disputed provision, it is ratified by act of Congress and is ratified within 6 months after such action by the Congress by a majority of the adult members of the tribe: *Provided*, That when so ratified the contract shall constitute a taking by the United States as of the date the contract was signed by the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, and the Secretary of the Interior, for purposes of determining the ownership of the Indian tribal, allotted, and assigned lands and interests therein.

SEC. 7. Nothing in this act shall be construed to restrict completion of the Fort Randall Dam to provide flood protection and other benefits on the Missouri River.

SEC. 8. The Secretary of Defense is hereby authorized and directed to transfer to the Secretary of the Interior from any appropriation available for the Fort Randall Dam and Reservoir project for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, the sum of $106,500, which shall be available until expended for the purpose of relocating the members of the Yankton Sioux Tribe, South Dakota, who reside or have resided, on tribal and allotted lands acquired by the United States for the Fort Randall Dam and Reservoir project, Missouri River Development, in a manner that will reestablish and protect their economic, social, religious, and community life. Title to any lands acquired within Indian country pursuant to this section shall be taken in the name of the United States in trust for the Yankton Sioux Tribe or members thereof. The said sum of $106,500 shall be assessed against the costs of the Fort Randall Dam and Reservoir, Missouri River Development.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 21, strike out "mineral interests" and insert: "oil and gas rights."

Page 5, line 4, after the word "act.", insert "If the negotiating parties are unable to agree on a proposed contract each party shall submit to the Congress separate detailed reports of the negotiations, together with their recommendations."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize the negotiation and ratification of separate settlement contracts with the Sioux Indians of the Lower Brule and the Crow Creek Reservations in South Dakota for Indian lands and rights acquired by the United States for the Fort Randall Dam and Reservoir, Missouri River development, to authorize a transfer of funds from the Secretary of Defense to the Secretary of the Interior and to authorize an appropriation for the removal from the taking area of the Fort Randall Dam and Reservoir, Missouri River development, and the reestablishment of the Indians of the Yankton Indian Reservation in South Dakota."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL TRUST FOR HISTORIC PRESERVATION IN THE UNITED STATES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3581) to further the policy enunciated in the act of October 26, 1949 (63 Stat. 927), to facilitate public participation in the preservation of sites, buildings, and objects of national significance or interest by providing for a National Trust for Historic Preservation in the United States.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in order to further the policy of historic preservation in the United States as enunciated in the act of October 26, 1949 (63 Stat. 927), the 3d, 4th, and 5th sentences of section 3 of that act are hereby amended to read as follows: "The number of general trustees shall be fixed by the Board of Trustees of the National Trust and shall be chosen by the members of the National Trust from its members at any regular meeting of said National Trust. The respective terms of office of the general trustees shall be as prescribed by said board of trustees but in no case shall exceed a period of 5 years from the date of election. A successor to a general trustee shall be chosen in the same manner and shall have a term expiring 5 years from the date of the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was chosen, except that a successor chosen to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of such term shall be chosen only for the remainder of that term."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TERRITORY OF ALASKA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1802) to amend the act of Congress approved March 4, 1915 (38 Stat. 1214), as amended.

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

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I object.

BROADKILL RIVER, DELAWARE

The Clerk called the bill (S. 639) to provide for the abandonment of a certain part of the Federal project for the Broadkill River in Delaware.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Chief of Engineers of the Department of the Army is authorized and directed to abandon the part of the Federal project for the Broadkill River in Delaware, adopted March 3, 1873, and modified March 2, 1907, which provides for an entrance channel from such river to Delaware Bay.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SURFACE RIGHTS VESTED IN THE LOCATOR OF A MINING CLAIM

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4983) to define the surface rights vested in the

locator of a mining claim hereafter made under the mining laws of the United States, prior to issuance of patent therefor, and for other purposes.

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I hope the gentleman will not insist upon his request to pass over this bill without prejudice because it is important legislation. The bill proposes to stop the entry of certain fraudulent mining claims. This matter was brought to the attention of the public all over the country through a featured article recently carried in Collier's magazine in which was described how these fraudulent mining claims were entered and how they went to patent. This bill is the answer to those fraudulent mining claims. It has the endorsement of the American Mining Congress and I firmly believe it will correct this evil to a very large extent and that it is very much in the public interest. The bill was unanimously reported by our committee, but its enactment will have to be postponed unless the gentleman withdraws his request.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

TUNGSTEN ORES AND CONCENTRATES IN THE UNITED STATES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2824) to encourage the discovery, development, and production of tungsten ores, and concentrates in the United States, its Territories and possessions, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Domestic Tungsten Program Extension Act of 1953."

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 2. It is hereby recognized that the continued dependence on overseas sources of supply for strategic or critical minerals and metals during periods of threatening world conflict or of political instability within those nations controlling the sources of supply of such materials gravely endangers the present and future economy and security of the United States. It is therefore declared to be the policy of the Congress that each department and agency of the Federal Government charged with responsibilities concerning the discovery, development, production, and acquisition of strategic or critical minerals and metals shall undertake to decrease further and to eliminate where possible the dependency of the United States on overseas sources of supply of each such material.

SEC. 3. In accordance with the declaration of policy set forth in section 2 of this act, the termination date of the domestic tungsten program, as amended, which program was established by regulation issued pursuant to Public Law 774 (81st Cong., ch. 932, 2d sess.), shall be extended an additional 2 years to July 1, 1958: *Provided,* That this section is not intended and shall not be construed to limit or restrict the regulatory agencies from extending the termination date of the domestic tungsten program beyond July 1, 1958, or from increasing the quantity of tungsten that may be delivered and accepted under the program as permitted by existing statutory authority.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, after line 21, insert the following section:

"SEC. 4. In order that those persons who produce or who plan to produce under purchase programs established pursuant to Public Law 774 (81st Cong.) and Public Law 96 (82d Cong.) may be in position to plan their investment and production with due regard to requirements, the responsible agencies controlling such purchase programs are directed to publish at the end of each calendar quarter the amounts of each of the ores and concentrates referred to in section 3 purchased in that quarter and the total amounts of each which have been purchased under the program."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. That completes the call of bills on the Consent Calendar.

ADDITIONAL INDEPENDENT EXECUTIVE BUREAUS, BOARDS, COMMISSIONS, CORPORATIONS, AGENCIES, AND OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1954

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 285, Rept. No. 553), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5690) making appropriations for additional independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill or any provisions contained in said bill are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 4 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Affairs may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill H. R. 5710.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

TRADE AGREEMENTS EXTENSION ACT OF 1953

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 275 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5495) to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the bill shall be considered as having been read for amendment. No amendments shall be in order to said bill except amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means or an amendment proposing to strike out title II of the bill, and said amendments shall be in order, any rule of the House to the contrary notwithstanding. Amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means may be offered to any section of the bill at the conclusion of the general debate, but such amendments shall not be subject to amendment. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] and yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of this resolution which provides for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5495) to extend the authority of the President of the United States to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended. H. R. 5495 proposes to extend that authority until June 12, 1954.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Ways and Means has reported this measure practically unanimously, which clearly indicates, I believe, that there will not be much opposition to the rule or to the bill. Another purpose of this measure is to increase the membership of the Tariff Commission from 6 to 7 members.

This is not exactly an open rule, neither is it exactly a closed rule. It is what you might probably consider a limited rule. It gives the members of the Committee on Ways and Means the right to offer amendments and it also gives a clear-cut vote on the so-called Cooper amendment in regard to the increase of the Tariff Commission from 6 to 7 members. This was the main point in controversy, and I repeat that it gives the membership an absolute vote on that question.

I think, Mr. Speaker, I should inform the House that no motion to strike out the last word is in order; therefore debate on the so-called Cooper amend-

ment to strike out title II will be limited to 10 minutes, 5 minutes for and 5 minutes against.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of this resolution.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct the thoughtful attention of my colleagues of the House of Representatives to the lamentable plight in which the classified civil-service employees and faithful postal workers find themselves.

The Congress has reserved to itself the right of fixing the salaries of the people in these groups. In the case of certain skilled artisans and production workers, it has delegated this authority to wage boards who can act to adjust salaries on their own initiative, subject, of course, to certain limitations of law. People employed in those fields know to whom to go with their pleas for relief.

This is not the case with classified employees or postal workers. They must come to a Congress worried by the momentous affairs of the day who have a tendency to consider this responsibility secondary to more pressing problems.

It means little to us—just another chore, another bill to pass—but to our employees it means the difference between happiness, contentment, and a full life and living debt-ridden on the ragged edge of poverty.

Never in the years that I have been here have we ever granted our loyal, hard-working Government workers a salary increase in keeping with the ever-rising cost of living. We have temporized. We have turned to expediency in the name of economy.

We have lagged in their salary adjustments. We have pursued the unrealistic policy of letting the cost of living run away ahead of their salaries and then only partially closing the ever-widening gap.

An upward salary adjustment for classified employees and postal workers is now overdue. In justice to them we should act at once.

Our pennywise and pound foolish policy is undermining the morale of Government workers. We have sniped at the fringe privileges that they once enjoyed through the adoption of riders on appropriation bills. We have caused confusion in their minds by the introduction of other riders that would destroy the implied guaranties of tenure, one of the baits we hold out to get people to enter Government service, riders that would substantially abolish job rights, including veterans' preference.

The newspapers say that we are shooting for a July 31 adjournment. If this is the case it is all the more reason that we should act with dispatch on this problem so important to so many.

Put yourself in the position of a Government worker in the middle bracket trying to maintain a home and a family in the proud American tradition. Analyze the cost of living of this group. Compare it with their salaries. I had a survey made by postal workers some time ago. We found 75 percent of them had to supplement their incomes with either outside jobs or have their wives work. This, you will agree, is not a happy, wholesome condition.

These people feel frustrated. They know not to whom to turn except to us and we find ourselves too busy to give their just case the prompt attention it warrants.

They cannot strike as can employees of industry. Why the very officers of their organizations or unions cannot officially be recognized by the heads of several agencies of Government. We should, at least, accord them this privilege so that they would then have a spokesman to plead their cause.

Let us, in the interest of economy, recognize the plight of our faithful employees to a proper upward salary adjustment and let us act at once.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I desire to speak in support of this rule, which I think is wisely reported by the Committee on Rules, to give the Members of Congress and Members of the House an opportunity to vote upon the provisions of H. R. 5495, which adds a seventh member to the United States Tariff Commission.

The reasons why this extra member of the Commission should not be added are numerous. I think there are several that might be pointed out to those Members who are especially interested in certain types of temporary or intermediate protection in regard to products manufactured in their districts.

It should be pointed out that under the bill as brought out none of the so-called protection that was attempted to be provided in the original Simpson bill is provided in this bill. The only new protection in the bill is the addition of a partisan member to the United States Tariff Commission, in violation of a precedent that was established in 1916 and has been in existence through some 20 years of Democratic administration and 12 years of Republican administration.

May I point out to my friends on the Republican side that if this provision is adopted into law it is going to work great hardship and embarrassment upon their Republican President and upon them as Members of Congress, because it is going to mean that more and more cases are going to have to be presented to the President where he will have to reverse the action of the Tariff Commission. This means you are going to have a bad situation all the way through in the sense that you are going to be called upon to ask the President to uphold the Tariff Commission, but the President is going to have to reverse the Tariff Commission in line with his announced policy of working for the establishment of a better system of world trade and the elimination of barriers that now exist. It is not going to be good politics from any standpoint.

COMMISSION PACKING

Mr. Speaker, the provision in H. R. 5495 to add a seventh member of the United States Tariff Commission is a bold and unconcealed attempt to pack the Commission, which, if successful, would destroy the very purpose for which it was established.

The Commission has been bipartisan for the 37 years since its inception, and now a small group of determined protectionists want to change the rules of the game and alter the Commission from a 6-man factfinding body to a 7-man, partisan, political body.

The Tariff Commission was created by Congress in 1916 in recognition of the need for a permanent, nonpartisan agency to assist the Congress and the President in making and executing tariff legislation by providing a disinterested investigation of the economic facts—regardless of tariff policy. It was needed to reduce the impossible burden of work and extraparliamentary pressures on congressional committees formerly charged with both policy and detailed rate-fixing. The first Chairman of the Commission, F. W. Taussig, properly set the tone of objectivity when he said, in 1917:

> Our essential task, then, is to act as the servants and assistants of Congress. We are to gather and prepare information, to sift the essential from the nonessential. We shall bend our utmost endeavors to be exhaustive in inquiry, and at the same time brief and discriminating in statement. As regards advice, we must be sparing, since advice must often rest on the basis of established fundamental principles; and fundamental principles must be settled not by the Commission, but by Congress and by the public.

This general statement of purpose is as valid today as then.

When the Commission was strengthened by the 1922 act, the Congress still insisted upon a membership of 6, not more than 3 of whom could be of one political party. When, in the 1930 act, the personnel was changed, bipartisanship was retained. By packing the Commission the protectionists hope to accomplish what they have not been able to accomplish in the Congress since 1934—the emasculation, if not the complete repeal, of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act; this in the face of general two-party support of that act.

POLITICAL DECISIONS

No administrative agency can possibly decide for the country what kind of tariff policy it should have; policy is set by the Congress. But in order to frame laws in the national interest, Congress must know the economic facts, as uncolored as possible by demands of special interests. Moreover, the application of policy to

specific cases is highly technical and demands expert investigation. Can anyone doubt for an instant that the presentation of economic facts would fluctuate with the changes in political majority of the seven-man Commission?

In the 37 years of its existence, no one has seriously questioned the necessity for a bipartisan Commission. It is claimed that the addition of a seventh Commissioner would insure against split decisions. Yet, as the minority report of the Ways and Means Committee points out, every single recommendation in escape clause proceedings to date has been either a unanimous or majority decision.

Nor can this measure be defended on the grounds that the present number of members is inadequate to handle escape clause proceedings in a period of 9 months. If the charge is just, the situation can be remedied easily enough by the addition of an even number of new Commissioners, 2 or 4 or 6, thereby retaining bipartisanship.

Indeed, the creation of partisanship would afford the strongest kind of incentive for domestic interests to file an endless number of applications for relief under the escape clause. There is no comfort in the fact that the President would still have the power to reject, in the national interest, the Commission's recommendations for relief—when it is realized how often the pressure would be applied at the White House by a partisan commission.

ANOTHER DAY

Those who would establish a precedent of partisanship for the Tariff Commission would not have to be reminded that, one awful day when political fortunes are reversed, the shoe will be on the other foot and the balance of power will shift to the antiprotectionist side. And the worst feature in making the Commission a political football would be the resultant insecurity for American industry. Industry can adapt itself to any system of tariff scheduling which is reasonably consistent, whether protectionist, free trade or in between; but industry enjoys no kind of security under tariff scheduling subject to the caprice of a partisan body that changes with each shift in political power. The Commission would lose the public's confidence. This, in fact, was the experience of the Tariff Board established during the Taft administration and later dropped by the incoming Democrats who viewed it as a tool of Republican protectionism.

The violation of the Tariff Commission's objectivity would have its repercussions abroad. It would be but one more sign to confirm the growing suspicion of our allies that, far from liberalizing our trade policy, as the President promised, we are deliberately crawling back into the shell of Smoot-Hawley nationalism.

On all counts, then, we must preserve the 37-year-old, bipartisan, fact-finding function of the Commission and leave the political decisions to the Congress.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose the granting of this rule. I do so on the ground that the pending rule is both unnecessarily arbitrary and patently discriminating.

First. There is no national or international emergency to warrant setting aside the ordinary procedures of the House.

Second. There is no excuse for depriving the duly elected Members of the Congress their right to discuss, amend, and otherwise participate in the drafting of legislation.

Thomas Jefferson once said:

> The ills of democracy are best cured by more democracy.

Here we see the wholesome advice of this great Virginia statesman tossed aside in order that the Congress, in the name of America, may launch a program reminiscent of New Deal days, designed to cure the ills of the world under the flimsy slogan of "More trade and less aid."

It is proposed to launch this noble experiment, Mr. Speaker, by imposing on the individual Members of the Congress a gag rule that both stifles free speech and effectively blocks any and all attempts to secure legislative redress of grievances.

If this procedure is a sample of democracy in action, which America hopes to teach the rest of the world, then only God himself can help the free people who are harassed by the fear of Communist aggression.

The proposal has all the earmarks of collusion between the House leadership of both major political parties. My party, the Democratic Party, appears to be more interested in playing partisan politics over the makeup of the Tariff Commission than it is in safeguarding one of the Nation's basic defense industries and the welfare of its employees. The information that actual want and starvation stalks relentlessly through hundreds of mining communities in the coal areas of the Nation—traditionally Democratic territory—seems less important to them than the need of supplying aid to distant lands.

It is too bad, Mr. Speaker, that we cannot declare these areas, laid waste by the operation of our trade policies, to be foreign territory. In that case they would not have to petition the Congress for relief. As Dean Acheson used to do and as Secretary Dulles now proposes to do—we would just carry it to them.

The Republican Party is making effective use of this rule to silence its own Members, a majority of whom are basically opposed to the idea of lowering our own standards of living and working conditions to the level of those already existing abroad today.

There is no relief provided in the renewal of this bill for a great segment of industry and the domestic producers of this Nation. When the Ways and Means Committee, in its wisdom, decided not to report out the Simpson bill, that we might have equal treatment to all parties, industrially and agriculturally, in this Nation, so far as trade agreements are concerned, then the opportunity to get relief for these affected areas was passed up.

What shall become of the new Simpson bill is a matter for the future. What we are dealing with now is the present situation.

I am basically opposed to the extension as proposed and if, when the vote comes on the previous question, an opportunity is afforded to register your protest to these arbitrary proceedings, I sincerely hope that Members on both sides of the aisle will stand up and be counted. With the welfare of America at stake, it is no time for political "buckpassing."

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, there should be no partisan approach to the problem of bolstering our economy for the slackening of employment inevitable with the decline in defense production. There are many conditions today that characterized the last twenties. I have always thought that the devastating depression that began in late 1929 might have been leavened, if not avoided, if at the time we had enjoyed something comparable to our present reciprocal trade arrangement. Our surest way now to avoid the likelihood of another serious recession is to aid and encourage the expansion of our export trade. On this there should be no division on partisan lines.

It is unfortunate that politics is being injected into what should be a bipartisan effort to strengthen our country to meet any economic storms attending the change from production for defense to production for a world of peace. Indeed, the reciprocal trade agreements are the strongest part of our armor of defense.

In an editorial in its issue of May 8, 1953, the Chicago Daily News said:

> It is utterly unrealistic to suppose that we can continue to sell goods unless our customers have some means of earning the money to pay for them.

The editorial in the Chicago Daily News continues:

> It would be particularly unsound for a creditor exporting nation, to scrap reciprocal trade agreements for a return to an outmoded, inflexible protectionism.

Mr. Speaker, my purpose in referring to the editorial in the Chicago Daily News of May 8, 1953, is twofold. First, it is the sound presentment of a logical argument. Secondly, its source is Republican and conservative.

The editor and publisher of the Chicago Daily News is John S. Knight. His father was a distinguished Republican member of this body. In his own right, Mr. Knight has made his niche in Ameri-

can journalism. Editor, publisher, and member of a powerful chain of great newspapers he is an active reporter for his own newspapers and weekly writes an editorial column for his newspapers that is unique in that it is not ghost written but is the personally prepared and transcribed analyses and reflections of the man who owns and controls the newspapers in which the column appears. I have great respect for Mr. Knight as a publisher who is also a working newspaperman.

Mr. Knight, independent when in his convictions the public interest is concerned, nevertheless is a born and bred Republican. His heart throbs in unison with the heart of the Republican Party. Moreover, he is a staunch supporter of President Eisenhower. Delegates to the Republican Convention in Chicago surely will remember how hearteningly they read the Chicago Daily News if their love and support were with Ike. If the delegates had loyalties elsewhere I presume with good judgment they passed up the Chicago Daily News.

Mr. Speaker, what I am trying to say, I am afraid a bit clumsily, is that Mr. Knight is a Republican born and bred and a friend of General Eisenhower in Chicago at conventiontime—when if ever the general needed friends.

Now, Mr. Speaker, may I say a word about Chicago? I have no quarrel with the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY], for whom I hold a real sentiment of affection. Even though he is a Democrat, he is fighting this bill, tooth and nail. I admire him for his position. He is fighting for the industries and the workers in his district. He is a friend of organized labor, tried and found true on every occasion, but when the welfare is in jeopardy of the management that makes possible the jobs, the gentleman is in there battling for the industry, management and labor with a common interest.

It happens that in the district represented by the gentleman from West Virginia are smaller industries, such as glassblowing, that would be, and are, adversely affected by the reciprocal-trade agreements. As the editorial of May 8, 1953, in the Chicago Daily News says:

> The conflict of interest is clear and irreconcilable. On the one side are those whose products find it hard to compete with imports. On the other is the greater good for the greater number by increasing the two-way flow of foreign trade through mutual deals lowering particular tariffs in each trading nation.

Mr. Speaker, in the territories serviced by the Chicago Daily News and its affiliated newspapers, and in the district which I have the honor to represent, are located either the large industries or the residences of the workers in such industries—industries that are the backbone of our country and the security of which now depends in a perilous and uncertain period upon the continuance of the reciprocal trade agreements.

Mr. Speaker, I wish now to talk to those on the Republican side of the aisle. All the Democratic members of the Ways and Means Committee have signed the minority report objecting to the title in the bill we are discussing converting the Tariff Commission from a bipartisan, or really nonpartisan body, into a body strictly political. If I should talk in my own way to you on the other side of the aisle in support of the position taken unanimously by the Democratic members of the committee you might suspect me of partisan motivation. I have in fact no such thought. I sincerely think that the welfare of our country is at stake. I am more concerned with the future of my sons and my grandchildren and of their contemporaries than in what may occur in favorable or unfavorable repercussions to me. So that there may be no misunderstanding I bring to you on the other side of the aisle, not my words but the words of the Chicago Daily News, owned and controlled by John S. Knight, Republican and a working newspaperman:

> This, in short, is protectionism of the old Hawley-Smoot variety. The Simpson bill proposes to implement it by packing the Tariff Commission, now a six-man bipartisan body, with another member.
>
> Already, President Eisenhower has designated as Chairman, Edgar E. Brossard, of Utah, protege of the late Senator Reed Smoot, an arch-protectionist. Also named to the Commission is former Republican Representative from Connecticut, John Talbot. He voted in 1945 to kill an extension of the Trade Agreement Act. Why President Eisenhower named two men apparently hostile to his professed policy is one of Washington's mysteries.
>
> Two more such appointments, and the high-tariff complexion of the Commission would be assured. Hence, unless the hope of expanding trade with our allies is to be abandoned, the Simpson bill must be defeated.

Mr. Speaker, before they vote, I at least have alerted my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to the thinking of responsible Republicans in the Chicago area, from which I come. I repeat I do not regard this as a proper field for political adventure. The important thing, especially at this time, is to encourage and expand our foreign trade. It is no time or place to play politics. The Tariff Commission should remain, as advocated by the Chicago Daily News and by the minority members of the Ways and Means Committee, strictly nonpolitical. I shall vote for the amendment to take politics out of what has at stake something greater than any party or any individual, the future of our country.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS].

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I now go on record as being opposed to this rule because it prohibits amendments to the bill. I think it is so important that this Congress should be able to express its will in regards to any legislation. One of the previous speakers said that we are changing the rules of the game. Did you ever see a game where the rules were not changed every so often? For instance, football, basketball, baseball.

The way of changing the rules in a democracy should be by the will of the majority.

I have just made a trip to my district and the people there feel the responsibility for this legislation lies with the Congress of the United States. When I appeared before the House Ways and Means Committee, I said then that there were rumors of a compromise. That not only was there a compromise made but it looks to me like it was a complete sellout of one segment of society.

The State Department has had a big hand in this matter. The State Department is more informed on matters in foreign countries than on the internal workings of this Nation.

The so-called million-dollar Cabinet also came up to testify on this legislation. Half of them, or the majority of them, testified for this bill.

Here is a statement that I heard, and I should like you gentlemen to remember it. Over this past weekend, while traveling through the coal fields of my district, I heard many miners say; "It looks like an old-fashioned Republican depression coming on."

Over 2,500 coal miners in my district are out of work. That throws a lot of railroad workers out of work, and workers in related industries. Do you not think that those people have to live some way?

They say, "No, we cannot change the rules of the game," in this matter of receiprocal trade. I believe that this Congress can and should change the rules, where they affect the lives of human beings.

They say, "Yes, we are trying to take care of Venezuela." Venezuela does not have as many people as the State of Pennsylvania. I will say that it probably helps a few people there, the people who already have the money.

But do you know what is being done? They are dumping residual oil on our east coast. I know the argument is going to be made that we need it, that we have got to save ours. Do you know how much of high-grade oil they are bringing into the United States? Four percent of their total output. We do not need this residual oil of which 48 percent is being brought into our country. We have lots of it.

I believe in reciprocal trade. I have voted for it every time it has been on the floor of this Congress since I have been a Member. And I want to express my view now that if this rule is allowed to stand and something is not done to help our people, then I will have to vote against it.

I know that some are going to say, "Special interests," but if helping the citizens, of my district and of these United States means special interests, then I am for special interests.

The first thing you know we are going to get to the point where we need these coal miners. Coal mining is a basic industry. If an emergency would arise then we would need the coal miners and their productions. Coal mining is one of the industries that has made America strong.

Under a bill that I and 22 of my colleagues have introduced in the House of Representatives, 5 percent of our country's production would be allowed to be imported into the United States. Who has been profiting from this residual oil? About 4 or 5 of the big oil companies in the United States. We are not helping the common people down in Venezuela.

As I say, I believe in reciprocal trade, but I believe first that we must help an industry that we may need sometime in the future. We say we will set a precedent if we pass this bill. Well, if it is a precedent to help our own people then we had better set that precedent; and I say again to this Congress we had better beware of that depression which is looming on the horizon.

The coal industry is one of our basic industries, and there are millions of people who depend on the things that come out of the coal mines and related industries.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER].

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman of the Rules Committee for giving me this time to call the attention of the House to title III of H. R. 5495, which establishes a commission on foreign economic policy.

Mr. Speaker, this is a matter which has been of major interest to me since the beginning of my service in the Congress.

April 23, 1951, I introduced a bill to create a commission on foreign economic policy. Twice I appeared before the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives urging the inclusion of that bill as an amendment to mutual security legislation. Twice on the floor of the House of Representatives I offered that bill as an amendment to the mutual security bills of 1951 and 1952. In all instances, the Democratic leadership rejected my proposal.

March 25, 1953, I reintroduced this measure in H. R. 4199, which is essentially the same in purpose and character as title III of the bill now before us.

March 26, 1953, at page 2339 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I included a brief history of my efforts in this respect.

I want to commend the leadership of the House and the President of the United States for taking action on this most important subject. It is necessary, I think, that we determine what our foreign economic policy shall be before specific steps in economic affairs are taken. This is a red-letter day for the people of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, within the past 2 months 145 Members of Congress have been eyewitnesses to the destructive force of atomic fission. I am sure I am not alone in gaining the lasting impression that the ingenuity of man has made advances in the scientific field at a far more rapid rate than the ingenuity of man in the governmental field has been able to manage scientific discoveries intelligently. We have surely found the means of destroying ourselves. This simple and incontrovertible fact has placed upon those of us who have chosen careers in Government a responsibility far more weighty and awesome than that confronting our predecessors in the preatomic age.

Mankind has always sought peace. The great majority of human beings has yearned for an end to wars and the havoc and suffering which accompany them. If it ever was necessary to give sober, intelligent thought to the causes of war and the means to gain a lasting and honorable peace, that time is now, when we know of the horrible potential of atomic warfare.

Mr. Speaker, I do not pose as an expert either on military strategy or human behavior. Yet I have some convictions concerning practical and, I believe, effective steps toward the elimination of some of the causes of wars. I believe it is my duty to offer these views for the consideration of my colleagues.

It may seem to some paradoxical to assert that the creation of a commission to develop a sound policy and program in our foreign economic affairs has a definite and demonstrable relationship to the cause of peace.

I start with the proposition that the causes of war are in part, economic. The development of economic power by a nation exerts pressures against rigidly established vested rights in the international status quo. These pressures, if not relieved in their early stages, build up and eventually explode in open military combat. I do not minimize the unmeasurable importance of human emotions and passions, which make a people fighting mad and willing to risk the suffering and desolation of warfare to gain some conceived national objective. I do not assert that the causes of war are wholly economic, but I do contend that economic considerations are significant factors contributing to the outbreak of hostilities.

It is my belief that we can minimize these economic causes of war through the creation of an international economic order of such flexibility as to permit the expression of natural human aspirations for self-betterment but which, at the same time, possesses the stability of a society governed by law and the recognition of rights of individuals and nations.

It is my belief that the economic system we have developed in this country which, on a basis of equal opportunity, permits an individual to seek his livelihood and his happiness in open competition with his fellow man, restrained only by his own capacity and by rules of fair conduct, possesses the features of flexibility and stability which it should be our aim to incorporate in the international economic order.

In first proposing the creation of a commission to study foreign economic problems on April 23, 1951, I said:

> If formulas can be found which will stimulate the investment of private capital in backward areas and eliminate many of the political obstacles and risks now restraining the export of capital, we will find that a major step has been taken toward the creation of that flexible but stable economic and political order among all nations which will permit the search for material and spiritual happiness by free citizens in an atmosphere of free enterprise.
>
> We will find that the causes of wars have been effectively minimized and that the general level of civilization has been substantially advanced through permitting the natural economic forces of specialization and exchange to work, free from artificial restriction.

As I view it, the primary task of the Commission on Foreign Economic policy should be to study ways and means whereby a climate can be created in the free countries of the world conducive to the investment of private capital and the conduct of trade and commerce. The Government should not directly engage in economic activities but should facilitate the economic activities of private citizens.

Mr. Speaker, it is my belief that the free-enterprise system, if permitted to operate free from artificial hazards and restrictions, can contribute to the economic betterment of the underdeveloped areas of the world and promote their internal stability and their capacity to resist external aggression. I quote again from my remarks of April 23, 1951, the following:

> Historically, the imperialistic aggressor has expanded his rule first against the weak and the unprepared. I think it is not inaccurate to say that the underdeveloped areas are vacuum areas into which the force of ambitious and ruthless power had a natural tendency to rush. To the extent that such vacuum areas are strengthened, become more independent and develop national pride and consciousness, as well as a higher standard of living, to that extent will the dangers of their being overrun by a conqueror diminish.

Mr. Speaker, in H. R. 4199 I sought to set forth a congressional declaration of purpose to guide the commission in its investigation and study of foreign economic problems. Title III of the bill before us contains no declaration of policy. However, that defect may not be important since the Congress has, in other legislation—the Mutual Security Acts and the Act for International Development—plainly gone on record in favor of promoting the competitive free-enterprise system in international economic affairs. In H. R. 4199 I sought to restate these purposes as follows:

> The Congress finds that the dynamic competitive free-enterprise system which has flourished in the United States can raise standards of living and promote internal strength and stability in other free countries, thereby increasing their capacity to resist aggression, stimulating international trade, and contributing to the growth of free economic and political institutions. These goals can be achieved in large measure through encouraging and facilitating the investment of private capital in other free

countries to develop their resources and improve their productivity. Numerous impediments now exist, however, which inhibit the investment of private capital and the conduct of trade and commerce throughout the free world. It is the purpose of this act to discover ways to overcome these obstacles and make the fullest use of free private enterprise, subject to proper restraints to prevent overreaching and unfair exploitation, in promoting mutual security, economic vigor, and individual liberty in the free world.

There should be no hesitation on the part of any Member of the Congress in subscribing to the principles stated in the foregoing declaration of policy.

Mr. Speaker, there is no more important business on the agenda of this Congress, in my opinion, than the initiation of a comprehensive and penetrating study of international economic affairs and the development of sound policies and programs in this field.

In my opinion, this study should be made by a commission. No committee of the Congress has broad enough jurisdiction to encompass the whole field of foreign economic problems. Furthermore, as I have previously pointed out, foreign economic activities of our citizens are matters in which they must voluntarily participate. They cannot be forced by governments to trade where they do not want to trade, nor to invest where they do not want to invest. For this reason it is particularly appropriate that the American business community have representation on any body or agency entrusted with the task of working out foreign economic policies.

Mr. Speaker, similar legislation, Senate Joint Resolution 78 to establish a bipartisan Commission on Foreign Economic Policy, was passed by the Senate May 19, 1953. Our passage of H. R. 5495 today will thus assure the creation of this Commission to undertake this most important study.

Again, I congratulate the administration and the leadership of the Congress on taking this concrete step toward the solution of the difficult, complex, and far-reaching international economic problems facing the world today.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, the essence of this bill represents a vindication for the foreign policy of the administration.

I hope that in voting on this rule Members will not let dust be thrown in their eyes. I am for the rule; it is the very best that could be obtained on the report from the Ways and Means Committee. It was obtained by great leadership on the part of the President and on the part of the leadership of this House which is entitled to great credit for bringing this legislation to its present situation.

This legislation I consider to be a package with foreign aid and with defense appropriations in the security interest of the United States. The Soviet Union is beginning to shift the ground of its struggle with the West, it is going into the trade battle now, and the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act is the first step on our part to show that we recognize that the trade battle might very well prove to be more decisive than the military preparations which we have had up to now and are necessarily continuing.

The nations of Western Europe used to do a very great part of their business, about 40 percent, with countries that are now in the Communist bloc. It must be our desire to reorient the foreign trade of all the free world so that free Europe can free itself and not be dependent upon the Communist bloc for a substantial part of its trade—and replaced this trade since World War II—but aid is being cut now. This is exactly what we mean by trade not aid and is vital to the free world as aid is being cut. Orienting the free world's trade within itself is directly against the interests of the Soviet Union and we can expect great opposition from them on it. Action on this extension is our first step of recognition that we are in that economic struggle and that we are determined to be prepared for it.

In addition to that, the Soviet Union is widely broadcasting its interest in big trade contracts with the free world, so is Communist China, offering big trade contracts especially to the Western European nations—tomorrow probably to Japan, as well. These offers could prove very attractive, especially to nations like West Germany which has a great industrial complex that needs to be employed and with great manufacturing capacity, the products of which need to be exported. We have to offer them some alternative, otherwise the Russians can beat us in this economic "war" whereas they could not beat the free world in the "cold war" and they could not beat the free world in a "hot war" by armed aggression in Korea.

I hope the Members of the House will pay attention to the paramount importance of this particular piece of legislation in the foreign policy package of the United States and will recognize that in passing the essentials of this bill—which I consider to be the 1-year extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act and the appointment of a Presidential-Congressional Commission on the United States foreign economic policy—it is backing up the President who is doing, I feel, an outstanding job in trying to secure the peace of the world.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY].

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. 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 Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I cannot support this rule, nor can I support the bill, for the obvious reason that it fails to take cognizance of the conditions in the coal industry whereby residual oil dumped into the United States from South America displaced over 30 million tons of coal last year. As a consequence many thousands of men have been thrown out of employment and many coal mines have been forced to close.

The coal operators and the miners implored the Ways and Means Committee for relief through quota restrictions on residual-oil imports. This was refused by the committee; and the Rules Committee brought out a rule that prevents consideration of any amendments from the floor except the one amendment to increase the Tariff Commission from 6 members to 7. This is a sop to the Members in order to get votes for this bill.

No consideration has been given to the plight of the coal industry nor of the glass industry, which has been crippled for several years as a result of the importation of cheap glass. I have always supported the Reciprocal Trade Act, but this time I am compelled to oppose it. In my district prosperity depends to a great extent upon the conditions in the coal industry, but it seems that this administration is not concerned with the welfare of the people in the 21st District of Pennsylvania and in many other districts.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, this bundle that the gentleman from New York speaks of containing the provision for a seven-man Tariff Commission to my mind is no vindication of our foreign policy. Vindication. Fiddlesticks, just nonsense, just a sop to the trade isolationists, the selfish interests of America, to get their additional man on the Tariff Commission so that the high protectiontists in this country can have their way, willy-nilly. It is a compromise, a crude deal, and it is rather astounding that the President should lend himself to it. I say this compromise is spindle-legged, it is an untoward surrender.

The President has already publicly surrendered his power to fashion trade policy. It has been the boast of those on this side of the aisle, on the Republican side of the aisle that in return for withdrawal of the original bill, the bludgeon bill offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SIMPSON], the "stand up and deliver" bill that the President promised to make no more trade agreements for 1 more year, that is surrender of principle.

What bad timing, too, I will say to the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] especially at a time when the Kremlin is preaching economic independence to the western nations and is backing up those promises and words with very attractive offers that involve items most affected by United States trade barriers. What about these pontifical declarations by the administration about world trade and world trade being a two-way street, and that we must buy in order to sell. The administration with

unction says we must level down our trade restrictions to enable our allies to enter our markets. Those are the words.

What about the deeds? The administration appointed to the Tariff Commission, not a man who is inspired with the philosophy announced in those pontificial declarations of the President. No. There was appointed a disciple of hard shelled protectionism. We remember Joe Talbot, a very distinguished gentleman, a fine Representative from Connecticut. He got the job. But he is a high protectionist of the old reactionary Republican school. What about deeds, not words, I say to the administration?

And again we shall have a high protectionist appointed to the Tariff Commission. The bill soon before us will provide for a seventh man. Because of pressure brought to bear on the White House by you Republicans and those whom you represent, the President will undoubtedly yield and select an additional high protectionist, so that we will have a Tariff Commission no longer nonpartisan but a Tariff Commission that will be armpit deep in partisan politics.

I then picture a long queque of applicants before the Commission demanding higher and higher rates.

Thus the President while apparently loking forward toward quickening and expanding foreign trade as a mutual two-way affair, is stepping backward into balkanizing world trade.

It is indeed an anomaly to me to see the administration on the one hand claiming credit for the wholesale elimination of personnel from the various agencies of the Government, reducing budgets, and on the other certain Republicans advancing the proposed amendment which would actually add another member to the Tariff Commission. This total inconsistency can only be explained on the grounds of pure political expediency. And that, I submit, Mr. Speaker, is the only reason for suggesting the proposal under consideration. And I believe it important that what is now proposed to pass under the guise of legislation be unmasked for what it truly is—unadulterated politics.

The proposal to make the Commission a political football is an affront to members of both parties who have labored solidly for years to keep the administration of the Tariff Act on a nonpartisan basis. A nonpartisan Commission was set forth in the Tariff Act of 1930. That act was framed by members of the present majority party. It was therein provided that a Tariff Commission of 6 members should be appointed by the President. Of these 6 Commissioners, it was established under the law that not more than 3 Commissioners could be of any 1 party, thereby assuring that neither of the 2 major political parties could dominate the Commission for partisan purposes. To further ascertain that equal weight in the Commission would be given to both parties, it was also directed that in making appointments members of different parties should be appointed alternately as nearly as could be practicable.

The above provisions, I might add, were derived from similar clauses in the Tariff Act of September 8, 1916, indicating that for almost 40 years it has been the consistent policy of both Republican and Democratic administrations to maintain the Tariff Commission on an impartial basis.

The success of this policy is eloquently spoken for by the untarnished record of the Tariff Commission during the period it has administered these provisions of law. Untouched by the slightest blemish of scandal or prejudice, the Commission has operated efficiently and devotedly over these many years, efficiently carrying out the mandate of Congress.

Now it is proposed to set aside the years of experience with a bipartisan Tariff Commission, to turn our backs upon an administrative organization which has worked so successfully for such a long period, and to inject the Tariff Commission into the arena of politics—to make the Tariff Commission the subordinate agency of the party in power.

Naturally, the real reason for resorting to politics instead of sound legislation at this juncture is to insure the administrative defeat of the pending measure extending the reciprocal trade treaty powers. The foes of this legislation are so determined to thwart the will of Congress and of the people that they would have the purposes of the bill defeated even after it becomes the law of the land.

The tariff, Mr. Speaker, is, as Mr. Havemeyer, of the American Sugar Refining Co., once said, "the mother of trusts." Often by Government fiat, it erects a vast wall which insulates much of American business from effective competition. The idea that the tariff is a temporary expedient to succor small and infant domestic industry until it matures has long been abandoned to the concept that the tariff often is a legitimate Government weapon to guarantee the domestic market for big business. Today the Big Three in aluminum are protected from competition by the tariff; the Big Four rubber producers are protected against competition by a duty on tires and other rubber products. The tariff assists the big paper companies and the big soap companies in controlling prices on those products in the United States. The tariff is no longer in many instances a sheltering arm for small competitive enterprise but a device utilized to protect the concentrated market of big business against competition.

At the same time, our high tariff makes enemies abroad. Unless the powers to continue reciprocal-trade agreements are authorized by the basic legislation undiluted by such amendments as is here offered, the United States will be criticized throughout the world for making it virtually impossible for many nations to rehabilitate their economy through international trade. How can we at the same time demand that we cease to assist these countries financially because they should be required to rely upon their own economies and at the same time foreclose them from the very markets which they must have in order to dispose of their goods. This reasoning is so elementary that it should be self-evident. Yet the same voices who cry loudest for abandoning our foreign-aid program are the very ones which now speak out against programs for reducing our tariffs or attempt to hobble such programs with crippling amendments.

Mr. Speaker, our Tariff Commission must remain untarnished, unsullied with politics and partisanship.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT].

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

JOINT RESOLUTION FOR THE PROCLAMATION OF A NATIONAL DAY OF PRAYER AND REPARATION

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a joint resolution, calling upon the President of the United States to proclaim a national day of prayer and reparation.

The words of Abraham Lincoln's second inaugural address, from which I have drawn freely in writing the preamble to this resolution, express far more eloquently than could I, the purpose which such a day would serve at this hour of world history. As apt today as they were almost a century ago, Lincoln's words remind us that—

> We have been preserved these many years in peace and prosperity. We have grown in numbers, wealth, and power as no other nation has ever grown; but we have forgotten God. We have forgotten the gracious hand that preserved us in peace, and multiplied and enriched and strengthened us; and we have vainly imagined, in the deceitfulness of our hearts, that all these blessings were produced by some superior virtue and wisdom of our own. Intoxicated with unbroken success, we have become too self-sufficient to feel the necessity of redeeming and preserving grace, too proud to pray to the God that made us.
>
> It behooves us then—
>
> He said—
>
> to humble ourselves before the offended power, to confess our national sins, and to pray for clemency and forgiveness.

It is my deep conviction, Mr. Speaker, that we in the 20th century have forgotten God. New wealth and new blessings have come to us over the decades that would have astounded Lincoln, but he would find nothing new in the same presumptuous pride that afflicts us today.

After World War II we sought, through the United Nations, the establishment of enduring world peace. But we are, today as in Lincoln's day, too proud to pray to the God that made us, too proud

to ask the divine guidance to follow His law.

Blinded by our achievements, we have become an end unto ourselves, and so blinded we are destined forever to grope in vain for the peace that cannot be without Him.

In the deepest humility, I submit that, as a Nation, we should turn, for just 1 day, to Almighty God in suppliant prayer, asking His mercy and forgiveness, that we may realize with Lincoln "the sublime truth announced in Holy Scriptures and proven by all history, that these nations only are blessed."

House joint resolution requesting the President to issue a proclamation designating an appropriate day as a National Day of Prayer and Reparation

Whereas in the words of Abraham Lincoln's second inaugural address, "it is the duty of nations as well as of men to owe their dependence upon the overruling power of God; to confess their sins and transgressions in humble sorrow, yet with assured hope that genuine repentence will lead to mercy and pardon; and to recognize the sublime truth announced in the Holy Scriptures and proven by all history, that these nations only are blessed"; and

Whereas we have, as a nation, "forgotten the Gracious Hand that preserved us in peace, and multiplied and enriched and strengthened us; and we have vainly imagined, in the deceitfulness of our hearts, that all these blessings were produced by some superior virtue and wisdom of our own"; and

Whereas we have, as a nation, "become too self-sufficient to feel the necessity of redeeming and preserving Grace, too proud to pray to the God that made us"; and

Whereas we may justly fear that it is God's chastisement for our transgressions which we now suffer in the conflict in Korea and in the suspicion and ill will which divide mankind the world over; and

Whereas we should, as a nation, "humble ourselves before the Offended Power, to confess our national sins, and to pray for clemency and forgiveness": Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That the President of the United States is hereby authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating an appropriate day as a National Day of Prayer and Reparation and calling on the people of the United States to observe such day, and urging the participation of all Americans and all religious groups, regardless of sect or creed, in the observance of such day by such means as they may deem appropriate.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REAMS].

Mr. REAMS. 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 Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. REAMS. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 5495 is titled "a bill to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes." With the stated purposes of this bill I am in complete agreement. There was never a time when the extension of Reciprocal Trade Agreements was more important to this country. In my judgment we must continue to act more like a creditor nation and work toward a free trade policy with the rest of the world. It is only by giving the other nations of the world an opportunity to sell their products here that we can continue to sell United States products all over the world. The ruinous alternative is to continue to pauperize the world and impoverish ourselves by the "handout" program.

The reciprocal trade agreements offer a selective manner in which trade with other countries can be expanded on a controlled basis. There are industries and groups of workmen who must have some protection for the time being. This is, first, that we may not give to these industries and their skilled workmen too sudden a shock from outside competition. It is also that we may retain under a controlled basis a group of skilled workmen for certain products which may be needed for our national defense program. It is also for protection of products like tung oil which we may sorely need should we again be shut off from the Orient. With all of this I am in hearty agreement.

With that part of title II of this bill which changes the composition of the United States Tariff Commission from 6 bipartisan commissioners to 7 commissioners, I am in complete disagreement. A study of the history of the Tariff Commission, its purposes and its record of achievement since its inauguration in 1916 commends the continuation of this bipartisan type of a commission. It has from the time of its creation consisted of 6 commissioners, not more than 3 chosen from the same political party. Its members have been appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate for terms of 6 years. It has, insofar as I have been able to learn, operated as a truly bipartisan body, its activities being without political significance. The chairman and vice chairman have been chosen annually by the President from the membership of the commission.

If the provision in title II of the Reciprocal Trade Agreement Extention Act of 1953 becomes the law, the Tariff Commission will henceforth have 4 members from 1 of the political parties, presumably the majority party and 3 from the other. It will then become a political commission without any apparent cause or any need for such a change.

Operating within the executive department of the Government there are 9 regulatory commissions. These are policy-forming commissions that are actually a part of the executive branch of the Government. There is good reason for these commissions to recognize, at least to some extent, their responsibility to the Chief Executive. These regulatory commissions consist of the Federal Power Commission, the Federal Trade Commission, the Federal Communications Commission, the Civil Aeronautics Board, and others. They have an uneven number of members of whom more than one half may be members of the President's party.

The United States Tariff Commission was created and has operated for 37 years as a board of 6 members not more than 3 of whom are of the same political party. Its duties are and have been to investigate rather than to regulate. It is not a policymaking Commission and a Commission which is responsible both to the Congress and the President for the purpose of investigation into tariff problems and for giving accurate information to the executive department and to the Congress. The very nature of the duties and activities of the United States Tariff Commission forbids it to espouse political theories or policies. Its primary duties are to investigate and report its findings to the President, the House Ways and Means Committee and the Senate Finance Committee. The investigative duties of the Tariff Commission as set up by law and confirmed by its years of practice are:

First. To investigate the administration of the customs laws of the United States and their effect upon the economy of our country and the income of our people.

Second. To investigate the tariff relations between the United States and foreign countries, including commercial treaties, preferential provisions, and economic alliances. This includes a report on the volume of importations compared with domestic production, and the effect of competition of foreign industries on the United States production.

Third. Has the duty of surveying domestic and foreign industries and publishing a factual digest concerning more than 2,000 commodities with which our tariff laws are or may be concerned.

Fourth. To report the difference in production costs of similar articles produced in the United States and abroad in order to ascertain what effect the differential between wages paid in this country and other countries has on the cost of the product to the American people. This is very important under the flexible tariff provisions and our reciprocal-trade agreements. It also is important in discovering where protection may be needed.

In addition to these duties, the Tariff Commission has also been charged with securing information on unfair competition in import trading, ascertaining whether foreign countries practiced discrimination against the commerce of the United States, and the practical operation of our trade agreements including the Philippine Trade Act of 1946.

These are the bulk of the duties of the United States Tariff Commission. They are functions of investigating and reporting on the enumerated and other related matters. These subjects of investigation may originate with the members of the Commission or by request by committees of Congress and the President or members of his staff in the executive departments. There is every reason why this Commission should be kept completely bipartisan. Useful information is the same whether it is Republican or Democratic.

The Tariff Commission does not make any decisions wherein a deciding vote of an extra member of the Commission

is important to advance the political theory of any President and his party. If the United States Tariff Commission carries out its duties under the law and gathers the needed facts, these facts are exactly the same regardless of whether the Commission consists of 6 or 7 members and which party controls the majority at the time.

If the duties upon each Commissioner are so heavy that it is necessary to add additional Commissioners, then I would urge that two additional members be added and that the bipartisan aspect of the Commission be preserved. So far as I am able to learn or ascertain from a study of the Tariff Commission throughout its long and useful career, I find no other valid reason for increasing its number. I am opposed to the principle and the practice involved in this provision of the bill which would make a partisan board out of this bipartisan Tariff Commission.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SECREST].

Mr. SECREST. Mr. Speaker, in 1934 I voted against the first reciprocal-trade agreements bill, fearing what it would do to domestic industry in the United States. The facts, I think, have proven the results to be as I expected.

Mr. President, I do not oppose increasing the number of members on the Tariff Commission because I think it is so bad that you cannot make it any worse. I do not oppose a study of this whole problem because certainly there is no problem facing our people that requires more study. But I do want, in this brief time, to give you a picture of what is happening to the industries about which I know the most, the glass industry, the pottery industry, the tile industry, the coal and oil industries, all of which are of extreme importance in my district.

Mr. Speaker, we compete with cheap foreign labor; we not only compete with cheap foreign labor but we have other disadvantages in trying to meet price levels of imports. Let me give you the picture on glassware. In 1950, 23 million pieces of glassware came into this country. In 1952, just 2 years later, over 50 million pieces of glassware came into this country, and on the basis of February and March of this year, 130 million pieces of glassware will come in during 1953. Imagine! In 1950, 23 million pieces came from countries having cheap labor, and these are all handmade products in which labor is about 70 percent of the cost. In 1953, just 2 years later, it is estimated that 130 million pieces of glassware will be imported.

Let us look at pottery. In 1950, 175 million pieces of pottery came into this country, and it is estimated that 190 million pieces of pottery will come into this country this year.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SECREST. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. In 1952, 36 percent of all the pottery products consumed in this country were imported from abroad.

Mr. SECREST. If this policy of free trade keeps on they will all be imported from abroad. This year, at the rate of imports so far, 320 million pieces of pottery and glass will come into this country.

Look at the picture in tile. In 1950 we exported three times as much tile as we imported. In 1951, just the next year, we imported more tile than we exported. The tile business and the pottery and glass industries are being destroyed.

Now we are destroying in great measure, by importing last year 128 million barrels of residual fuel oil, coal mining and many other industries.

In 1952, $61 million worth of jeweled watches and watch movements were brought into this country, which I am told was over half the domestic consumption of those items. Over $5 million worth of motorcycle parts, and over $34 million worth of fish were brought in, to compete with the fisheries in California and other parts of this country. Cord and twine were brought in to the extent of over $3 million, and many, many other items were imported.

We thought we had gained a victory when we added the escape clause to the Tariff Act, but what happened? Twenty-six applications were filed in 1952 and relief was given only to two small industries. If this policy keeps on of giving money abroad out of the taxpayers' resources and at the same time destroying industry here at home, where will we be in another 20 years? A bankrupt Nation with no industry left to produce the wealth of the country or to defend ourselves in time of war.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SECREST. I want to show you two pieces of glassware. They are identical. One piece is produced in Bellaire, Ohio, being designed by men drawing large salaries. As soon as this was put on the market and a copy could be made, in came another one like it from Germany. This is made in the district next to mine at wages averaging $1.60 an hour, and it is made to sell for $1.25. This one was purchased in Macy's store. It is identical, and it was made in Germany, copied, for 80 cents. The people we compete against in connection with these handmade articles, pottery and glassware, motorcycles, and all the other things that have much labor involved in them, get about 25 percent the wages our people get. We are either going to have to bring our wages down, which no one wants to do, or bring their wages up, which we cannot do, or we have the alternative of going on a quota basis and saying that 5 percent of the pottery we will use or 10 percent of the glassware we use can come in from outside. If we do not do something of that kind, we will have lost all these industries.

I am speaking for those industries I know, but there are men here with many, many industries in their own districts that are being destroyed because we are trading machine-made goods for handmade goods. Every time you make a day's work by sending over mass-produced goods you put 10 people out of work in our own country for every day you gain. If we keep it up, there will not be anyone working in America. What will happen to our standard of living and to our potential if we get into another war? I think this thing needs a study if anything ever did. I am not hopeful unless they put someone on the Commission who really is sincere in trying to solve these problems. We all know we must have imports, but we do not want destructive imports to completely destroy an industry. I want another man on the Tariff Commission, but 7 baboons cannot teach school any better than 6, and unless we put a better man on the Commission than those we have, we are done in this country.

Mr. PERKINS. 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 Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I must protest this procedure whereby H. R. 5495 has been brought before the House subject to a closed rule, barring the consideration of amendments from the floor, except with reference to the proposal to add another member to the Tariff Commission. This action is contrary to the practice heretofore followed with respect to reciprocal trade agreement legislation—except during the 80th Congress—which has been considered by the House under open rule permitting amendments. There are many Members in this body who would like to have the opportunity to vote for a sound reciprocal trade bill, a bill of sufficient duration to give importers and exporters some assurance of stability.

Personally, I do not intend to go along and support this legislation unless this rule is defeated. I feel that we should have the opportunity to present the viewpoint of the coal people and the coal miners on this floor.

The adoption of this gag rule deprives the Members from the coal-producing areas of the opportunity to offer an amendment to H. R. 5495 so as to place a necessary limitation upon excessive imports of residual oil. This undemocratic and arbitrary foreclosure, denying the House its rightful opportunity to deal with this urgent and important problem is shameful.

I have personally advocated since the commencement of this session that the residual oil problem be treated separately, inasmuch as the coal industry is most vitally affected of all basic industries by the importation of residual oil. The committee declined to follow that procedure but decided to tie our problem up with numerous other industries, none of which face a critical situation comparable to the coal industry.

Another bill, H. R. 5496, contains provisions in section 322 which would place

reasonable limitations upon the dumping of surplus residual oil into this country. This bill contains the provision identical to the bills introduced by more than 20 Congressmen from the coal-producing areas. This double-play combination of a closed rule on H. R. 5495, and continuing inaction upon H. R. 5496, has bottled up efforts to provide a needed solution of the critical problem of excessive and increasing residual oil imports which are so seriously disrupting our domestic coal markets and depriving our miners of the opportunity to work in order to support their families and educate their children.

The plight of the coal industry and our miners resulting from swollen imports of residual fuel oil from the Caribbean area is a special problem not to be confused with the desirable objective of promoting beneficial international trade.

I have always supported legislation to further reciprocal trade agreements because I firmly believe that continued efforts to develop sound trade relations with other countries of the free world are absolutely essential to our own interests.

It is not right, however, to permit big oil to destroy the coal industry. Huge volumes of residual oil dumped as a waste byproduct at any price it will bring in our fuel markets do not provide a solid base for international trade. This mounting flood of residual oil from a single producing area is an exceptional problem which requires corrective action without further delay. We must act upon this problem now with proper recognition of the indispensability of our coal industry and our coal miners to the long-range needs of the domestic fuel economy and our national security.

Consider what the situation will be in the unhappy event of a future emergency, if we continue recklessly to depend upon erratic supplies of residual fuel oil now being dumped expediently on our shores while our own vital coal industry has been allowed to suffer attrition.

Let us not forget also that during World War II, with a much larger number of miners than now, there was such a shortage of manpower that we deferred thousands as more essential in the mines than in the Armed Forces. Mr. Speaker, the miners, not only in Kentucky, but throughout the Nation, have been waiting patiently for the opportunity to present their case to this body. These laboring people and the coal industry deserve just and equitable treatment. They are entitled to their day in court. The protests and warnings of the miners and the coal industry, as presented to the committee, are being ignored. The unfortunate consequence of the proposed closed rule which has been handed down on H. R. 5495 deprives the Members of Congress of the opportunity of offering amendments to deal with this problem which vitally concerns the Nation as a whole.

Let us vote against this rule in order that this House may have the opportunity to work out a sound reciprocal trade bill, and, at the same time, do something to improve the serious situation in the coal industry.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BAILEY) there were—ayes 120, noes 14.

So the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5495) to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 5495, with Mr. HOEVEN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the bill H. R. 5495, the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1953, is the ninth extension of the act since its original enactment in 1934. The purposes of H. R. 5495 are clearly set forth in the committee report which accompanied the bill. I shall quote from the committee report as follows:

1. Extend until June 12, 1954, the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, to enter into trade agreements as requested by the President;

2. Reduce from 1 year to 9 months the period within which the Tariff Commission must make its investigation and report on application for relief under the escape clause;

3. Increase the membership of the Tariff Commission from 6 to 7;

4. Establish a temporary bipartisan commission to be known as the "Commisison on Foreign Economic Policy" which will provide the mechanism for a thorough examination of our foreign economic policy as recommended by the President.

From the day of the enactment of the Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act in 1934 and even prior to its enactment, a torrent of propaganda was poured through churches, schools, patriotic societies, the press and magazines, urging its enactment as a cure for the so-called emergency of the moment namely "a depression."

The free-trade advocates in 1934 argued that its sole purpose was to rebuild domestic economy by encouraging exports.

I am including at the close of my remarks some tables which show that the increased exports about which the free-trade sponsors of the 1934 act bragged were in fact war supplies exported to aggressors who were then preparing for war. The increased exports stockpiled the aggressor nations.

I call the attention of the Members of the House to the following analysis of the arguments officially advanced by the executive branch to the Congress in support of the reciprocal-trade program since 1934. It will be noted that each time the question of its renewal was before the Congress, it was urged that the program was an indispensable part of any policy designed to remedy whatever emergency was facing the country at the moment.

Year	Emergency confronting United States	Argument for program
1934	Depression	Sole purpose is to rebuild domestic economy by encouraging exports.
1937	Threat of wars abroad	Will help to preserve world peace through increased international trade.
1940	War in Europe, fear of United States being involved.	Will not involve United States in war. Will help build enduring peace for this Nation and the world.
1943	Winning the war and establishing lasting peace.	Failure to extend agreement would discourage our allies. Agreement essential to lasting peace.
1945	Establishing a lasting peace and post-war prosperity.	Indispensable to world peace. Essential to domestic prosperity. We will have to find foreign markets for our surplus production. (NOTE.—Cost our taxpayers $45 billion in aid to find markets.)
1947	Threat of new world war	War dislocations have resulted in widespread world poverty tending toward war. Reciprocal trade agreement program will spread wealth throughout the world.
1948	Threat of new world war continues	Trade agreement program only way United States can contribute its full share to sound economy and peace.
1949	Threat of new world war; concern with mounting cost of foreign aid.	Trade agreement program is necessary to protect our tremendous investments abroad. It will promote world economic recovery and peace.
1951	Menace of aggressive communism	Agreements will strengthen free world.
1953	Time of peril	"The long-term economic stability of the whole free world and the overriding question of world peace will be heavily influenced by the wisdom of our decision."

NOTE.—On Dec. 7, 1941, the United States was involved at Pearl Harbor. Not counting ships and planes, our losses were as follows: Navy: 2,117 officers and men killed; 960 men missing; 876 wounded. Army: 226 officers and men killed, 396 men wounded.

Without our exports to Japan this tragedy would not have occurred.

Japan not a signatory to an agreement, yet she had the benefit of the most-favored-nation clause in stockpiling with our exports.

I do not like subterfuge, specious arguments, hypocrisy, and bad faith with reference to trade agreements or any other legislation. The record shows, and by now it ought to be obvious to every thoughtful citizen, that the trade agreements have never contributed to world peace, yet that has been the main argument and emotional appeal by those urging the legislation and its extensions.

Now, what are the facts? As I have previously mentioned, the arguments have been repeatedly advanced by the proponents of the reciprocal trade program that the increased international trade claimed to have resulted therefrom was a basic factor in maintaining world peace. The fact is, however, that there has never been a period in world history when wars have been more numerous and more costly in blood and treasure than the period from 1934 to date. The reciprocal trade program has not resulted in peace for this Nation nor for the world.

I say to you that despite the dogmatism with which, over the years, the sponsors of the program have insisted that it was a vital factor in world peace, the facts are otherwise.

The figures show that the insatiable desire to the proponents to promote exports at any cost has made it possible for our enemies to obtain from our own shores the war materials which they needed in order to wage aggressive war.

What does the record show with reference to our exports to aggressors? From 1935 through 1940 we exported to Japan war material worth $949,018,892. Yes; and from 1935 through 1939 we exported war materials worth $323,099,694 to Germany, and war material worth $243,334,099 to Italy.

It was the exports of war material to Japan that made possible the war between Japan and the United States.

Faced with the deplorable facts that we exported from 1937 to 1939, inclusive, an average in each year of war materials worth $63,670,697 to Germany; $64,662,000 of war materials to Italy, and $176,948,579 worth of war materials to Japan, the proponents of the reciprocal trade program have shrugged their shoulders. They point out proudly that we did not have any reciprocal trade agreements with Germany, Italy, or Japan. But what they fail to mention is that our enemies did greatly benefit from the reciprocal trade-agreement program. The enemy nations benefited by getting the war material from the United States, and they also benefited financially. This is because each nation, whether or not it was a party to a trade agreement with us, received all the tariff-rate benefits that were awarded to any nation in any agreement.

Thus, over 100 different categories of products which were actually imported into this country from Japan since 1934 and prior to 1939 in amounts of $2,000 or more, received the benefit of reduced rates under trade agreements which we had entered into with other countries.

These rate reductions made it highly advantageous for the Japanese to get dollars to purchase war materials to wage World War II.

In view of the facts just mentioned, it is not surprising to find that the Japanese were able to import from us $530,845,737 worth of war materials in the period 1937 to 1939 which was 40 percent more than in the period of 1932 to 1934 which preceded the initiation of the trade-agreement program.

Similarly, Italy which also was able to take advantage of the myriad rate reductions granted in agreements with other countries found the dollars with which to purchase from us $150,217,263 worth of war materials in the period 1937 to 1939 which was 21 percent more than Italy purchased in the period 1932 to 1934.

Now, here is a most interesting and striking fact. Unlike Italy and Japan, Germany was unable to take advantage of the reduced tariff rates afforded by the reciprocal trade-agreement program because, effective October 15, 1935, we refused to allow her products to enter this country at the reduced rates. We find, in the case of Germany, that her imports of war materials from us decreased by 18 percent during the period 1937 to 1939, when she was actively preparing for war under Hitler, as compared to the period 1932 to 1934. In other words, where the aggressor nations were able to take advantage of the reciprocal trade program they were able to substantially increase their imports of war materials from us.

In the case where they were unable to avail themselves of the program, such as Germany when she was preparing for war more intensively than any of the others, the exports of war materials actually decreased. If Japan and Italy and other aggressor nations had not been assisted by the reciprocal-trade-agreements program in getting dollars which they needed to buy war materials from us; if a determined effort by the past administration had not been made to promote exports of any kind at any cost to almost every nation, regardless of the damage to domestic industry and to domestic self-sufficiency, I am convinced that Japanese aggression against this country would have been prevented.

The facts presented, I am forced to conclude that the reciprocal-trade-agreements program made a ghastly contribution to World War II.

The reciprocal-trade-agreements program, stripped of its mask of hypocrisy, is nothing more than a back-door approach to free trade.

The proposed extension can be justified only by the proposal to extend it for 1 year, during which time the subject of foreign-trade policy can be studied by the Commission to be appointed, as recommended by the President, and also on the proposal to increase the membership of the Tariff Commission from 6 to 7. This increase in membership will prevent tie decisions on peril-point cases.

If H. R. 5496, which gives certain tariff relief to domestic industries now hard pressed by foreign imports, were being considered, I would support it. It is my hope that H. R. 5496 may yet be brought to the floor for action.

Here are the figures with respect to the exports of war materials to which I have referred:

Table A shows the exports of war materials to Germany, Italy, and Japan, from 1936 through 1939 in the cases of Germany and Italy, and for the period 1936 through 1940 in the case of Japan.

Tables B and C, prepared by Harold T. Lamar, Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, show the exports of these same war materials to the same three countries for the years 1932 through 1935.

Table D analyzes the foreign trade of the United States with Germany, Italy, and Japan for the years 1932 through 1934, when the reciprocal-trade-agreements program was not in operation, and the years 1937 through 1939, when the program was in full operation.

Table E shows the total exports of war materials in dollars to Germany, Italy, and Japan for the years 1935 through 1939, in the cases of Germany and Italy, and the years 1935 through 1940, in the case of Japan.

Table F shows the total exports from this country of war materials to all countries for the years 1929 through 1939.

It should be noted that the war materials referred to in tables B through E are those identified in table A. The classification of war materials in table F is different in a few minor respects.

TABLE A.—*Exports of certain war materials to Germany, Italy, and Japan*

Commodity	1936			1937		
	Germany	Italy	Japan	Germany	Italy	Japan
Raw cotton:						
Bales	719,327	339,520	1,356,060	888,261	539,721	918,949
Dollars	47,539,855	22,766,839	88,337,929	52,862,082	33,687,832	62,616,417
Petroleum and products: Dollars	19,409,249	9,009,811	28,873,205	19,707,549	12,108,713	41,530,749
Aviation gasoline [1]						
Iron and steel scrap:						
Tons	7,000	285,000	1,010,000	88,000	381,000	1,873,000
Dollars	122,000	3,564,000	11,897,000	1,610,000	6,640,000	37,418,000
Steel ingots, blooms, etc.:						
Tons	None	None	6,002	None	None	208,037
Dollars			123,327			8,902,847
Tinplate:						
Pounds	12,499	205	40,329,895	217,351	13,501,114	94,402,962
Dollars	508	10	1,681,191	10,459	755,766	4,442,819

[1] Not given separately.

TABLE A.—*Exports of certain war materials to Germany, Italy, and Japan*—Continued

Commodity	1936			1937		
	Germany	Italy	Japan	Germany	Italy	Japan
Tinplate, scrap:						
Tons	None	None	13,662	None	None	14,126
Dollars			253,069			246,770
Copper, refined:						
Pounds	65,278,609	47,700,894	79,852,142	75,070,191	41,624,043	145,688,933
Dollars	6,041,037	4,483,789	7,292,977	9,971,923	5,482,976	17,997,004
Copper scrap:						
Pounds	13,947,584	None	5,355,471	23,715,774	276,057	10,838,709
Dollars	1,109,983		431,728	2,551,764	38,738	1,215,430
Motortrucks, buses, etc.:						
Number	27	378	7,769	97	95	10,462
Dollars	19,079	311,092	2,594,696	79,420	64,472	3,875,283
Aircraft and parts: Dollars	411,252	631,270	989,100	1,026,947	470,131	2,483,946
Firearms and ammunition: Dollars	11,156	None	11,037	10,439	65	49,965
Machine tools: Dollars	22,433	104,792	105,211	18,252	26,390	60,113

Commodity	1938			1939			1940 [2]
	Germany	Italy	Japan	Germany	Italy	Japan	Japan
Raw cotton:							
Bales	394,949	402,527	1,049,773	374,344	368,051	829,000	
Dollars	18,271,000	19,794,107	53,221,192	19,948,423	19,542,436	42,498,000	29,566,000
Petroleum and products: Dollars	24,262,928	14,152,852	49,567,108	13,604,641	13,925,853	45,285,009	54,600,000
Aviation gasoline:							
Barrels	None	None	None	23,646	4,711	555,456	776,499
Dollars				88,318	10,866	5,013,614	3,220,553
Iron and steel scrap:							
Tons	231,000	436,000	1,365,721	16,584	425,896	2,035,000	963,000
Dollars	3,046,000	6,061,000	21,685,100	238,145	6,335,496	32,732,000	17,082,000
Steel ingots, blooms, etc.:							
Tons	None	None	97,713	None	384	144,000	285,000
Dollars			3,397,333		12,244	5,639,000	8,763,000
Tin plate:							
Pounds	114,870	151,708	28,263,158	None	None	642,000	21,216,000
Dollars	4,440	8,429	1,631,366			29,000	1,112,000
Tin plate, scrap:							
Tons	None	None	12,495	None	None	10,699	4,269
Dollars			227,874			200,497	79,689
Copper, refined:							
Pounds	148,665,920	43,747,205	217,879,738	42,568,111	56,028,758	249,277,000	233,897,000
Dollars	14,871,930	4,295,196	21,813,071	4,340,771	5,937,419	27,567,000	24,621,000
Copper scrap:							
Pounds	23,678,355	2,639,365	3,804,560	11,049,580	3,986,127	9,882,000	6,815,000
Dollars	1,967,323	64,153	350,707	931,021	426,735	983,000	715,000
Motortrucks, busses, etc.:							
Number	1,025	35	5,804	124	13	2,427	58
Dollars	824,086	27,108	2,129,287	127,396	10,783	969,000	198,000
Aircraft and parts: Dollars	580,040	187,005	11,062,777	90,780	81,286	3,306,000	933,000
Firearms and ammunition: Dollars	24,845	125	100,365	18,532	32,710	761,684	4,143
Machine tools: Dollars	9,855	25,227	6,857	800	11,150	19,811,526	17,051,359

[2] There were practically no experts to Germany in 1940 or to Italy after the first 5 months.

NOTE.—Official figures giving exports of individual commodities by countries were discontinued in March 1941.

TABLE B

Commodity	1932			1934		
	Germany	Italy	Japan	Germany	Italy	Japan
Raw cotton:						
Bales	1,741,599	697,074	2,248,997	739,773	492,583	1,737,101
Dollars	67,624,264	27,023,646	85,921,334	44,947,706	31,915,790	112,178,330
Petroleum and products: Dollars	8,019,160	5,619,745	15,524,341	11,511,470	6,061,861	21,052,163
Aviation gasoline						
Iron and steel scrap:						
Tons	134	6,678	164,001	10,883	225,644	1,168,496
Dollars	8,390	37,421	1,325,464	122,643	2,226,712	12,427,799
Steel ingots, blooms, etc.:						
Tons	9				7	5,040
Dollars	850				701	127,724
Tin plate:						
Pounds		39,998	15,809,419		3,624,998	90,082,404
Dollars		1,187	580,292		131,835	3,628,315
Tin-plate, scrap: [1]						
Tons	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)
Dollars						
Copper, refined:						
Pounds	30,447,338	23,344,238	448,041	72,761,664	43,041,104	113,769,412
Dollars	1,828,128	1,444,003	33,603	5,715,954	3,211,793	8,266,479
Copper scrap:						
Pounds	19,120,592	208,933	2,715,885	10,126,806	70,675	4,827,634
Dollars	1,136,595	14,650	139,730	700,892	5,411	322,965
Aircraft and parts: Dollars	192,501	3,696	366,950	1,761,607	107,295	320,562
Firearms and ammunition: Dollars	6,102	3,391	3,758	9,107	4,342	5,764
Machine tools: Dollars	36,077	32,142	38,065	63,405	30,529	66,202
Motortrucks, buses, etc.: Dollars	14,311	67,408	979,677	35,978	67,974	3,139,454

[1] Included in iron and steel scrap, not separately classified.

TABLE C

Commodity	1933			1935		
	Germany	Italy	Japan	Germany	Italy	Japan
Raw cotton:						
Bales	1,653,098	803,700	1,813,845	590,184	451,575	1,517,997
Dollars	77,106,754	37,501,111	86,699,273	38,452,681	29,935,050	98,596,883
Petroleum and products: Dollars	9,810,577	5,575,404	14,440,009	14,018,950	9,798,905	25,650,244
Aviation gasoline						
Iron and steel scrap:						
Tons	14,111	114,419	547,539	4,113	382,772	1,065,143
Dollars	162,099	858,739	4,738,917	99,142	4,164,559	10,813,964
Steel ingots, blooms, etc.:						
Tons	8			70		30,868
Dollars	750			1,275		598,192
Tin plate:						
Pounds		5,841,477	53,632,500	225	5,887,388	48,269,007
Dollars		208,827	1,924,639	13	233,165	1,874,099
Tin plate scrap:						
Tons					2	31,961
Dollars					30	661,482
Copper refined:						
Pounds	34,762,322	30,037,514	28,158,249	49,832,842	90,493,875	106,265,391
Dollars	2,523,043	2,026,793	1,589,136	3,822,008	6,746,111	7,888,379
Copper scrap:						
Pounds	8,927,880	113,005	7,399,436	11,701,869	13,331	3,243,049
Dollars	489,932	5,608	392,263	765,219	920	228,697
Motortrucks, buses, etc.: Dollars	2,833	10,708	1,238,889	16,902	539,490	2,834,813
Aircraft and parts: Dollars	349,539	21,005	339,208	195,464	789,826	950,377
Firearms and ammunition: Dollars	8,626	3,674	6,947	21,472	394	6,448
Machine tools: Dollars	36,710	12,937	34,562	8,025	36,703	80,363

TABLE D.—*Comparison of United States exports, exports of certain "war materials" and imports for the 3-year periods, 1932–34 and 1937–39, United States exports to and imports from Germany, Italy, and Japan*

GERMANY

Year	United States exports of "war materials" to Germany	Total United States exports to Germany	United States imports from Germany
1932	$78,866,378	$133,668,000	$73,572,000
1933	90,490,863	140,024,000	78,185,000
1934	64,868,762	108,738,000	68,805,000
Total, 3 years	234,226,003	382,430,000	220,562,000
1937	87,848,835	126,343,000	92,468,000
1938	63,862,747	107,130,000	64,550,000
1939	39,300,509	46,475,000	52,448,000
Total, 3 years	191,012,091	279,948,000	209,466,000
Average for 3 years, 1932–34	78,075,334	127,476,667	73,520,667
Average for 3 years, 1937–39	63,670,697	93,316,000	69,822,000
Percent decrease 1937–39 over 1932–34	18	27	5

TABLE D.—*Comparison of United States exports, exports of certain "war materials" and imports for the 3-year periods, 1932–34 and 1937–39, United States exports to and imports from Germany, Italy, and Japan*—Continued

ITALY

Year	United States exports of "war materials" to Italy	Total United States exports to Italy	United States imports from Italy
1932	$34,247,289	$49,135,000	$42,403,000
1933	46,224,806	61,240,000	38,571,000
1934	43,764,243	64,578,000	35,749,000
Total, 3 years	124,236,338	174,953,000	116,723,000
1937	59,275,083	76,830,000	48,170,000
1938	44,615,202	58,292,000	41,241,000
1939	46,326,978	58,864,000	39,922,000
Total, 3 years	150,217,263	193,986,000	129,333,000
Average for 3 years, 1932–34	41,412,113	58,317,667	38,907,667
Average for 3 years, 1937–39	50,072,421	64,662,000	43,111,000
Percent increase, 1937–39 over 1932–34	21	11	11

TABLE D.—*Comparison of United States exports, exports of certain "war materials" and imports for the 3-year periods, 1932–34 and 1937–39, United States exports to and imports from Germany, Italy, and Japan*—Continued

JAPAN

Year	United States exports of "war materials" to Japan	Total United States exports to Japan	United States imports from Japan
1932	$104,913,214	$134,921,000	$134,011,000
1933	111,403,843	143,435,000	128,418,000
1934	161,535,757	210,480,000	119,251,000
Total, 3 years	377,852,814	488,836,000	381,680,000
1937	180,839,343	288,558,000	204,201,000
1938	165,193,073	239,662,000	126,762,000
1939	184,813,321	232,184,000	161,212,000
Total, 3 years	530,845,737	760,404,000	492,175,000
Average for 3 years, 1932–34	125,950,938	162,945,333	127,226,667
Average for 3 years, 1937–39	176,948,579	253,346,000	164,058,333
Percent increase 1937–39 over 1932–34	40	55	29

TABLE E.—*Total exports of war materials to Germany, Italy, and Japan*

To Germany (1935 through 1939)	$323,099,694
To Italy (1935 through 1939)	243,334,019
To Japan (1935 through 1940)	949,018,892
Grand total	1,515,452,605

TABLE F

[Value in thousands of dollars]

Commodity	1929	1932	1933	1934	1935	1936	1937	1938	1939
Aircraft parts and accessories: Value	$9,126	$7,946	$9,181	$17,663	$14,292	$23,143	$39,404	$68,228	$117,806
Motortrucks:									
Number	196,760	24,964	43,516	92,723	99,080	106,239	166,167	115,788	115,301
Value	$111,435	$11,716	$20,113	$44,207	$50,582	$54,961	$100,376	$72,220	$69,622
Iron and steel scrap:									
Thousand tons	557	228	773	1,835	2,079	1,892	4,062	2,987	3,559
Value	$7,748	$1,859	$6,874	$19,188	$21,500	$22,049	$76,810	$45,155	$54,790
Pig iron:									
Tons	46,357	2,324	2,750	4,096	4,107	5,316	782,436	432,857	177,023
Value	$830	$54	$64	$97	$96	$119	$19,403	$7,135	$3,436
Steel ingots:									
Tons	42,578	1,627	3,169	19,586	39,782	20,400	338,722	167,641	215,778
Value	$1,500	$64	$114	$577	$901	$607	$13,392	$5,905	$8,124
Petroleum and products: Value	$561,191	$208,381	$200,016	$227,537	$250,327	$263,149	$376,239	$388,606	$383,122
Nonferrous metals (except precious) including aluminum, copper, zinc, lead, nickel, and brass: Value	$238,815	$33,210	$36,946	$68,276	$69,066	$76,217	$129,245	$117,664	$151,919
Steel sheets (black ungalvanized, and not containing alloys): Value	$14,307	$2,844	$2,465	$6,025	$6,550	$10,003	$22,464	$15,155	$18,456

TABLE F—Continued

[Value in thousands of dollars]

Commodity	1929	1932	1933	1934	1935	1936	1937	1938	1939
Munitions, gunpowder, etc.: Value[1]	$7,250	$2,362	$3,555	$4,385	$4,284	$6,020	$7,672	$10,305	$7,780
Tractors and parts: Value	$75,224	$5,096	$6,252	$11,926	$18,609	$28,750	$52,859	$51,421	$47,989
Passenger cars and chassis (new):									
Number	339,617	40,656	63,754	143,914	172,572	179,957	229,186	161,612	137,866
Value	$234,539	$23,286	$31,805	$77,783	$94,511	$103,024	$134,815	$100,143	$84,658
Raw cotton, except linters:									
Thousands of pounds	3,884,766	4,714,631	4,411,597	3,028,802	3,084,719	2,826,078	3,034,779	2,288,437	2,404,493
Value	$764,760	$343,182	$395,168	$397,165	$383,398	$353,822	$360,023	$224,293	$239,222
Total value	$2,026,725	$640,000	$712,553	$874,829	$914,116	$941,864	$1,332,702	$1,106,230	$1,186,924

[1] Includes light arms (revolvers, rifles, etc.), machine guns, and heavy ordnance guns, cartridges, shells, gunpowder, dynamite, and other explosives.

Source: Foreign Commerce and Navigation of the United States, 1929, 1932-39, U. S. Department of Commerce.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the time is very limited for the consideration of this very important bill. Many requests have been made by Members for time to speak on this bill, so in view of that situation I shall only ask your indulgence long enough to make a brief statement.

Mr. Chairman, it is rather interesting to note in passing that the situation exists on this bill as it has throughout this session of Congress, the distinguished chairman of the committee speaking in opposition to the program recommended by the President of the United States. We have had that type of situation existing all along during this session. The bill H. R. 5495 was favorably reported by the Committee on Ways and Means by a vote of 23 to 2.

Mr. Chairman, this bill includes four provisions:

First. It extends the present Trade Agreements Act for a period of 1 year.

Second. It reduces the time for the Tariff Commission to make its reports to the President under the escape clause provision from the present 1 year to 9 months.

Third. It provides for an increase in the membership of the Tariff Commission from the present six to seven members, and increases the term from 6 to 7 years, and provides that not more than four of the members of the Tariff Commission shall be members of one political party.

Fourth. It provides for the Commission, as recommended by the President, to make a comprehensive study of the foreign-trade policy of this country.

This bill is in response to a special message by the President of the United States to the Congress, which was submitted here immediately following the Easter recess.

Mr. Chairman, since its inception in 1934, the trade-agreements program has been the cornerstone of our foreign-trade policy. I have always strongly supported this program. It is my conviction that, judged in the light of its contribution to the prosperity and economic welfare of our country and the free nations of the world, it is one of the greatest programs ever adopted by the Congress.

The trade-agreements program has been an essential collateral to our foreign-aid programs, such as the Marshall plan and the program under the North Atlantic Treaty Organization setup. It has contributed very materially to the economic strength and solvency of the free nations of the world, while at the same time imposing a deterrent upon communistic aggression from without and subversion from within.

Trade agreements have been to the mutual advantage of all contracting parties. Under the trade-agreements program, our exports to countries with which we had trade agreements had increased about 60 percent from the inception of the program until the outbreak of World War II, while our exports to "nonagreement countries" had increased only about 30 percent. In this same period, imports from agreement countries increased about 20 percent, compared to an increase of only about 10 percent from nonagreement countries.

They have made foreign markets accessible to our farmers and other domestic producers, which we would never have gained otherwise. This has been beneficial to all elements of our economy—labor, industry, and agriculture alike—and has contributed greatly to our internal strength.

In 1951, our exports represented 8.9 percent of our production of movable goods. In money, this amounted to around $15 billion, $4 billion in agricultural products and $11 billion in nonagricultural products. The $4 billion in farm exports equaled the combined farm income of New York, North Carolina, Indiana, and Kansas, and the production of 53 million acres of farm land. We exported about one-third of our total production of cotton, wheat, flue-cured tobacco, rice, dried whole milk, dried peas, and grain sorghums, and more than one-fifth of our total production of soybeans, dried fruits, hops, lard, and tobacco of all types. Even from this partial list of our farm exports, we can see that nearly every State has a large production of at least one farm product which is vitally dependent upon exports. One dollar out of every eight dollars of the income of farmers came from exports. Stated in another way, income from exports averaged $1,100 for each commercial farm in the United States.

Of our total production of nonagricultural commodities in 1951, exports in some cases ran as high as 41 percent. This was true in the case of sardines. In the case of road graders, we exported 30 percent of our total production; in the case of tractors, 21 percent; trucks, 16 percent; refrigerators, 14 percent; and machine tools, 11 percent. Most of these industries were running at full capacity. We can see that if their export markets were lost, the cutback in their production could run as high as 41 percent.

These figures indicate the importance of our export trade to our economy. It has been estimated that if there should be a decline in the exports of farm products so as to increase the supply available to our domestic market by only 7 or 8 percent, farm prices would fall as much as one-third. Repercussions from such an event would be a severe blow to our entire economy, since, as we all know, when our farm economy suffers, economic reverberations are country-wide.

At a time when our defense preparedness program is about to reach its peak, and when it appears that foreign aid has been successful in rehabilitating the war-torn economies of many friendly foreign nations, it is more than ever necessary to reaffirm our determination to continue the trade agreements program in our own self-interest, and in the interest of constructive and cooperative international effort and relations.

We must foster well-balanced, self-sustaining and mutually beneficial international trade, since the international economic policies and relations of the United States are one of the main foundations not only of our own national security and prosperity, but of the security and prosperity of all the friendly nations of the world. Since we have got these nations to cast their lot with us in our fight against world communism, we must assure them that they will not find us returning to economic isolation.

I am quite agreeable to a 1-year extension of the President's authority to enter trade agreements, as proposed in the bill under consideration. However, I very strenously oppose title II of this bill, which would make a fundamental and basic change in the Tariff Commission from its present nonpartisan, fact-finding nature to a partisan, political nature.

From the very beginning of the Tariff Commission in 1916, Congress has very carefully and purposefully intended that the Tariff Commission be independent of politics and objective in its functions. I quote from a letter from President Wilson to the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, recommending the establishment of a permanent Tariff Commission, dated January 24, 1916.

What we need would be, above all things else, a board (tariff board) as much as possible free from any strong prepossession in favor of any political policy and capable of looking at the whole economic situation of the country with a dispassionate and disinterested scrutiny.

Partisan politics has no business whatever in determining the composition of the Tariff Commission. The Commission's function should continue to be the ascertainment of economic facts by qualified, experienced and objective staff personnel and members. In 1929, an attempt was made to change the nonpartisan nature of the Tariff Commission, and the attempt was very roundly defeated.

This proposal to change the Tariff Commission from a nonpartisan fact-finding body to a partisan body is sponsored by those who have been known as opponents to the Trade Agreements Program from its very inception.

The main argument advanced for this proposal to "pack" the Tariff Commission is that it would avoid evenly-split decisions in escape-clause proceedings. There is certainly no precedent for this, because findings in escape-clause proceedings by the Tariff Commission have always been either unanimous or by a majority vote. When this argument fails, this provision stands out even more prominently in its true light, as an attempt by economic isolationists to do indirectly what the Congress has not permitted them to do directly.

I feel it my duty to point out that many persons feel that it would be better not to renew the President's authority to enter reciprocal trade agreements at all, if it is not possible to renew his authority without changing the traditional and historical nature of the Tariff Commission. The reason for this position is that there are no plans to negotiate new trade agreements in the coming year, and to renew the President's authority while at the same time changing the Tariff Commission to a political body will give the opponents of the trade agreements program an opportunity to eat away at existing trade agreements, and eventually destroy them.

It is my fervent hope, as one who has always supported the trade agreements program, that the provision increasing the Tariff Commission from 6 to 7 members will be stricken from the bill.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES].

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, within the next few weeks the fishing industry in New England will appeal to the Tariff Commission for relief to determine whether the increases in imports into this country cause serious injury to the domestic fishing industry producing like or competitive products.

As a consequence of the last appeal, the Tariff Commission refused the request for relief on September 4, 1952, by a split decision. It is my firm belief that the more damaging effect of recent imports should persuade the majority to change its opinion when the new testimony is presented. It is quite obvious to me, and to members of the fishing industry, that this business cannot possibly survive if the imports continue to increase as they have in recent years. In the year 1940, only 10 million pounds of ground fish fillets came into this country, and it represented only 10 percent of domestic consumption. In 1951 87 million pounds were imported and represented 37 percent of the domestic consumption, and in 1952, 107 million pounds of fish were imported, which represented over 45 percent of the domestic consumption. Many of the firms, both large and small, in Gloucester, Mass., sustained large losses a year ago and indications are, at the moment, that the losses will be more substantial during the present year.

As a result of the tremendous imports of a year ago, the storage of frozen fillets in the United States amounted to 51 million pounds in January of 1953, while in January of 1952 they only amounted to 33 million pounds. The 5-year average of fish holdings amounted to only 29 million pounds. Because of this, landings in Gloucester, Mass., which had amounted to 91 million pounds in the January-May period of 1951, and 58 million pounds in the January-May period of 1952, amounted to only 42 million pounds for the 6 months of the present year. Production of fish has also steadily declined. In the month of May 1951, in Gloucester production amounted to 27 million pounds. In 1952 it was 21 million pounds. In May of this year, production amounted to only 16 million pounds.

This appeal to the Tariff Commission will undoubtedly be the last one because if a favorable decision is not granted, the domestic fishing industry may close its doors and thus sadly end 329 years of fishing from that port. Unless some consideration is given, the industry will be faced with extinction and thousands of our people will become unemployed.

There is no basic controversy toward the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Act. The only opposition revolves on the proposal to increase the number on the Commission from 6 to 7 members. I am strongly in favor of this amendment and believe that the membership should be increased to an odd number. I can think of nothing more frustrating than to have the people of my district make their appeal and to receive the result of a 3-to-3 decision. Whatever opinion the Tariff Commission makes of the facts that will be presented to them, I say let that be a firm and clear-cut decision, not one that is evenly divided. Almost all Government activities which are established to make decisions have an odd number of members, so there is ample precedent established in this respect, although it has been said here today that this would establish a precedent. Rather the opposite is true. There are ample precedents in having an odd number of members on Government fact-finding boards, namely: 11, Interstate Commerce Commission; 5, Federal Power Commission; 7, Federal Communications Commission; 5, Federal Trade Commission; 3, Civil Service Commission; 5, Securities and Exchange Commission; 3, War Claims Commission.

This same situation should prevail on the Tariff Commission, and I strongly urge the House to accept the proposed amendment in order that the Tariff Commission may render unequivocal verdicts.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS].

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, I was a little amused a few minutes ago when my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER] joked a little with Mr. REED about his regularity. Mr. REED, because of his seniority, his high character, and ability, meets all the qualifications of a capable and eminent statesman.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER] said something about agricultural exports; and I assume that he was referring to the period of the last 3 or 4 years. I should like to have the gentleman discuss, and I should like to point out with him, the fact that a large part of the agricultural exports since April 1948, and up to last year were paid for by the American taxpayers, and given away to various countries of the world. I shall just cite three of them.

What: The American taxpayers paid for $1,600,000,000 worth of wheat; $1,200,000,000 worth of cotton; and $450,000,000 worth of tobacco. These were all given away to these other countries, but were calculated in the figures presented by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER].

Mr. JENKINS. I am glad to have the gentleman's contribution, and I shall just take enough time to say that the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota appeared before the Ways and Means Committee when we were having public hearings on the bill H. R. 4294. He gave what I thought was a most lucid and complete dissertation with respect to the rights and problems of the farmers of this country. It is unfortunate that that bill we were then considering was divided into two bills, one of which we are considering here today.

I should like to talk to you, my colleagues, just in an informal way as though we were talking shop. The predecessor of the present Simpson bill was H. R. 4294. That is the number of the bill about which you have been receiving so many letters for several weeks. That bill was prepared with the greatest care and with the finest purposes in mind. It was not only Mr. Simpson's bill, but it was the bill of all of the Republican members of the Ways and Means Committee. That was in part the bill of some of the leading authorities in the country on the subject of the reciprocal trade agreements program. Our purpose was to prepare a bill that would meet the situation that was confronting the country and involving our economic, financial, and national welfare.

We had 5 or 6 meetings when we were preparing that piece of legislation. They were not secret meetings. They were not for the purpose of binding anybody. It was a meeting for the purpose of trying to find out just what was going on in the country, and what the different in-

dustries wanted, and what the people wanted to be included in the bill. We agreed on about what the substance of that bill should be and Mr. SIMPSON introduced H. R. 4294 on March 30, 1953.

Great interest in that bill was manifested immediately by many persons and groups that knew what it was all about. Among these groups were those interested in the coal industry which is one of the big industries of the country. And there was the pottery industry which is a great industry in Ohio and a number of other States. The railroads of the country were also much interested. Likewise the glass industry and the watch industry and the textile industry and about 30 or 40 other industries big and little were vitally interested in this bill.

We had long hearings before the Ways and Means Committee lasting for about 3 weeks.

People came from all over the country to testify. I suppose that 300 different witnesses appeared, of these only 10 or 12 were opposed to the bill H. R. 4294.

Congressman AUGUST H. ANDRESEN appeared for agriculture and many other Congressmen and Senators appeared. Democrats and Republicans appeared and they were at least 15 to 1 in favor of the proposed legislation.

I was proud of that bill and I thought that we would be able to pass it because it was of such vital importance to so many people.

Just about the time when these hearings were started the President indicated that the administration would prefer to give the matter further study. Four or five members of our President's Cabinet came before the committee and expressed their views. It developed that the President would like to have the Simpson bill put over for a future time. But in the presentation of their views they claimed that they would like to have a commission appointed to study the subject of our trade policy. But they indicated quite clearly that they were not inclined to relieve the situations about which so many witnesses had protested, to wit, the importation of a vast amount of commodities that were in competition with our American industries.

Secretary of State Dulles testified before the committee as follows:

I want to say to you that, as Secretary of State, I have no preconceived ideas and no policies to which I feel committed. I have a completely open mind. That is why I can conscientiously urge that there be in effect a "standstill" until this problem can be studied under fresh auspices in its relation to the complex problems into which tariff policy must be fitted. That is why I urge that H. R. 4294 should not now be adopted. Its present adoption would have serious international repercussions, injurious to the best interests and welfare of the United States. It would be taken, throughout the free world, to forecast United States trade policies which would make it impossible for them to live without increasing association with and dependence on the Communist world.

Well, he probably did have an open mind.

The Secretary of State apparently had an empty mind as far as his knowledge of the bill was concerned because his mind apparently was set on benefiting foreign countries without regard for our domestic economy. His vision apparently was way across the oceans. He apparently was thinking about what would be best for Europe and Africa. When I thought we were getting ready to vote out the Simpson bill that we had spent so much time on Mr. SIMPSON decided to divide his bill into two bills. This was done and the bills are numbered H. R. 5495 and H. R. 5496. After some consideration the Ways and Means Committee voted out H. R. 5495. This is the bill that we are considering today.

As has been stated this bill, H. R. 5495, does four things: first it extends the President's authority to make agreements for 1 year; second, it provides that the Tariff Commission shall consist of 7 members instead of 6 members; third, it provides for the appointment of a commission of 17 persons to spend several months in studying world conditions; fourth, it provides that the Tariff Commission should report its findings within 9 months instead of 1 year on escape-clause actions.

This Commission that is to be appointed should consist of 17 members. Seven to be appointed by the President and 5 by the Speaker and 5 by the Vice President. Those who are not now in Government service are to be paid $75 per day with all expenses. This Commission no doubt will travel all over the world. If you pass this bill you know very well they will go to every country. You know how readily they go on a junket; do you not? They will no doubt have dozens of highly paid secretaries and high-titled experts and the cost will no doubt run into hundreds of thousands of dollars. And what will they do when they come back? They will come back with tall stories of the kind that we have been hearing for years. They will not know as much about tariffs and foreign trade as our own committee experts know now. There are not many people in our congressional districts who get $75 per day and all their expenses. I am opposed to this extravagance. This would be a fine opportunity to save about $500,000 which could be applied toward balancing the budget.

I am opposed to this bill. And I ought to give a reason for the faith that is within me. I can do that, I think. Here is the reason I am going to vote against the bill: Because it does not do anything that will be for the benefit of these thousands of people who need help badly—the conditions in the coal, glass, tile, and many other industries are all very bad. They tell us that the other Simpson bill which is still pending in the committee will be passed by Congress and that that bill H. R. 5496 will take care of these distressed industries; I am looking at the Republican side now and I prophesy that this next bill will not pass this House. But if it does it will not pass the Senate. I shall not be a party to deceiving the hundreds of people who need help. We should not yield to pressure and lose a good cause.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS. I yield to my friend the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. At the time the gentleman drew up that bill there was no Democrat represented, not a single Democrat was represented.

Mr. BOGGS. Who drew up the bill? The gentleman mentioned drawing up a bill. There are 10 Democrats on the committee, but not one of us were present.

Mr. JENKINS. We had hearings for about 3 weeks every day. The gentleman asked questions. He was very busy there.

Mr. BOGGS. The gentleman talks about drawing up a bill. I saw the bill only after it was drawn up. Who drew it up?

Mr. JENKINS. What were you doing there during the 3 weeks that we had hearings?

Mr. BOGGS. We have not discussed the bill since the hearings.

Mr. JENKINS. Did the gentleman not participate in the hearings?

Mr. BOGGS. I sure did.

Mr. JENKINS. I thought you did. You are smart, and you knew what was going on.

Let me proceed. I want to say in all seriousness, and I know that a lot of you are exactly in my position, I do not like to be considered as voting against anybody, but I have the honor to represent a good many fine people. I have been here a good many years, and I think I know right from wrong. I know that the heart of the bill H. R. 4294, upon which we held hearings for days and days, is sound and should become law. It was progressing nicely, but something came along, and the Simpson bill was divided. They put in one bill those parts that are before us today. But the heart of the bill is back there in the committee and is represented as H. R. 5496. We are going to vote on it in committee tomorrow, I think. When it comes out, I bespeak for it your serious consideration. But I hear that if it ever passes this House it will never survive in the Senate. I hear all of these things, and I tell my people in my district that I have done my very best. That is all I can do, and that is the way I expect to vote.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. COOPER. Our distinguished colleague says he does not know what happened. What happened was that President Eisenhower sent a special message to Congress and all the members of his Cabinet appeared before the committee in opposition to the original Simpson bill. When I asked Mr. Dulles the specific question:

Mr. Secretary, do you think it would be better for the present law to expire than to enact the Simpson bill at this time?

He said:

Yes.

Mr. JENKINS. He said he would rather see the present law expire than to see our bill H. R. 4294 pass.

Now, then, to come back again to the hearings on the original bill. Who appeared against the bill? A few members

of the President's Cabinet, and they all had the same little speech. They want this great big study commission appointed; they wanted the existing law that has done so much damage extended a year. Who else came before the committee? Why, there were witnesses representing the Norfolk & Western, the Pennsylvania Railroad, and the C. & O. Railroad, the greatest coal carriers in this country. All of them appeared in favor of the proposed bill H. R. 4294.

Who else came before the committee? The representatives of dozens of the small oil-producing organizations in the country? Who else? Well, what is left of the glass producers, also the poor watchmakers and the pottery makers.

These representatives of these groups are a fine segment of our citizenship. They should not be punished so that someone or some group might gain political advantage.

I was a little bit disappointed in the testimony of some of the members of the Cabinet. Of course, they are all fine men and are entitled to their own views. Likewise, I am not finding fault with the President, I know Mr. Eisenhower well, I know that his integrity and his patriotism cannot be challenged. It is unfortunate that many deserving persons and business concerns must suffer for something for which they are in no way responsible.

Again I say that we have a serious proposition, before us, not only the Republicans but the Democrats as well. Those of you who represent people who are interested in the bill that is up to be considered, I am sure will want to do justice. That shall be my only purpose.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. D'EWART].

Mr. D'EWART. 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 Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Chairman, we have before us a measure of great importance to the producers of certain minerals, wool, mustard, and other commodities in my State, who have been seriously hurt by the reciprocal trade program as presently administered. We recognize the need of trade with foreign countries and want to encourage this trade when it is conducted on a plane of fair competition.

Unfortunately, such has not always been the case. In fact, through quotas, limitations, subsidies, and currency manipulation, trade with foreign countries is oftentimes anything but fair, resulting in great harm to domestic producers. Let me illustrate what I mean by using wool as an example: We have subsidized wool coming into the United States and breaking the domestic price from both Argentina and Uruguay. In Argentina the exchange rate was 5 pesos for an American dollar. Under controlled currency and manipulation, 7½ pesos was allowed for each American dollar if used in the purchase of Argentine wool and wool tops. Wool tops is raw wool that has been sorted, scoured, and washed, carded, and then combed, ready for spinning into yarn. In Uruguay, where the peso on the official rate was 1.519 per American dollar, the rate was set at 2.35 pesos for an American dollar if used in the purchase of Uruguayan wool tops.

Since 1949 wool tops imports into the United States have climbed from 1.1 percent of domestic production to 11.8 of domestic production. Uruguay's exports of wool tops to the United States in 1952 were 5,647 percent greater than they were in 1949 and total wool top importations into the United States in 1952 were 1,027 percent greater than in 1949. Because of the subsidy, Uruguayan wool tops, even after the payment of the present duty, have undersold United States produced tops by as much as 30 cents per pound. The current differential is about 20 cents per pound.

The result was that American producers, through manipulation of the currency, lost their market to foreign subsidized imports, and American workers, who in 1949 prepared 99 percent of the tops, lost 12 percent of their production to cheap foreign labor competition.

Briefly, I would like to tell you about what happened to mustard seed production in my State. In 1941 there were 124,000 acres of mustard seed harvested, with a production of 55,180,000 pounds. In 1949, the acreage was 17,700 and 8,700,000 pounds were produced. Up until 1929 the tariff was 2 cents per pound on mustard seed. It is now seven-eighths of a cent per pound, in an agreement with two principal exporting countries to the United States. Under the escape clause and peril point and under other provisions of law, protection could have been given United States producers. Protection was not given by the previous administration.

The proposed extension under consideration for 1 year will add another member to the Tariff Commission and broaden the Commission's powers. It will extend the program for 1 year and set up a commission to study and report to the Congress, at which time we can appraise the effects of the reciprocal trade program upon trade and determine whether the Commission, as presently constituted, will give protection to United States producers who have been harmed in the past.

Under these conditions I am going to support the President's request for an extension.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the proposal in the bill to expand the Tariff Commission to seven members can be put in its true light by asking one very simple question: Why is it necessary?

Have the Republican sponsors of this proposal forgotten that they have a Republican President in the White House? Have they forgotten that under the present law the President has the final say on the action to be taken based on the findings of the Tariff Commission?

Do not the Republican sponsors have faith in President Eisenhower? Or are they afraid that he might be just a little too liberal in his foreign trade decisions to suit the high tariff wing of the Republican Party?

Mr. Chairman, I am a Democrat; and I think most all Democrats have more faith and confidence in President Eisenhower's judgment on foreign-trade policy than the leaders of the Republican Party. Those of us who have been in the House for many years might do some of our colleagues on the opposite side of the aisle a great favor by offering them a word of caution. If you do not support your President, you will have an awful lot of explaining to do to the people back home who elected him.

I cannot get away from the fact that the attitude of the Republican leadership on changing the bipartisan Tariff Commission to a strictly partisan group reflects some very odd thinking by this great political party. Apparently, if domestic industry cannot get relief from foreign competition by honest means, they will have to do it dishonestly through a "packed" Tariff Commission. Apparently, the Republican sponsors believe "if we can't get it by hook, we will get it by crook."

I might point out, Mr. Chairman, that the original bill on which hearings were held by the Committee on Ways and Means apparently turned out to be too embarrassing even for its supporters to advance with sincerity. It lacked provision only for electronic equipment for discovering a domestic injury and for speedily processing it into a restriction of an import. It provided for practically everything except electronic eyes that could hunt out pinpricks to industries even when they were unaware of being hurt; amplifying equipment that could step up a mild "ouch" to a series of sustained thunderclaps; and teletype equipment for rushing the Tariff Commission's "orders" to the President for proclaiming restrictions of imports.

Getting back to the bill under consideration, I wonder if the Republican sponsors thought of the consequences of changing the Tariff Commission to a political organization? Under this Republican plan a man who is not a Republican is virtually guaranteed an unfair hearing before the Tariff Commission. This is hardly a proper means of giving fair and adequate protection to American industry.

And most important of all: This is hardly a proper way for any administration, regardless of party, to conduct our foreign economic policy. President Eisenhower, in his state of the Union message to Congress, stated that he was "sincerely" interested in having a bipartisan foreign policy.

If President Eisenhower is sincere in this thought, then the leaders of his party are doing him a great disservice by destroying the character of the key bipartisan agency in the Government which traditionally has been free from narrow partisan politics.

Mr. Chairman, this attempt means no more and no less than the fact that the Smoot-Hawley high-tariff boys are in control and at it again. They have been defeated in their attempts to restore what they consider the good old days of the protectionist period in the open, and now they are trying to sneak in the back

door when we are not looking, by politicalizing the Tariff Commission.

We will stop them just as cold here as we have stopped them in their direct assaults on the trade-agreements program.

It amazes me that any group of responsible men can today be so shortsighted and forgetful as are the high-tariff boys of the plunder bund. They would create major unemployment and invite a depression by cutting off our imports altogether if they could do so in order to gain personally at the expense of the people. Just pure, simple mathematics would refute their case in its entirety. Any schoolchild knows that you cannot sell where you do not buy. Trade is not a one-sided proposition; it takes two to make a bargain. You cannot send ships to foreign ports laden with American products and expect them to return in ballast. It just cannot be done, as we learned under the Republican Smoot-Hawley tariff law, which brought on the greatest depression in history.

A return to the depression-ridden Smoot-Hawley era can only be sought by the most selfish, self-interested groups. They are a very distinct but vicious minority. Just checking the hearings before the Committee on Ways and Means proves this.

I can no better elucidate on the fact that the protectionists would defeat their own purpose than by quoting a letter, most eloquently written, which I received from Mr. John S. Coleman, an outstanding industrialist and president of the Detroit Board of Commerce, under date of May 29, 1953, which reads as follows:

DETROIT BOARD OF COMMERCE,
Detroit, Mich., May 29, 1953.

The Honorable JOHN D. DINGELL,
Representatives Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In recent weeks a large number of representatives of protected industries have appeared before a congressional committee to protest against a reduction of tariff barriers or to advocate the raising of tariff barriers or the imposition of import quotas. Their argument is that only by the maintenance, or, in many cases, the raising, of customs duties can their businesses be protected against injury or destruction. I am writing this letter as president of the Detroit Board of Commerce and as the head of an important Michigan company, in order to point out that the acceptance of their protests may seriously damage some industries in this State.

I do not deny that a reduction in tariff barriers will expose some firms to greater competition, but I am sure you will agree that this in itself is no argument against lower tariffs. Against an injury to a single business or industry must be weighed the benefits which will at the same time accrue to consumers, to export industries (which employ many more people than the protected industries in question), to the American economy as a whole, and to the free world.

I submit that the number of persons representing protectionist interests, which I understand was very large, who appeared before the committee, by no means reflects either business or public opinion in the community at large. There was a time when the business community was protectionist in viewpoint. That is no longer true. The United States Chamber of Commerce (representing some 1½ million businessmen), the Detroit Board of Commerce, the National Foreign Trade Council, and the United States Council for the International Chamber of Commerce have all declared themselves for freer trade.

A recent survey made by the Council on Foreign Relations of the views of leading citizens in 25 cities showed, in the great majority of cases, including those of businessmen, a solid rejection of the protectionist thesis. I repeat that, despite the higher proportion of protectionist spokesmen as against spokesmen for freer trade appearing before the committee, the opinion of most of the business community is convincingly against higher tariffs.

An argument constantly heard is that tariff reductions will cause unemployment. This may be true; but, on the other hand, if there are not tariff reductions, unemployment will be caused in export industries. The many thousands of people supported by export operations would be affected by the failure to encourage an increase in United States imports and they would be even more seriously affected if tariff barriers were raised or quotas imposed.

We do not have the choice between employment and unemployment. The question is where that unemployment is to strike, in export industries which are more productive, which are paying the highest wages to American workers and which are willing and able to compete with goods from all over the world, or in import industries which contrary to the basic philosophy of American free enterprise are demanding that the Government protect them against competition at the expense of that free choice between products which is the right of the consumer.

During the postwar period, our surplus of exports has been paid for by foreign aid to the extent of approximately $5 billion a year. With the tapering off of foreign aid, it is clear exports must be reduced to the extent that we do not permit the recipients of aid to earn more dollars in our market. Thus, something must give. Tariffs place a penalty on imports, but in doing so, they also penalize exports. Either we must take more imports or exports will be cut.

The basic question at stake then is: shall our policy be based on the interests of a few industries or on a concept of the national interest? We have heard much about the threat of competition from imports, but we heave heard little to date about the right of consumers to buy the goods they prefer; we have heard little about the right of American industry and agriculture to export the goods that they produce; we have heard little about the urgent interest of the United States in strengthening the economies of our allies abroad. The administration has called for the extension of the Trade Agreements Act without crippling amendments. It seems to me that President Eisenhower's recommendation should be accepted. It seems to me that as Americans and as leaders of the free world, this is where both our interests and our obligations lie.

Yours sincerely,

JOHN S. COLEMAN,
President.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS].

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, when President Eisenhower asked the Congress on April 7 to extend for 1 year the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act that expired last Friday, he must have had at least two major purposes in mind. First, he presumably wanted to assure the countries of the free world that his administration had no intention of reverting to the high tariffs and restrictive trade practices which have traditionally been associated with Republican administrations. Secondly, he wanted to use the 1-year extension period, not to negotiate new agreements—he specifically disavowed any such intention—but to allow time for a special commission to make a thorough reexamination of our whole foreign economic policy. That commission's report could then be used by the next session of Congress to make whatever changes in our foreign trade policy seemed appropriate.

Failure to extend the Trade Agreements Act which just expired denies the President authority to negotiate new trade agreements; such failure does not terminate, or in any way alter, any existing trade agreement to which the United States is a party. The practical effect of a 1-year extension of the Trade Agreements Act which just expired would be to reassure the free world that until the United States formulates a new trade policy it will take no steps either to narrow or to extend its restrictions on imports.

But shortly before the President formally declared his wishes and intentions, the high protectionist group had already drafted H. R. 4294, a bill introduced on March 30, 1953, by my esteemed colleague on the Ways and Means Committee, Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. His bill proposed a streamlined mechanism custom-designed to scuttle virtually all of the accomplishments so laboriously achieved during the past two decades under the trade agreements legislation. Among the more brazen and least subtle features of the bill were: one which would convert the Tariff Commission from a respected, nonpartisan, fact-finding agency to a "packed" partisan body; and another which would require the President to give effect to all "escape-clause" recommendations for restricting imports which this "packed" commission would formulate. The criteria of "injury" to domestic industry which were contained in that bill were such that the Tariff Commission would virtually be compelled to find "injury" in almost every instance when there was a complaint of increased competition from imports.

The original Simpson bill (H. R. 4294) proved to be too much for any but the most ardent protectionists to swallow in its entirety. The bill accordingly was fashioned into two parts: H. R. 5495, which we are here considering; and H. R. 5496, which contains those provisions of the original Simpson bill that are not embodied in the bill before us.

The Simpson bill which we are here considering actually contains only 1 objectionable provision, namely, that for packing the Tariff Commission by increasing its membership from 6 to 7 commissioners, "not more than 4 of 'whom' shall be members of the same political party." This same provision appeared in the original Simpson bill, but there in company with a provision that made it mandatory for the President to carry out all Tariff Commission recommendations for restricting imports in escape-clause cases. But this bill leaves with the President complete discretion in deciding whether to carry out such recommendations. What useful purpose then would now be served by

having a majority of Republican Commissioners on the Tariff Commission? Some may feel that the President would be less inclined to disregard Tariff Commission recommendations if they were made by at least four Republicans. There is no evidence, however, that President Eisenhower would hesitate to reject Tariff Commission recommendations even if they were made by unanimous decision. Whereas President Truman never failed to carry out an escape-clause recommendation by the Tariff Commission which was unanimously arrived at, President Eisenhower has elected not to carry out the only two Tariff Commission escape-clause recommendations which have thus far come to his attention. One of these applied to briar pipes and the other to silk scarves, and in both instances the recommendations were by unanimous decision of the Tariff Commission.

Granted that packing the Tariff Commission would not achieve a major objective of the sponsors of H. R. 5495, would any harm likely result from such action? Yes, indeed—a great deal of harm.

Packing the Tariff Commission would be tantamount to telling the free world that while we feel it necessary to devote a year's study to learn what kind of trade policy best suits our enlightened self-interest, we can now clearly anticipate one certain result of that study, namely, the need to have all complaints of injurious competition from imports examined—not by an objective, nonpartisan Tariff Commission as at present—but by a partisan political body. Would the free world interpret such legislation as signifying our proclaimed intention of maintaining the status quo in our foreign-trade policy for the next year? Of course not. The free world would quite properly interpret the action as signifying that while the United States will not reduce any restrictions on imports during the next year, a politically dominated Tariff Commission will recommend to the President restrictions on virtually all imports, the limitation or prohibition of which would redound to the advantage of special interests but not necessarily to the benefit of consumers or the country at large. The free world would regard passage of H. R. 5495 as giving the groups in the United States that have always opposed a liberal trade policy an opportunity to destroy in 1 year all that the trade agreements program has accomplished since 1934.

But that is not the only damage which passage of H. R. 5495 would cause.

It is probable that a packed Tariff Commission would find it more comfortable to work with a staff that was either preconditioned or readily adaptive to viewing problems and prescribing remedies which were in good taste politically, irrespective of whether they were wholly warranted by the facts. Once the Tariff Commission staff ceased to be wholly objective in its investigations, the Tariff Commission's usefulness to the Congress would be at an end, no matter which political party was in power. If the Tariff Commission were to lose its present good reputation, together with its best and most experienced staff, it could not readily be reestablished.

This is not the first time that a proposal has been made to pack the Tariff Commission, but every past effort to do so failed. Ever since the Congress created the Tariff Commission in 1916, it has maintained the number of Commissionerships at 6, with not more than 3 from the same political party. Further, the Congress has always carefully avoided referring to the Tariff Commission as a partisan agency.

The drafters of the present plan to pack the Tariff Commission either never contemplated the possibility that the American people would again elect a Democratic President or they assumed that if a Democratic administration were to come into power again, it could repack the Tariff Commission to assure a majority control. Because presidential terms commence at the beginning of the calendar year and last for 4 years, and terms of Tariff Commissioners begin midyear and would last for 7 years under H. R. 5495, succeeding political administrations would not often find that they had majority membership on the Tariff Commission at the beginning of presidential terms. In 1957, for example, a Democratic President would find four Republican Tariff Commissioners in office; and that Republican majority would, on the basis of H. R. 5495, continue in office for an additional 1½ years, because the first Commissioner's term to expire under the next presidential term would be that of a Democrat.

In such circumstances, would the new President be expected to work with a Republican-dominated Tariff Commission for 1½ years; would he be expected to ask for resignations from one or more Republican members; or would he be expected to repack the Commission, possibly raising the number of Commissioners to 9?

At the present time when the Eisenhower administration claims to be making every effort to reduce the cost of Government and to increase its efficiency, what purpose is there to adding to the expense of operating the Tariff Commission? An additional Tariff Commissioner and his staff would also require office space which is both costly and scarce. Further, would increasing the number of Commissioners operate to increase the speed with which the Commission would process escape clause complaints and perform its other duties? Can 7 men reach decisions more quickly than 6?

The sponsors of the packing plan have intimated that a 7-man Commission could in fact reach decisions more quickly than a 6-man Commission, because evenly divided decisions would be avoided. But how many evenly divided escape clause decisions has the Tariff Commission thus far rendered? Exactly none. Of the 29 escape clause investigations instituted by the Tariff Commission to this date, 22 have been completed. The Commission recommended restrictive action in 8 cases, but found that there was no injury in 14 cases. Six of the 8 recommendations to the President were by unanimous decision of the Commission and 2, by a majority of 4 to 2. Every finding of no injury was by either unanimous decision or by a majority vote. To date, the Tariff Commission has not had a single evenly divided vote in which an escape clause action was at issue.

If the sponsors of the packing plan merely wanted to avoid the possibility of evenly divided Tariff Commission decisions, why did they not propose that the President be authorized to act on the recommendations of either of the evenly divided groups?

In conclusion, I urge that the provision to "pack" the Tariff Commission be deleted from H. R. 5495. To include it would be a signal to the free world that we will speedily retrace our steps in the direction of the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act while we are theorizing about the most suitable foreign trade policy to pursue commencing next year. To include it would also result in permanently damaging the Tariff Commission, inviting future "repackings" of the Commission, lowering its prestige and usefulness, reducing its efficiency, and increasing its cost of operation.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. The gentleman made the statement that the groups opposed to reciprocal trade would destroy in 1 year all that has been built up since 1934. I would like the record to show that the groups which are waging this fight are not interested in destroying the basic idea of reciprocal trade. We are interested in equal justice under law. We would like to have the same protection and the same privileges that have been accorded to other groups that have been enjoying the benefits of reciprocal trade. We just simply ask equal treatment. The gentleman from Arkansas is well aware that equality of treatment does not exist today.

Mr. MILLS. I understand the gentleman's position. The gentleman would not, I presume, desire to go back to the old system of Congress writing tariffs. I do not think he would. I think what the gentleman wants is an administration of the program in the light of the needs which exist in the area which he represents. I have agreed with the gentleman and contended with others that in the case of those industries which involve a great amount of manual labor and wherein labor costs are a major item, great caution must be exercised in lowering the protection which exists for those industries. But weighed against this consideration must be our overall national long-range economic welfare and security as well as our international relations and the economic welfare of friendly free nations. I am certain that the extension of the President's authority to enter trade agreements will be to the benefit of the majority of the American people and redound to the benefit of our country as well as the free nations of the world.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CAMP].

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Chairman, I had sincerely hoped that the Committee on Ways and Means would have, in accordance with the expressed views of the President and those of most of our leading economists and industrialists, reported a simple bill to extend for another year the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act without change or amendment. While the bill now before us does extend this great program for another year, it contains, however, a provision to increase membership of the Federal Tariff Commission from the 6 members as now constituted to 7, providing that no more than 4 shall be of the same political faith. In other words this subtle amendment changes the Tariff Commission from a nonpartisan advisory board of experts to one of a partisan or political nature. It is my contention that this increase in the membership of the Tariff Commission will weaken its effectiveness and the high respect and regard in which it is held by American businessmen.

The President did not ask for this change. I do not know of any considerable element of our business or industry who do ask it. I sincerely trust that this House will strike it from this bill and by its vote pass a simple reenactment of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act as it now stands on our statute books.

It is my belief that this is the most important legislation that will come before this body during this session. The renewal of the Trade Agreements Act, in my humble opinion, is as important and vital in our efforts to promote goodwill and peace in this troubled world as any other program we may be called upon to consider, and furthermore, it is a most vital factor in our domestic economy. This is not a question of politics. It makes no difference whether you are a "high tariff" or a "low tariff" or a "free trade" man. There are far more questions involved in this bill than simply the protection of our domestic industry. Our domestic industry will suffer no more under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements program than under the Smoot-Hawley tariff. In fact our automobile industry and many others may be seriously injured by a return to high tariffs.

To have a full measure of prosperity in this country we must dispose of our surpluses of manufactured goods and agricultural products. For many years in our past history the United States enjoyed almost a monopoly in the production of raw cotton. The rest of the world bought cotton from us because there was nowhere else for them to get it. Until recent years the same thing was true of manufactured automobiles and motor vehicles. The world bought these products from us by sending us their gold regardless of trade barriers. They do not now have the gold to send us. Of the known supply of gold, to wit $36 billion, more than 60 percent of it is now in America, this country having at Fort Knox and elsewhere a total of $22,563,000,000.

Foreign countries have been buying our surpluses with money which we have been giving them in the form of Federal grants and aids. It is obvious that we cannot continue these huge grants. If they are discontinued, the only way for us to dispose of our surpluses is by trading with the world. The Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act offers the best method of increasing our exports without injuring our domestic economy.

I would like to trace for a moment the history of this program and the underlying reasons for its first adoption.

At the beginning of the Wilson administration in 1913 there was great concern over the steady decline for a number of years in our foreign trade; there were great surpluses of agricultural products, wheat, corn, rice, tobacco, and especially cotton, which we had been unable to export. Accordingly, President Wilson called a special session of Congress to meet for the purpose of studying the causes for the decline in our world trade and to study the tariff. On October 3, 1913, Congress passed the Underwood tariff law. It was a low tariff and it made considerable additions to the free list. In many cases it substituted ad valorem for specific rates in addition to reducing rates generally.

Among the articles placed on the free list were: Raw wool, iron, agricultural implements, raw sugar, coal, lumber, many agricultural products, including live cattle, meat, eggs, milk, cream, wheat, flour, corn, flax, and hemp and numerous manufactures, including shoes, wood pulp, and certain types of paper. This act was in operation about 9 months when World War I broke out in August 1914. Its effect on this country's foreign trade, therefore, may not be adequately judged by trade statistics, but we did experience almost immediately an upsurge in world trade.

In 1916 Congress passed an act creating the Tariff Commission, to be composed of 6 members whose duty was to study tariff rates and their effect upon world trade as well as upon our domestic industry. This Commission was to be nonpartisan, appointed because of qualifications as experts on the subject matters they were to deal with. The Commission had no authority except to advise the President and Congress about tariff matters.

The Republicans, following their election victory of 1920, immediately raised tariff duties in the so-called emergency tariff of 1921. Under this act duties on a number of agricultural products were increased and antidumping measures were imposed. A qualified embargo was placed upon dyes and certain other chemicals. This was essentially a stopgap tariff pending the enactment of a comprehensive revision of the entire tariff structure.

In 1922 the Fordney-McCumber Tariff Act was passed, which greatly increased rates. There was considerable fear of excessive imports following the cessation of World War I hostilities. The chemical and mineral industries were particularly insistent upon higher duties, largely because of their great expansion following the shutting off of foreign sources of supply during the war. On the agricultural side considerable competition was encountered as a result of overproduction in domestic areas under the stimulus of wartime conditions.

This act introduced the principle of the so-called flexible tariff, the provision authorizing the President to increase or decrease existing rates of duty by 50 percent after investigation by the United States Tariff Commission for the purpose of equalizing foreign and domestic costs of production.

Prior to the election of 1928 there was considerable discontent in certain agricultural areas because of their failure to share in the unusual prosperity that followed the depression of 1921. In the election campaign Mr. Hoover had promised tariff adjustment to help agriculture. The election of 1928 was interpreted by the Republican Party as a mandate for tariff revision.

In January 1929 hearings were begun on what at the time was expected to be a limited adjustment in behalf of the farmers and in order to correct a few other inequalities. As the hearings progressed, however, it became clear that the revision would be much more general than was at first intended. Indeed, the Tariff Act of 1930, known as the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act, became a general upward revision, raising both agricultural and industrial rates to the highest level in American tariff history. The hearings and the congressional debates on it were long and arduous, and Members of Congress, especially the late Senator Vandenberg, later said that they would never again want to have to go through the experience of a general congressional tariff revision.

The effect of the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act upon our foreign trade was immediate and disastrous. In 2 years our trade declined practically 50 percent. This was because other countries retaliated against our high rates and such formidable trade barriers were thereby elected as to paralyze, in many instances, some of our most profitable world trade.

The newly elected Democratic administration in 1933 immediately began work to remedy this situation. The Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, sponsored by former Secretary of State Cordell Hull, considered by many to be our greatest expert on tariff matters, became effective in June 1934, and immediately produced an increase in our world trade. It has been renewed every few years since then but in recent years has had incorporated in it a number of protective devices, including the escape-clause provision and the so-called peril-point amendment. Until 1947, however, the act operated in its original form and under it numerous trade agreements were consummated. This original act empowered the President to enter into executive agreements with foreign countries for the reciprocal reduction of trade barriers, and on the part of the United States he is authorized to lower tariffs by as much as 50 percent.

Twenty-nine trade agreements were concluded between 1934 and 1947. These agreements involved the reduction, or binding, by the United States of rates of duty on products accounting for almost three-fourths of this country's dutiable imports.

In 1945 the Trade Agreements Renewal Act extended the President's power, making it possible for him to lower duties to 50 percent of the rates in effect in 1945 instead of those prevailing in 1934, as in the original act.

Since 1947 rate reductions have taken multilateral form in that they have been negotiated with more than one country at a time under the agreement concluded at Geneva in 1947 when 23 countries, including the United States, negotiated the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade—the so-called GATT. Under this agreement the United States entered simultaneously into trade agreement negotiations with each of the other 22 countries and they, in turn, negotiated with each other. Subsequent additions were made in conferences at Annecy, France, and Torquay, England, so that the general agreement now has 34 contracting parties accounting for about 80 percent of total world trade.

Thirteen of the 27 countries with which the United States had bilateral trade agreements in effect in 1947 have since acceded to the general agreement, and bilateral agreements between them and the United States have either been terminated or suspended. Therefore, most of the results of trade-agreement negotiations consummated under the original Trade Agreements Act are now incorporated in the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

The Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951 made it more difficult for the President to negotiate reductions in tariff duties via trade agreements, by virtue of the escape clause and the peril-point amendments. In fact, no important trade-agreement activity has taken place under either the act as modified by the 80th Congress, which was immediately undone by the 81st Congress, or under the Extension Act of 1951. Some of the proponents of the trade-agreements program, in fact, maintain that it is not likely that any action could be taken under the Trade Agreements Act in its present modified form. These advocates of reciprocal tariff reduction maintain that the Trade Agreements Act in its present form, is more important as a piece of protectionist legislation, principally because of the escape clause, than as trade-liberalizing legislation.

The 34 contracting parties to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade are Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Burma, Canada, Ceylon, Chile, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, West Germany, Finland, France, Greece, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Italy, Liberia, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, Peru, Southern Rhodesia, Sweden, Turkey, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom, United States.

The 14 countries with which the United States has had bilateral trade agreements, but which are not parties to GATT, are Argentina, Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Iceland, Iran, Mexico, Paraguay, Switzerland, Uruguay, Venezuela.

The Czechoslovakian and Mexican trade agreements have been terminated.

The following tables of our world-trade history reveal the effects of our various tariff policies:

Foreign commerce

NO. 1008. EXPORTS AND IMPORTS OF MERCHANDISE, WITH TRADE BALANCES

[In thousands of dollars]

Year	Exports	Imports	Excess of exports (+) or imports (−)
1790	20,205	23,000	−2,795
1800	70,972	91,253	−20,281
1810	66,758	85,400	−18,642
1820	69,692	74,450	−4,758
1830	71,671	62,721	+8,950
1840	123,669	98,259	+25,410
1850	144,376	173,510	−29,134
1860	333,576	353,616	−20,040
1870	392,772	435,958	−43,186
1880	835,639	667,955	+167,684
1890	857,820	789,310	+68,519
1900	1,394,483	849,941	+544,542
1910	1,744,985	1,556,947	+188,038
1911	2,049,320	1,527,226	+522,094
1912	2,204,322	1,653,265	+551,057
1913	2,465,884	1,813,008	+652,876
1914	2,364,579	1,893,926	+470,653
1915	2,708,589	1,674,170	+1,094,419
1915 (6 months)	1,852,863	912,787	+940,076
1916	5,482,641	2,391,635	+3,091,006
1917	6,233,513	2,952,468	+3,281,045
1918	6,149,088	3,031,213	+3,117,875
1919	7,920,426	3,904,365	+4,016,061
1920	8,228,016	5,278,481	+2,949,535
1921	4,485,031	2,509,148	+1,975,883
1922	3,831,777	3,112,747	+719,030
1923	4,167,493	3,792,066	+375,427
1924	4,590,984	3,609,963	+981,021
1925	4,909,848	4,226,589	+683,258
1926	4,808,660	4,430,888	+377,772
1927	4,865,375	4,184,742	+680,633
1928	5,128,356	4,091,444	+1,036,912
1929	5,240,995	4,399,361	+841,634
1930	3,843,181	3,060,908	+782,273
1931	2,424,289	2,090,635	+333,654
1932	1,611,016	1,322,774	+288,242
1933	1,674,994	1,449,559	+225,435
1934	2,132,800	1,655,055	+477,745
1935	2,282,874	2,047,485	+235,389
1936	2,455,978	2,422,592	+33,386
1937	3,349,167	3,083,668	+265,499
1938	3,094,440	1,960,428	+1,134,012
1939	3,177,176	2,318,081	+859,095
1940	4,021,146	2,625,379	+1,395,767
1941	4,021,146	3,345,005	+1,802,149
1942	8,078,988	2,755,893	+5,323,095
1943	12,964,906	3,381,498	+9,583,408
1944	14,258,702	3,928,866	+10,329,837
1945	9,805,625	4,159,138	+5,646,487
1946	9,738,321	4,942,054	+4,796,267
1947	14,429,747	5,756,333	+8,673,413
1948	12,653,058	7,123,877	+5,529,181
1949	12,051,108	6,622,390	+5,428,718
1950	10,275,102	8,852,161	+1,422,941
1951	15,020,409	10,961,550	+4,058,858

The finest example of what can be done by two countries really working together for reciprocal trade is the case of Venezuela. Trade with Venezuela has increased markedly in recent years. Back in 1911–15 United States exports to Venezuela averaged less than $6 million. In the 5-year period 1921–25 total trade between the two countries averaged $30 million, divided about equally between exports and imports. In 1938, just prior to the negotiation of the original United States-Venezuelan Trade Agreement, trade between the two countries totaled $72 million with exports to Venezuela amounting to $52 million and imports from that country amounting to $20 million.

In 1951, trade between the two countries had expanded to the amazing total of $776 million. Exports to Venezuela in that year were valued at nearly $454 million. In 1950 the total trade was $711 million with exports amounting to $389 million and imports to almost $322 million.

United States imports from Venezuela are smaller than exports to that country and consist of a relatively short list of commodities. Petroleum and its derivatives account for over 90 percent of the trade. Other imports consist largely of iron ore, coffee, and cacao.

United States exports to Venezuela cover a wide list of commodities. Among the most important exports are foodstuffs, industrial machinery, electrical equipment, office appliances, textiles, automobiles and tractors, iron and steel products, including pipe, tanks, sheets and shapes, glass, paper, pharmaceuticals and medicinals, and copper wire.

In the new trade agreement with Venezuela, signed at Caracas on August 28, 1952, important concessions were obtained on all of these United States exports, especially the concessions obtained in behalf of automotive vehicles and parts and trailers and other vehicles.

American economy has prospered greatly under the reciprocal trade agreements program. If we abandon it at this time, thereby nullifying the splendid work of patriotic and able American experts in world trade, and build up tariff walls whereby our cotton, wheat, corn, and other agricultural products and our automobile industry may be unable to dispose of its surplus products, we are surely bringing economic disaster.

We cannot increase our trade with the world except on a reciprocal basis. For every passenger automobile exported from the United States, 62.4 pounds of lint cotton and 2 pounds of linters are sold. Each truck exported carries 86 pounds of lint cotton and 4 pounds of linters. Each separate tire exported carries an average of more than 5 pounds of lint cotton. Besides the cotton—manufactured cotton, not raw cotton—of course, there is the steel and all other things. During 1 year more than 50,000 bales of high-grade cotton and 1,000 bales of linters found a market in our foreign sales of automobiles, trucks, and tires, and two-thirds of our automotive exports are to countries with whom we have trade agreements, all of whom gave us concessions on automobiles, trucks, parts, and accessories.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that no political issue is made of this subject. Let us not do grave damage to our country's prestige and world influence at this time.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS].

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, I listened with great interest to the remarks made a few moments ago by my friend, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS]. I gathered that Mr. JENKINS was not pleased with the legislation before the committee nor was he pleased with the position taken by the administration.

My colleague from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS] pointed out to the committee that the hearings had been held on the so-called Simpson bill; that the Simpson bill had been drafted by agreement, and that after the hearings had been held on that bill, because of pressures, of

which, of course, I am unaware, that bill had been shelved for the time being.

It is not difficult for me to understand why there should be some confusion among my friends sitting to the left. As a matter of fact, anyone who has followed these proceedings would almost automatically be confused. Let me review for a moment just what has taken place so far this year on the trade-agreements program.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SIMPSON] introduced a bill, a very comprehensive bill, but certainly anything but a trade-agreements bill. I believe it is the consensus of opinion that it is about as close to a return to the Smoot-Hawley tariff policies as you can get without reenacting the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act. About that time the President of the United States sent a message to the Congress saying that he wanted the Trade Agreements Act extended, as is, for a year. Then a few days later he sent another message down saying that he wanted to establish a commission.

Of course, we have a lot of commissions now. This was another one. About that time we were holding hearings on the trade-agreements bill of Mr. SIMPSON's and I understand that the original Commission message was referred to the Foreign Affairs Committee, which was a bypassing of the Ways and Means Committee.

At that time the administration started sending down a group of witnesses. Secretary Dulles came down and apparently did not impress my good friend, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS], very much. Secretary Weeks came down. Secretary Humphrey came down. Secretary McKay came down.

Their testimony was very interesting. For one thing, it was impossible to find our whether or not any of these gentlemen were opposed to Mr. SIMPSON's original bill.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. From reading the testimony of Secretary Weeks and Secretary McKay, I would say that they compounded confusion, did they not?

Mr. BOGGS. I would not say that that was an exaggeration. In keeping with what the gentleman had to say, I remember an examination of Mr. McKay before the committee. I believe it was the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] who referred to a statement in the Secretary's remarks in which he commented on this seven-man Commission that we are debating right now. The essence of his statement, if I remember it correctly, was that by creating this seven-man Commission we removed all possible objection to the extension of the Trade Agreements Act. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] asked him what he meant by that. The Secretary took a look at it and said that he did not believe he had seen it before, although he had just gotten through reading it. He disclaimed authorship right there on the spot.

As a matter of fact, Secretary Dulles—I presume that he was being facetious; I am sure he must have been—but in my examination of the Secretary he finally pled his constitutional privilege under the fifth amendment.

Where are we today? Let us examine the situation for a moment. I can genuinely understand why it is difficult for Mr. REED, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. SIMPSON, and all these other fine gentlemen, whose friendship I value—they are some of the closest friends I have in this body—I can understand why it is difficult for them to sit here and argue for an extension of the trade agreements program. After all, they have been opposed to it since 1934. They have led the opposition to it in one Congress after another. They have offered amendments to cripple the program; the peril-point amendments, the escape clause amendments. They have offered the motion to recommit in past years. I presume it is a bit difficult to ask them to sit here today and say, "Oh, we have been wrong for 20 years; you men over here have been right. We are now asking you to vote to extend the Trade Agreements Act."

So I cannot find any fault with my good friends in taking the position that they take, and I cannot blame them for being a bit confused. I suspect that somewhere down the line they have some assurances. Let us look at it for a moment.

To begin with, this committee never met to consider the Trade Agreements Act program in executive session until you started hearing about this seven-man Tariff Commission. Then about the time that you started hearing about the seven-man Tariff Commission another thing took place: the gentleman from Pensylvania [Mr. SIMPSON], my good friend, divided his bill; he came up with one part of it which said we will extend trade agreements for 1 year, we will create a packed Tariff Commission, we will change the whole concept of the Tariff Commission, we will pack the Tariff Commission against the Republican President in the White House—that is what it really says—and we will create another study commission. Now, that is what is before us in the first part of this bill. But at the same time my good friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SIMPSON], introduced another bill which is given another number, which has all of the restrictive provisions in the original Simpson bill worked out in collaboration with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS], as he pointed out here a moment ago. In addition to that, tomorrow morning at 9 o'clock the Committee on Ways and Means is going to meet in executive session to consider the restrictive Simpson bill.

I cannot believe that all of this is coincidental; somehow or other I am inclined to believe that if that committee should succeed in reporting out the new Simpson bill which imposes all sorts of import restrictions, which imposes all sorts of quotas and limitations and almost completely destroys the power of the President of the United States in the peril-point and escape-clause provisions—I cannot help but believe that should the Committee on Ways and Means report that bill, that in a couple of weeks you will have a rule on that bill and you will have to choose then and determine whether or not you adopt those provisions.

Now, it may not happen, but it could very well happen, and I cannot believe either that this seven-man Tariff Commission is just a vain and futile thing, that it is just done for no purpose at all. I certainly cannot believe that it is done simply to give somebody else a job; there seem to be a lot of jobs around. I do not think they have to go thus far to create another job for somebody; no, sir. The purpose of that seven-man Tariff Commission is to accomplish at least a minimum amount of destruction of the trade-agreements program.

Now, you might ask how in the world could that have any effect. As the gentleman from Massachusetts asked a moment ago, why complain about it? You have a 7-man Federal Communications Commission, a 3-man some other commission, and a 9-man commission of some other kind. Well, why complain about it? Because the Tariff Commission heretofore has not been a quasi-judicial body, and I think that the statement of the gentleman from Massachusetts pretty well determines the road ahead.

The objective here really is to take away from the President of the United States the power to make the decision, and to put the power in a partisan, quasi-judicial body so that that body, not the Congress or the President, will make that decision. I fully understand the chagrin of my Republican colleagues, but I believe the time sooner or later must come, Mr. Chairman, when you are going to have to make up your mind whether or not you are going to follow your President in the White House.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 9 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SIMPSON].

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I trust the prognostications made by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS] with respect to what will take place in reference to the second half of this reciprocal trade agreement program are true. I hope that tomorrow morning the Ways and Means Committee does report out the second bill. I hope a rule is granted on it. I hope every Member of this body has an opportunity of voting for or against the protection of American industry.

I am sure that under the bill now being considered there is a measure, a small measure it is true, of protection for American business, but, nevertheless, it is there, and the passage of this bill will give some measure of relief to a number of people who appeared before the Tariff Commission for relief under the escape clause or the peril-point provision of existing law.

I listened a bit ago to my very good friend and our colleague from Georgia

[Mr. CAMP] who mentioned a neighboring country and told how the exports-imports had increased from perhaps $20 million a year to $700-million-plus a year, after the making of some reciprocal trade agreements. The inference was that it was a great advance in our economy to have that situation exist. But the other side of the page is a dark, black one, for in the hills and mountains of West Virginia, Illinois, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and numerous other States there are sitting today idle thousands upon thousands of your neighbors and mine. These are men who ordinarily work in the coal mines but cannot work because of the dumping in this country of residual oil, a waste product, if you please, prepared and produced in Venezuela, shipped in here and paid for by your neighbors and mine who are sitting today on unemployment compensation, the direct result of the unfair competition of the reciprocal trade agreements, which I want to correct.

This bill makes a beginning. The bill tomorrow will do better, if we are successful in getting it before this body.

The issue at the moment has to do with an amendment which will be offered, I believe, by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER] to the bill now before us seeking to remove from the bill the provision that the Tariff Commission hereafter shall consist of 7 rather than 6 individuals and that of the 7 not more than 4 shall be of any 1 political party. There is a reason for that, and a very good reason today just as there was a reason many years ago when the Tariff Commission was limited to 6 with the proviso that not more than 3 shall be of any one political party. Back at the time of the creation of the Tariff Commission the duty imposed upon that Commission was just one. It was that of finding facts, facts having to do with the cost of production of articles made here in America being competed with by articles made abroad. The men of the Tariff Commission and their employees were principally accountants and men capable of examining costs and books, and so forth, dealing with the cost of production and they went all over our country seeking to determine just what those costs were. These costs were unvaried, they were set. But they were facts, they were determined, and having been determined there was no discretion whatever in the powers of the Tariff Commission.

Those facts were presented to the Congress, and the Congress through its committees and by virtue of its own powers interpreted the facts and reached the conclusions. It was felt at that time, and perhaps rightly, that inasmuch as the figures they were seeking were unvarying and firm, that there should not be any opportunity for political division, and consequently to safeguard that approach it was provided that there should not be more than 3 of 1 political party out of the 6, and if that picture prevailed today I would have no complaint whatever at leaving the Tariff Commission with six members.

But, is that the picture today? It is not. A couple of years ago this Congress passed a proviso to the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act providing that we should have what has become known as the peril point and the escape clause provision. Those obligations were imposed on the Tariff Commission and the Tariff Commission, at the request of the industry claiming damage or a threat of damage, was required to make a certain survey, not for facts, but for facts upon which a conclusion would be made by themselves and a determination and finding made. That changed the duties of the Tariff Commission from a fact-finding body to a quasi-judicial body; a group which found facts, it is true, listened to testimony, it is true, but then sat and considered and reconsidered and reached a conclusion or a determination as to whether or not the industry, which might be one within your own congressional district was or was not suffering as a result of too low tariff rates. Thus today the objective of having a 3–3 group, 3 of 1 party against 3 of another party, no longer prevails, for there comes into the picture a question of policy, if you please, one wherein the Administration may have an interest, just exactly as there does with respect to the Federal Trade Commission, the Interstate Commerce Commission, and any and every other commission which this Government has seen fit to set up. So, there is no more reason to deny the majority party having, if it chooses, 4 of its party in a 7-man commission with respect to the venture than there is of cutting back the number of Commissioners allowed in any one of the other commissions in our Government today. If one is to be limited to a tie vote under certain circumstances, then the others could, equally failing, be so limited.

Now I plead that there is an element of safety for the American industry which has to appear before the Tariff Commission under the provisions of the escape clause if we make the Tariff Commission 7 rather than 6. In recent years there have been 3 of the majority party and presumably 3 of the other, though vacancies have been allowed to exist, and it is true that in the vast number of cases there are not tie votes. But my point is that if it is continued and if the vacancies are filled at 3 to 3, then there will be tie votes, and your industries, which are forced to appear before a governmental agency and almost on bended knees beg for the protection of their industries, are entitled, I say, to a decision. If it is an adverse decision they may want to fold their tents and creep away; they may want to give up the manufacturing of glassware, of pottery, of weaving, the production of coal, the manufacture of motorcycles, any one of 1,000 items; they may want to give it up if the decision is against them, but on the other hand in a close case they are entitled to a decision in their favor, and I believe if we increase the size of the Commission to 7 their chances of a favorable decision will be greatly enhanced over what their chances are today.

It is for that reason, because I am for protection, protection of an American industry deemed necessary to the employment of your neighbors and mine, that I ask your opposition to the amendment to be offered later.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I yield.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I want to comment on the gentleman's statement about the Venezuelan oil. Is it not true that every dollar of that increase in trade was a dollar taken out of the pockets of some wage earner in the coal industry?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. That is the point I tried to make. The gentleman has done it quite effectively. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. KEAN].

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Chairman, America must keep her ports open to foreign trade.

In order to purchase American exports, foreigners must have dollars. Most of these dollars can only be secured by sales in American markets. Otherwise, the American taxpayers must make up the difference, as they have in the past.

The United States has asked friendly nations not to trade in strategic materials with countries behind the Iron Curtain. The free countries, therefore, must be supplied with substitute markets.

Therefore, I believe that this extension of the reciprocal-trade law is for the best interest of the United States. I do agree, however, that there has been just criticism in the past of the administration of the law.

The State Department, which conducted the trade negotiations, seemed not to take into consideration anything but the international policy of the United States, and they certainly did not give sufficient consideration to the position of American industry or American labor, both of which are vitally affected by tariff cuts.

However, the new administration has shown by their actions in the case of the currency manipulation by Uruguay and in other matters that they will consider the interest of the American producers and will carry out the law as it is written.

I believe that the taxpayers of this country do not look with favor on a permanent program by which we will continue to subsidize our exporters through recurring large foreign-aid appropriations in order to give to foreign nations the needed dollars to purchase the goods which under present conditions they may only purchase in this country.

I also believe that the people of this country do not wish to drive most of the nations abroad into the necessity of very heavy trading with the nations on the other side of the Iron Curtain.

If European and Asiatic nations are forced to enter into such close relations that they look to the Communist nations for the goods necessary for their welfare and to the same nations for markets for their agricultural products and manufactured goods, it will not be too long before they will inevitably look to these same nations for their cultural and political ties.

In the past, Western Germany sold many of its manufactured goods to East Germany, to Poland, to the Ukraine, and

to the Balkans in exchange for agricultural products.

In the past the great market for Japanese manufactured goods was China and Manchuria.

We must make it possible for these nations to earn dollars, or they will be either thrown into the arms of the Communist nations, or else our American taxpayers will be forever burdened with demands for heavy foreign-aid appropriations in order that they can meet the dollar gap.

Ever since we became a creditor Nation after World War I, we have in some form or other used the taxpayers money to fill this gap.

Continuation of the reciprocal-trade program and the resulting encouragement of purchase of foreign goods is not a cure-all. It cannot fill all the dollar gap. But it will help.

We must try to fill the gap in other ways. We must encourage the investment of American money in equities abroad, not by buying foreign bonds for when the maturity date come on such bonds foreigners would have to find the dollars for repayment and thus the problem would only be postponed. The holders of equity investments, on the other hand, the purchases of stock in corporations which have their headquarters abroad would never require return of the capital they have invested to the United States.

We must always maintain and protect that American industry which is essential to our national defense. We also cannot ruthlessly throw to the wolves those industries which under tariff protection have for long periods of time provided the living for great numbers of American labor.

However, with proper administration, with the assurance that the law will be strictly adhered to, there should be sufficient protection for American industry in the present peril-point and escape-clause provisions.

I am pleased to support this bill.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] may have permission to extend his remarks just prior to the remarks of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I regret that the limitation of time for debate requires that these remarks be placed in the RECORD without being delivered on the floor of the House where they would be subjected to the challenge of debate by these who disagree with them.

Nevertheless, the main points of what I have to say have been well and ably covered by those who spoke on the floor. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. KEAN] and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES], my colleagues on the Ways and Means Committee, have essentially expressed my viewpoint.

I want to emphasize two points and add another point. First, selfish interest is not a valid argument against advocates of a position. Especially when the selfish interest involves many people in our society. Indeed if the matter did not concern the selfish interest of some segment of our economy it would hardly be worth our while discussing it here in the Congress. In fact those who take the position in favor of "freer" trade can in most instances be accused of having selfish interest. They happen to be exporters or organizations who have capital invested abroad and are interested in importing their products into the domestic market at a profit.

The question before us is what is most beneficial for the greatest number of selfish interests with due regard for the short haul and the long pull. This is what we call enlightened self-interest. I cannot for the life of me see the argument that because the coal industry comes in and points out that it is being damaged by our trade policies that therefore it becomes a special pleader, uninterested in the welfare of our country, devoid of all sense of the realization of the importance of world trade and the need for friends abroad. Indeed, translate the coal industry into lives and happiness of men who are directly involved in this industry and then expand this translation to include the dependence of our national welfare upon the good health of a vital industry like coal and we begin to shift our views a bit about where lies the selfish interests.

Regardless of whether we turn down the plea of the coal industry or the many other industries who plead that they are being damaged by our trade policies certainly our hearts should be moved to sympathy and if we do feel that it is necessary for the overall selfish interests of the country to somewhat sacrifice the interests of this segment of our society at least we can do it with understanding and apologies, not with insults.

Second, I would say to my self-styled liberal friends that the freedoms of mankind are written in procedure. The Tariff Commission has been changed from a mere factfinding commission to a quasi-judicial commission. Our collective wisdom has for sometime resolved that when we have a tribunal that must make decisions of judgment it is well to have an odd rather than an even number to render the decision of judgment. This is elementary and yet we have the cry of politics when we make a move to apply this matter of well established human knowledge. Indeed, if the argument had been made, the Tariff Commission is still a factfinding body rather than body which must make decisions of judgment, we perhaps could have resolved the debate quickly. I think it is fair presumption to state that this ground of debate was not taken because it was admitted. There seems to be little question that under the present Reciprocal Trade Act the Tariff Commission is required to make decisions of judgment.

Then finally, I wish to point out a matter which has not been touched upon. At the close of the last century we found it advisable to lay down certain procedures which would insure as best we knew how free competition for our domestic enterprise. We passed antitrust and other laws to prohibit competitive practices which we found similar to strangleholds and finger bending and eye gouging in wrestling, because we felt that our enterprise would flourish better. We find today many of these holds forbidden in domestic competition transported abroad, and regrettably in many instances by American concerns, applied under the guise of being foreign trade and therefore free and unrestrained. Certainly, we should be as much concerned about unfair competition from abroad as we admittedly are concerned about unfair competition from domestic concerns.

The freedoms of mankind are written in procedures. Trade indeed will become freer if we begin to write some intelligent and fair procedures. Certainly the alley roughneck does not like rules. Certainly, the urban slick man likes rules or ethics as he sometimes wants to call them, which give him the advantage. Government's job is to make rules and make them fair. I am unimpressed by those who want no rules, and I am equally unimpressed by those who want special rules. I do not care in what form they wrap their package and how much they appeal to broad national interest. I do not care how often they scare us with Russia and cry we need friends abroad. Our job is to weigh all the selfish interests and come up with a set of fair rules.

Paradoxically, it can be the protectionists who are for the procedures which will bring about more and freer trade and it can be the free traders who would bring about less trade if the procedures they advocated further protected and encouraged the international cartels and trusts. There is much to study and generalities benign or malign do not help keep the head clear for such studying.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Chairman, the Dictionary of Tariff Information, published by the United States Tariff Commission in 1924, gives, beginning on page 724, a résumé of the functions and organization of the Commission. It describes the Commission as "an independent nonpartisan body whose principal function is to ascertain facts upon the basis of which Congress may determine tariff policies, the rates of duty to make the policies effective, and methods of customs administration, and on which the President may base certain administrative acts in relation to these matters."

The key words are "independent" and "nonpartisan." "Nonpartisanship was to be secured by the requirement that not more than three of the Commissioners were to be members of the same political party"—page 725. From its creation in 1916 to date the statutes have provided for a total membership of 6;

the terms are now for 6 years, with 1 term expiring each year.

The need for an independent agency to supply objective information and advice on the regulation of our foreign trade is surely as great today as at any time in our history. With the increase in the number and complexity of policy decisions that much be made by the Congress there is less and less time for attention to tariff policy. And with the expansion of Government activities to encompass almost every detail of our daily life the President can personally devote but little time to the question. It becomes pertinent, accordingly, to review the administration of our tariff policy in recent years.

One of the expedients adopted to counter the great depression of the 1930's was the Trade Agreements Act of 1934. Its sponsors declared that by cutting our own tariffs we could bargain for tariff cuts abroad and thereby revive our exports, which would, in turn, stimulate our domestic economy. They requested, and were granted, power to cut any and all of our tariffs by half.

Many of our industries which are dependent on tariff protection for their very existence protested that cuts in their protection might wipe them out and thereby add to the depression. They asked that Congress include in the law some statements of principle, such as comparative costs of production, to give them a fighting chance of survival. But the free traders opposed all such statements of principle as crippling amendments which would prevent any worthwhile negotiations. In lieu thereof they enacted that before concluding an agreement the President must seek information and advice from the Tariff Commission. As stated above, the Commission was supposed to be both independent and nonpartisan. As such it should have been able to restrain, at least to some extent, the free-trade partisanship of the State Department.

Unfortunately, the record belies the suppositions. The Commission did not submit information and advice to the President. It did not function as an independent agency. Rather, it lent its name and resources for the use of the State Department.

After enactment of the act in 1934, the State Department asked the Tariff Commission to designate someone to serve on the interdepartmental trade agreements organization which became known as the Trade Agreements Committee. The Commission complied with this request and, from there on, one Commissioner, acting as an individual, became the Tariff Commission for trade-agreement purposes. The Commission delegated its authority to one man, carte blanche. It neither gave him instructions, nor did it review his actions. Yet the official propaganda continued to emphasize the participation of the Tariff Commission in the program. If you are interested in a detailed review of the procedure, you should read the testimony of the Commission's Chairman before the Senate Finance Committee in April 1947.

It is true that the Commission, as such, did review the factual and statistical information in the digests submitted to the Trade Agreements Committee. But this is staff work. This is a far cry from furnishing advice by an independent Commission composed of equal numbers of Republicans and Democrats. Is it not true that it was not until the Commission made its peril-point reports under the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1948 that the President ever got any advice from the Tariff Commission to aid him in carrying out the trade-agreements program.

To this date, the Commission does not participate in the work of the Trade Agreements Committee, unless you consider that an individual member is the Commission. The Tariff Commission member of TAC has never been subject to instructions from the Commission, nor to review by it. He is now appointed by the Chairman—under Executive Order 10082, paragraph 1—and need not account to the Commission.

Thus was the will of Congress frustrated; it called for, but was denied, advice from an independent nonpartisan body. The Commission now functions as a body in peril-point and escape-clause reports. If it is to have a function directly in the work of the Trade Agreements Committee, it should be able to control its representative on that committee. Isn't it time for a change?

The Commission has always functioned as a body when reporting to committees of Congress. But its reports in recent years have often been far from satisfactory. Even if we accept the thesis that the Commission should refrain from making policy recommendations to Congress, we should require that its reports be as clear and concise as possible. The tendency seems to have been to make the reports as vague and uninformative as possible, avoiding, whenever possible, a clear analysis of any point that may be controversial.

It often seems as though the Commission was seeking the least common denominator—omitting from its reports on legislation anything that might cause an argument. Reports on bills are always unanimous and it is impossible to believe that men of diverse tariff philosophies—as Tariff Commissioners should be—could always be in perfect harmony as to what is pertinent to a full, clear, and concise analysis of a proposal to raise or lower the tariff. And many Members of Congress will recall that they have sought, and failed to find, an understanding of tariff problems in reports from the Tariff Commission.

Our tariff has now reached the lowest level in history, averaging less than 6 percent ad valorem. Even if we limit the computation to dutiable imports, the average is only 12 percent. Nevertheless, the cry is still raised that our tariff is too high and must be reduced.

We recognized the importance to many of our friends abroad of exports to the United States and we know that a big foreign trade has been beneficial to our own country, especially to our farmers, but many of our industries are at a competitive disadvantage compared to foreign industries, largely due to higher wages, and these industries might be bankrupted unless given tariff protection. If, after a full analysis of the various cases, we decide to deny protection, that will be a matter for Congress to decide. But can we depend on the Tariff Commission for an understandable report on these cases, so that we can make an intelligent judgment?

Recent history raises grave doubts in these premises. It is important that a thorough review be made of the administration of our tariff policy. It is useless for Congress to legislate in favor of moderate tariff protection if every complaint from American industries is to be whitewashed by administrators sympathetic to free trade. We need a revitalized Tariff Commission. We need a reorganization of the Tariff Commission.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Chairman, the foreign trade policy which the United States will pursue in the future is of vital significance and importance not only to the United States but to the economic and political strength of the free world. The United States and its allies can only meet the challenge of increasing Soviet economic and military power if the nations of the free world continue to grow in strength and collective security. An expanding and mutually advantageous trade is essential to that growth.

Under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, the cornerstone of United States trade policy since 1934, the President has the power to reduce tariff duties on United States imports. These reductions have been made in exchange for the reciprocal reduction of trade barriers to United States exports through trade agreements with other countries. This act has signified to the rest of the world the willingness of this country in reducing its own trade barriers in an attempt to achieve more liberal trade policies and an expanding trade throughout the world. While I probably would not go along with some of the more ardent supporters of the trade-agreements program, I feel that conditions today would be a great deal worse had not the United States through the reciprocal trade-agreements program exercised its influence in bringing about a free flow of trade among the nations of the world.

An abrupt departure from the present United States trade policy through the adoption of a restrictionist attitude toward imports would be disruptive to the cooperative efforts of the nations of the free world in meeting the threat of Soviet expansion.

We are asked to extend for 1 year the present Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. The President has proposed this action as an interim measure to "allow for the temporary continuation of our present trade program pending completion of a thorough and comprehensive reexamination of the economic foreign policy of the United States."

In following up his recommendation concerning the present Trade Agreements Act the President has requested this Congress to establish a Commission to make a "thorough reexamination of the foreign economic policy."

Opponents of the Trade Agreements Act in the past have claimed that certain domestic producers were being injured from increased imports resulting from

tariff concessions given to other countries by the United States. While this injury has remained, for the most part, undefined, spokesmen for these interests have maintained that only by keeping out imports can certain industries in the United States survive. While no public interested party, be he private citizen or Government official would advocate standing by when domestic producers are threatened with disaster and workers face unemployment other factors must be considered before restricting of imports becomes the only and final solution to the problem. If the United States is to change its policy from one of liberalizing our trade to a policy of constructing further obstacles to the free flow of trade, many factors must be taken into account.

Obviously, if many producers were to be injured and many workers were to become unemployed as a result of allowing more imports to enter the United States, the national interest of the United States would best be served by a careful policy of restricting certain imports that threaten domestic producers. That the United States remain strong must be the central theme in any phase of our national policy. Our allies recognize this, for without a strong United States the rest of the free world could not survive the onslaughts of continued Communist pressures, be they economic or military.

All too often, however, it is not so obvious that workers in industries dependent upon exports to other countries might suffer if the United States were to pursue a policy of restricting imports further. In the event that the other nations of the free world were made less able to pay for our exports by restriction on their exports to the United States they would certainly find it necessary to cut back further their demand for United States goods.

To what degree would domestic producers suffer if the United States were to encourage more imports? To what degree would industries in the United States dependent upon exports be injured if the United States restricted its imports further? What would be the position of our allies in the free world's quest for collective security if either policy of restricting imports or encouraging imports were to be followed? It is questions such as these which must be answered if the trade policy of the United States is to be consistent with the overriding necessity of keeping both the United States and its allies strong and free.

In this time of strife between the nations of the free world and those which are Communist-dominated the United States can ill afford to disregard its national interest while paying homage to the shortrun interest of some particular producer. Such a study as suggested by the President can bring to light the facts that must be considered in developing a trade policy in the national interest.

It is my firm belief that we should follow the President's recommendations in extending the present Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act for an interim period of 1 year. This will be a symbol to our allies that the United States will continue to work for the achievement of an expanded world trade, founded on the principles of mutual advantage and friendly cooperation.

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Chairman, I am wholeheartedly in favor of renewing the Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act for another year. This act has been on our statute books for a long time. It is the cornerstone of United States commercial policy and it epitomizes the ideal of equal treatment of foreign countries which has characterized our foreign relations since the founding of the Republic.

I am convinced that if Congress should fail to renew this law, it will signify to the entire world that the United States is doing an about-face in its foreign economic relations. The dangers involved in our pursuing such a course would be great and in many quarters it would be interpreted as a signal that the United States is about to return to the discredited principles of tariff protection of the Smoot-Hawley era. The immediate effect of such a course of action would be to provide the Communists with ready-made propaganda material at our expense.

The original purpose of the trade agreements program, when it was first inaugurated back in 1934, was to break the logjam in foreign trade resulting from the worldwide economic depression of the Hoover days. Through the years, the program has played its part in stimulating international trade. Under the act numerous agreements with foreign countries have been signed and, while some of the concessions that have been granted by the United States have been more symbolic than effective in increasing such trade, it is certainly true that many of the concessions have stimulated trade.

Most fair-minded people will admit that this act, and the program administered under it, have been in the public interest. Most will agree that trade agreements played an important part in the economic recovery that set in shortly after the inauguration of President Roosevelt and that the program has helped to reduce United States trade barriers and has done much to bring about improved international relations. There is no doubt that it has become a practical measure for the strengthening of our economy and the improvement of our relations with other countries.

The unfortunate thing is that the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act early became a victim of partisan politics. Whenever the act came up for renewal—and it has come up many times, because Congress at no time went further than to delegate the power to modify tariff duties on a temporary basis—the debate and voting has been along strictly party lines. But while the act itself has become a political issue, the trade agreements program has been administered on a nonpartisan basis and every legitimate domestic interest has had ample opportunity to be heard and to present its case before any tariff duty has been lowered. Furthermore, in recent years, the act has been amended in such a way as to afford greater protection against foreign competition than domestic producers ever enjoyed before.

While I do not claim that the trade agreements program has averted war or that it has brought about international economic stability, I do maintain that, if not for this act, international trade restrictions throughout the world today would be even tighter than they are and the free world would be worse off than it is. A particular medicine may not have effected a complete cure, but that should not blind us to the fact that it has at least kept the patient from getting worse.

There was a time when the debate over free trade versus protectionism afforded an opportunity for many people to exercise their lung power. Most informed persons were ready to admit that free trade would be desirable and would enlarge the sum-total of goods and services available for consumption. The fact remained, however, that a sudden change from protection to free trade would have precipitated such difficulties of adjustment that it would have resulted in considerable hardship. Under the circumstances the issue was largely academic.

Today, this is no longer true. The debate between those who would keep out imports and those who would be more liberal about it, occupies a new political setting. The world is divided into two parts, the one free and the other Communist. The crying need of the free world is for military, economic, and psychological strength. The need for military strength is obvious. Less obvious, but no less important than military strength, is psychological and spiritual strength, which comes from mutual understanding among nations of different cultural and religious backgrounds. The bridge between military and spiritual strength is economic strength and this means mutually beneficial trade. Those who are still under the influence of isolationism and fail to realize the significance of improved trade relations between ourselves and our allies are painfully unrealistic in their attitude on this question.

In the period following the end of World War II, the countries of Western Europe were economically prostrate. Aid was imperative and if the Marshall plan had not been enacted in 1947, it is altogether probable that Italy and France would have gone Communist. Military assistance under the Mutual Security Program later on was equally essential.

Direct aid, however, is becoming onerous, both to the recipients and to the givers. One solution advocated is through the stimulation of foreign trade. It is pointed out, for example, that each and every dollar of increased imports that the United States allows to enter the country will in fact make just that much foreign aid unnecessary. The fact that the lowering of United States tariffs may not be a panacea for all the world's ills hardly renders such action unimportant. The United States has much more to gain from increasing imports than from stifling trade.

There are, in fact, but three lines of action open to the United States:

The first is to continue our present course of granting huge sums in direct

foreign aid, but restricting imports. This is known as the gift route, and its dangers are becoming increasingly evident as the American taxpayers become more restless, while the recipients abroad become uncomfortable.

The second line of action would be to curtail such aid and to allow the chips to fall where they may. If we pursue this course, we are certain to curtail exports also, thereby denying to the countries of Western Europe many of the raw materials which they urgently need if they are to increase production and pay their own way. Furthermore, the strain that would be brought upon our own economy by a severe curtailment of exports would be most dangerous. Many of our industries are dependent upon export markets and by cutting off those markets we could hardly avoid a depression in this country that would have unfortunate repercussions throughout the free world.

The third, and to my mind the only really tenable policy for the United States to adopt, is to lower tariffs and quotas in order to stimulate imports. Such a course of action would enable countries that now receive aid from us to help pay their own way and it would relieve the American taxpayers of some of their crushing tax burden.

If we fail to renew the reciprocal-trade agreements, thereby denying to the President the power to enter into trade agreements with other countries, we announce to the whole world an abrupt reversal in United States commercial policy. Even though the present act is hamstrung by the escape-clause and the peril-point provisions, it is better than no act at all. The President has recently appointed the Honorable Lewis W. Douglas to organize a group for the purpose of making a comprehensive study of the entire subject of economic foreign policy. The very least that we can do is to extend the existing trade law for another year pending the outcome of this study.

We have no respectable alternative but to extend the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act in its present form, at the very least, for another year. Let us give the President the required time in which to formulate his recommendations in this complicated area of economic foreign relations. This is not the time to erect new and ever more effective barriers against international trade. It is a time for sound thinking and constructive action.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I am glad to support this bill to extend the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act for a year, which authority has been requested by the President.

I am sure we have had some definite benefits as a result of some of these reciprocal trade agreements in the past. I know that in my own particular area we have been able to dispose of considerable surplus crops in foreign countries by mutual agreements between the United States and those countries. The most important aspect of these agreements at the present time is to assist in the disposal of the tremendous surplus crops that are in storage bins all over the country as well as the Commodity Credit Corporation of the Federal Government. In order for us to keep farm prices stable, it is necessary that each year we dispose of approximately 10 percent of our grain in foreign markets. The disposal of this 10 percent is the margin that keeps our farm program on an even keel.

Undoubtedly the most important feature of the new reciprocal trade act will be the establishment of a temporary bipartisan commission to be known as "The Commission on Foreign Economic Policy," which will provide the mechanism for a thorough examination of our foreign economic policy. This commission will be expected to report back by June 12, 1954, as to its findings. I am hoping that one of the proposals to come out of that commission will be the establishment of an agency in the Department which will be in the nature of a supersales agency for the disposal of our goods and crops abroad.

I support the grain grant to Pakistan which will arise on the floor next Thursday. I feel sure that if the matter had been worked out months ahead, we would have been able to establish a much better trade for ourselves than the Pakistan agreement sums up. If we have an agency in the Department of Agriculture whose sole purpose is sale of our surplus grain in foreign markets, I believe we can do a better job than has been done. Our only task is to find a medium of exchange. Many of these countries want our produce but lack dollars. This agency when created should be able to barter produce of the many countries in exchange for strategic materials which we need for our goods.

I am cognizant that the reciprocal trade agreements as they have been passed by this body in the past have served some useful purposes. However, in order for our reciprocal trade agreements to be effective enough to solve some of our own economic problems, there must be constant readjustments to world conditions. There have been serious economic changes throughout the world since the establishment of the first Reciprocal Trade Act in 1935. Our trade agreements must be able to keep up with the times. I am hoping that the Commission on Foreign Economic Policy will come up with a solution of some of those problems when it makes its report back here next year.

Mr. STRINGFELLOW. Mr. Chairman, it is with reluctance and some trepidation that I vote today for the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1953. As I have stated on several occasions in the past, I do not object to a general extension of our reciprocal trade agreements for a period of 1 year in order that the President, his Cabinet, and the Tariff Commission might have ample opportunity to study and reevaluate the entire tariff and trade programs. What I do object to is the fact that there is no provision in this act to grant immediate relief to several of our vital industries such as wool, lead, and zinc producers who are imperiled and face economic collapse unless action is taken to protect them from foreign products being dumped on our markets.

I heartedly supported and was in favor of the old Simpson bill, H. R. 4294, which embodied most of the worthwhile principles in the present extension act. However, H. R. 4294 took into account that several of our domestic industries were being endangered and would have immediately imposed quotas and additional duties on the importation of residual fuel oil, lead, zinc, or on other commodities which are being imperiled by foreign dumping on United States markets. Unfortunately there is no such provision in this new Simpson bill, H. R. 5495. It is sincerely hoped that early consideration will be granted by the Ways and Means Committee to H. R. 5496 which contains provisions covering critically imperiled commodities which were eliminated when the Simpson bill was rewritten at the request of the Administration.

When I appeared before the Ways and Means Committee and testified in support of the old Simpson bill, I said:

> I am not in accord with any policy or view which would allow some of our vital and critical industries to fold up and collapse while we sit idly by on our legislative hands, waiting for the year evaluation period to elapse. The time to start saving a drowning man is when he gets into water over his head, and not wait until he has gone down for the third time. The moment for making plans and preparation to assist the lead, zinc, and wool industries is right now, and not after all of our mines have closed and started caving in and filling with water or after our sheep have all been slaughtered or perished because of lack of markets. We here in Congress must make up our minds whether we are going to encourage or destroy the domestic production of lead, zinc, and wool. We must take action now to prevent further damage or we will be faced with the irony that our apathy and inaction has resulted in strangling the life out of these segments of our economy.

That statement is still applicable today.

Utah in 1952 had 30 active lead-zinc operations. To May 31, 1953, there were only 8 of these still active, and 6 of the 8 were on a curtailed basis. In May only 58 percent as many men were employed in Utah's lead-zinc mines, mills, and lead smelters as at this same time last year. The same depressed condition exists in other lead-zinc operations throughout the Nation.

This is not simply a case of bailing our own domestic producers out of a crisis, but is a matter of either saving or destroying these industries. It is a fact that the present depressed condition is directly attributable to the United States policies of financially aiding and fostering foreign producers at the expense of the United States taxpayers and to the detriment of our own domestic producers.

Much the same story exists in the wool industry as in the case of lead and zinc. Imports into the United States of shorn wool has been multiplying so rapidly that a continuation of the present practices will entirely wipe out the sheep industry of the United States as an important agricultural and livestock industry.

There is no question about the immediate emergency need for action if we are to save the wool industry. In the past 20 months wool prices have dropped 51 percent. In that same period lamb prices dropped 38 percent. To show the dependence of one segment of our industry upon the other, that drop in the price of lamb includes a drop in the price of lamb pelts from a high of $12.86 to $2.85, a 78-percent decline. Because of wool imports forcing a decline in domestic wool prices, the sheep growers of the United States have seen their lamb prices drop $10 a head, or approximately the equivalent of 10 cents per pound liveweight.

Thus, one of America's basic industries finds itself depression ridden in the midst of a national economy for the rest of the Nation, which has climbed 9 percent in the same period, from an index of 229.5 to approximately 250, near its all-time high. That makes it self-evident that the decline of prices to producers has not been accompanied by any decline in the cost of production. Under continuation of import competition for even 1 more year in the volume and at the prices which have prevailed in the past 10 years, there would be no chance for a price improvement in time to save a further serious decline in production and further losses to the producers and handlers of the industry in the United States.

There are provisions in the Tariff Act and there is section 22 of the Agricultural Act of 1949 which could have given the industry some temporary relief, but these, like the relief provisions of the peril point and escape clause of the Trade Agreements Act, were not made sufficiently mandatory by the Congress, were not enforced, and in actuality provided little protection for the wool growers.

I have tried to briefly outline some of the problems and dilemma facing the wool, lead, and zinc industries in my own State and in the Nation. In my office I have many files and additional data, all testifying to the urgency of this situation. This information is available to any Congressman or other persons who might be interested in becoming more familiar with this trade and import problem. I have introduced legislation dealing with flexible duties on the import of lead, zinc, and wool, which, if enacted, will largely alleviate the present problem. Also, I have urged early consideration of these measures or similar provisions contained in Congressman SIMPSON's bill, H. R. 5496, in order that relief might come before it is too late to save these vital industries.

The United States is and will continue to be the most powerful economic producer nation on the face of the earth, only so long as we vigilantly protect and foster the development of our raw materials and build up our productive facilities. The strength and ability of this Nation to wage war or to defend itself against aggression is directly related to our domestic industries. If we continue to develop and build up foreign producers at the expense and detriment of our own domestic industries, we might well find ourselves in the dilemma of having provided our enemies or turncoat allies with the industrial potential which might rear up like a Frankenstein to destroy us.

I believe in foreign trade; I believe in improving our international relations; but I do not believe that we should always cast the United States or United States industries in the role of having to be on the giving end—of receiving the short end of every deal. Let us wake up to reality. While we are attempting to bring a higher standard of living and democratic principles to the backward areas of the world, we are sowing economic, social, and political theories in our own country that might well cause us to lose our own sacred birthrights. To paraphrase the Biblical quotation, "For what is a man profited, if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own soul," we might have the analogy of aiding the whole world and losing our own place in the sun. I believe in America, first, last, and always. Internationalism and free trade must be secondary to our own domestic needs. Let us save at least some of America for Americans. Let us stop giving our inheritance away for a mess of international pottage.

There is no better time to start than now, and there is no more logical place to start using some good common economic sense than in our basic domestic industries.

I urge my colleagues in the Congress to study this problem and seek enlightenment on the effect which the continuation of present depressive trade policies will have upon our own domestic industries. I feel confident that if you have all of the facts on our foreign trade and import policies, that you will be motivated to support and demand that our domestic producers be given the protection and assistance provided in H. R. 5496 or in my own bill pertaining to these commodities, H. R. 5638 dealing with wool, and H. R. 4462 dealing with lead and zinc.

I am voting for the extension of the Trade Agreements Act in the hope and with the expectation that an early hearing will be granted to legislation designed to protect United States industries which are imperiled. Also, I have implicit faith in the leadership and advice of our great President, and believe he had the sincere interest of our Nation at heart in requesting the extension. The establishment of a Commission on Foreign Economic Policy is a definite step forward to work out a permanent and lasting policy to foster foreign trade and at the same time take into consideration our own domestic producers and the need for principles which will aid and foster United States production. However, we cannot afford to wait a year, 6 months, or even 3 months for the report of this new commission. We must come to the rescue of our wool, lead and zinc industries immediately and that is the reason why I urge early consideration of H. R. 5495 and H. R. 5638.

"Trade not aid" is an overworked phrase which has little merit in the present crisis. I urge a little more aid for our own domestic industries and a little less devotion to a slogan which has failed to solve any of our import-export problems. A better slogan for all of us to follow in this day and age is "Now is the time for all good men to come to the aid of their country." I urge you to vote to save United States industries today—tomorrow may be too late.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I wish it were possible for me to stand here and say that this bill has my unqualified support. Unfortunately I cannot. I cannot vote for this bill without taking an opportunity to draw the House's attention to how the administration of our trade policies in the past have affected a vital industry in my State.

Reciprocal trade, in my opinion, is necessary in a world as interrelated economically as ours has become. In self-interest we must trade with other nations, and, of course, they must trade with us. But under the guise of helping our friends throughout the world we must never allow our own economic position to deteriorate. I am sorry to say that the State Department in the past has not recognized this fact. The provisions in the Reciprocal Trade Act expressly placed there by Congress to protect our vital domestic industries have been ignored until, at the present time, these industries are faced with extinction.

I am not speaking here of those industries whose narrow specialties make them particularly vulnerable to skilled foreign competition. Nor do I speak of industries which changing times and changing demands have made obsolete. No amount of tariff protection would have saved the blacksmith shop.

But I am concerned with industries whose basic production and continued operation are vital to the Nation's security. One such industry is our lead-zinc mining industry. And this industry more than any other illustrates the dangers that can occur to our economy through mismanagement of our trade policies.

I would like to explain to the House briefly how Government policies in the past have brought this great industry to its knees and why the passage of this Reciprocal Trade Act extension will not correct the present crisis.

Our lead-zinc mining industry has—more than any other segment of our economy—been the victim of a double standard of values which has been accepted and followed during the past decade by those who would buy international good will with the jobs of American workingmen.

Here is how the double standard has operated.

We have continued to levy record high taxes against our local mining industry during the same period that tax concessions have been granted to any citizen who would invest funds in foreign mining ventures.

The Office of Price Stabilization imposed strict ceiling prices on domestic lead-zinc production during the same period that our Government procurement agencies were paying high prices—all the market would bear—for foreign production. While consistently

refusing to give any increased tariff protection to our domestic output, the Government is now buying under long-term contracts the output of foreign mines at prices well above the current market price.

The result is, our own mines are closed; foreign mines are booming. Miners who used to earn $80 per week in Utah are now dependent upon welfare and union benefit payments. They already have exhausted their unemployment compensation. Meanwhile, French Morocco miners are all employed at the munificent salary of $24 per month. Uncle Sam is receiving no taxes from our closed mines. But foreign nations are reaping tax benefits from a mining industry that is booming.

I am confident that the new administration will realize the importance of keeping a healthy mining industry. I am certain that the year's study provided in this bill will prove that the lead-zinc industry along with other selected raw material producing industries must be given adequate protection from foreign competition. But in the case of lead and zinc a year's delay may be fatal. Mines must operate or they fill with water. Miners must work or they abandon the mining community. During this study, it is imperative that we grant this industry some added protection. Otherwise I am fearful that any recommendation made by the study commission will come too late. It will do us no good to reprieve the condemned man after the hanging.

Consequently, my vote for this bill should not be interpreted as approval of continuation of the status quo in our foreign trade agreements. During this period, when the entire problem is being restudied, additional protection must be afforded the lead and zinc industry or it won't live until the cure is perfected.

Unless this legislation is supplemented by special protection for this vital industry I am fearful that ghost towns in Utah, Idaho, Wisconsin, Arizona, New Mexico and Colorado will stand as monuments to those who feel that free trade is the open sesame to national prosperity and security.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to an extension of this alleged reciprocal-trade program. The record of performance under this act in the past shows that it has operated all too often on a one-way street—with American agriculture, industry, and labor caught in the dead end of that street.

How reciprocal is it to import millions of dollars worth of commodities from the Iron-Curtain countries, including Russia and Communist China, as we did last year and shelling out American dollars, wrung from the taxpayers, to pay these countries for the stuff shipped to us?

Our trade policies in recent years have not been based upon what is good for this Nation and its citizens. These policies have been based almost entirely upon what a few soft-headed internationalists in the State Department thought was good for foreigners.

I predict that the day will come when the American people will awaken to just how badly they have been sold down the river by this international trade program. Then the emptiness of this word "reciprocal," as it has been used, will become all too apparent. But the damage will be done.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, the pending bill proposes to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, for a period of 1 year. It reduces from 1 year to 9 months the period within which the Tariff Commission must make its investigation and report on applications for relief under the escape clause, and it proposes an increase in the membership of the Tariff Commission from 6 to 7.

In my judgment both of these amendments are sound and should be approved. The present Tariff Commission is composed of only six members. This has on many occasions resulted in stalemates, with 3 members voting one way and 3 voting the other way. There was probably some justification for the six-member Commission when it was established back in 1916 because at that time the agency was purely a fact-finding group. The members were called upon to study and collect facts with respect to cost of production of various products involved in international trade, both domestic and foreign. Those facts were turned over to the Congress for appropriate consideration in connection with legislation. But more recently the duties of the Tariff Commission have been expanded. The Congress has done that by changes in the law. The Congress has ordered the Commission to administer the escape clause and the peril-point provision which have been written into the trade-agreements law. In doing so, the Commission is required to make findings, establish conclusions, make recommendations, and resolve differences. It has become a quasi-judicial agency.

In the interest of orderly procedure in democratic processes, it is imperative that the Commission be modernized to enable it to meet responsibilities placed upon it by the Congress. That, of course, requires that the Commission be composed of an odd number of members. Otherwise you invite stalemates, indecision, lack of responsibility and confusion. After all, this is no new doctrine. The need for odd numbers on quasi-judicial agencies has been recognized for years in the Government. The Interstate Commerce Commission, the Federal Trade Commission, the Federal Power Commission, the Federal Communications Commission, the Civil Service Commission—all have odd numbers of members, and for good reason. To oppose correcting this hiatus in our Tariff Commission setup is to oppose plain necessity in orderly procedure—a necessity created by the Congress itself.

I am not going to let partisanship control my action in this matter. I prefer to think in terms of sound principles or orderly procedure in the operation of an agency where majority decisions must be made from time to time.

Moreover, Mr. Chairman, the work of the Tariff Commission has increased considerably in recent years along with the vast increase in and the expansion of world trade. The Commission is far behind in its work schedule. For example, last September hearings were held by the Tariff Commission to determine whether controls under section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act were necessary with respect to importation of wool. The Secretary of Agriculture had advised the President that he had reason to believe that raw apparel wool and wool tops were being and were practically certain to be imported into the United States under such conditions and in such quantities as to render or tend to render ineffective or materially interfere with the price-support program for wool. The Secretary recommended to the President that he cause the Tariff Commission to make an investigation of the facts.

It is clear from reading section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as amended, that the Congress intended to protect against import prices being permitted at levels below 90 percent of parity. Accordingly, at the request of the Secretary of Agriculture, the President directed the Tariff Commission to hold a hearing, determine the facts, and then make a recommendation with respect to the relief contemplated by the law. That hearing was held. But 9 months have come and gone and no decision has yet been rendered.

That indicates in itself that the Commission is overworked and is far behind with its work. Perhaps the addition of another member will not only improve the capacity of the agency to make decisions but will also help to expedite its work which the Congress expects it to do.

Mr. Chairman, the importance of encouraging wool production in this country has been recognized time and time again by Government officials who deal with the subject and who are acquainted with the plight of the growers in competing with mass production in foreign countries. Wool has been designated as a strategic commodity the domestic production of which is essential to our national security. The Secretary of Agriculture has recognized the problem in his testimony before Senate and House committees this year. Secretary Brannan recognized it last year when the Department of Agriculture sponsored the hearing before the Tariff Commission.

Several bills are now pending in Congress which are designed to meet the problem and alleviate the distress which has been caused by the dumping and excessive imports of foreign wool, some of it made possible by exchange manipulations and foreign subsidies. I recently introduced a bill, H. R. 5700, which is designed to protect domestic growers against disastrous low-cost competition, and maintain the integrity of the parity price principle. This bill simply implements section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, to which I have already referred. It is now pending before the Ways and Means Committee, and I earnestly hope that committee will be able to give it proper consideration during this session.

The fact is that under the Trade Agreements Act, as it has been administered, the domestic wool growers have not been given the consideration to which they are entitled. They have not been given the protection that has been

authorized by the Congress and which was contemplated in many laws that have been enacted. The position of the growers is well described by Ernest Williams, secretary of the Texas Sheep and Goat Raisers' Association, in a recent letter on the subject in which he said:

As you know, this association, representing the sheep industry of Texas, has long felt that the industry was not sufficiently protected by provisions of the Trade Agreements Act from wool importations from countries having a lower cost of production. I hasten to say that we do not, and have not, opposed the importation of foreign wools into the United States in the amounts needed for consumption above our own production, and so long as the American grower has first chance at the American market at a fair price. Certainly there is nothing selfish in this desire, nor is it against the best interests of the United States.

We do strongly oppose the importation of wools at prices less than our cost of production. The American sheep industry is efficient, but costs of production are dictated by factors over which the producer has no control. His supplies are produced by labor which has a floor under its wages—foreign labor has no such advantage; certain supplemental feeds have, either directly or indirectly, floors under which their cost cannot fall. The market for lamb is a free one. Wool does have a support in the form of a loan, but that loan is lower than full parity and yet high enough in terms of foreign exchange to allow wools from other countries to come in at an even lower price.

As mentioned above, we do not oppose the importation of these wools. Until such time as the Congress recognizes the needs of the American wool industry, and as a result it is able to expand in sufficient numbers, we must have those wools. We do strongly feel that not 1 pound of Australian, New Zealand, South African, or South American wool should come into this country at less than the American parity price for such wool. It is our contention that the raising of present tariffs to a point more in keeping with American production costs would not decrease the amount of wool coming into this country, nor would it decrease the flow of American dollars to those countries from which the wool comes.

Mr. Chairman, there has been a tremendous drop in sheep numbers and in wool production in this country during the past 10 years. If we are to rebuild this important industry and achieve the production goals which the Congress has called for, it is imperative that sympathetic consideration be given to remedial legislation to protect the growers against foreign subsidized imports, dumping, and unfair competition. Foreign trade is absolutely necessary. Exports and imports are essential. But international trade contemplates fair competition. That means reciprocity that takes into consideration the relative competitive situation of our own industries and the factors which enter into the fairness of foreign goods sold on the American market. Unless a more realistic and sympathetic approach is given to the administration of existing laws and trade agreements, it is imperative that the Congress legislate further on the subject as it affects domestic wool producers. This should be done at an early date.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I would like to address myself today to one of the most important pieces of legislation facing this Congress—the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

Nineteen years ago the United States, under the leadership of the Honorable Cordell Hull, embarked upon a policy of liberalizing and expanding trade under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Program. Through negotiations under this program the United States has made gradual tariff concession from the record high tariffs established under the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act of 1930 for trade concessions from other countries. Under this program the international exchange of goods and services has been encouraged and during this period the United States has emerged the leader among the nations of the free world. The United States now has trade agreements with over 40 foreign nations. The high degree of prosperity in the country today is ample evidence the program has not seriously injured any substantial segments of this economy.

I have a strong conviction that any change in existing tariff policy at this time would be extremely unwise. The President has recommended that Congress extend the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act in its present form for one year during which time a thorough study can be made of our foreign trade problem. The President has indicated that he hopes United States trade policy can be coordinated with the country's total foreign policy.

I heartily concur with the President in his recommendation. To me it appears unwise to change our trade and tariff policy until we are sure we know where we are going and until we have given careful study to what the effects of such a change might be.

There are many arguments for extending the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act in its present form, but my reasons for supporting this legislation are based primarily on the necessity for maintaining our foreign market outlets, achieving economic unity of the non-Communist world, and developing a trade policy which is consistent with our role as the greatest creditor nation in history.

This maintenance of our foreign market outlets is vital to the welfare of this Nation. This is particularly true for agriculture as evidenced by the fact that exports of agricultural products reached $4 billion or 27 percent of total United States exports in 1951. In that year approximately a third of our raw cotton, wheat, rice, dried peas, and tallow was exported. About a fourth of our tobacco, peanut oil, soybeans, and lard also was exported. The loss of foreign markets for these products would cause serious economic and social repercussions in this country's agricultural areas. The decline in agricultural exports in recent months is already being felt on the domestic front. Stocks are piling up in the Commodity Credit Corporation and farm prices in most cases have tumbled to support levels.

The agricultural commodities moving into export markets in the 1951–52 season represented the production of some 60 million acres—equivalent to the cultivated areas of the States of Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Tennessee, and Kentucky. And this does not include the livestock products produced on pastures or orchard crops.

The absorption of the production of these acres by the domestic market is virtually impossible in any short period of time. Some shifts can and will be made by farmers to other crops in the long run. Nevertheless, reducing the acreage in the export crops will take time if serious maladjustments in agriculture are to be avoided.

For instance, in the South the opportunities for alternative crops which would give farmers anywhere near the same income they now receive per acre from cotton are limited. Shifts into other major crops of any sizable acreage over a short period of time simply contribute to the oversupply for the other crops. Shifts into livestock production take time. A permanent loss of three to four million bales of cotton exports would mean a reduction of income that would be disastrous to the economy of the South.

Significant segments of United States industry also have a strong interest in exports. In the industrial machinery field, the United States currently sells abroad about 21 percent of its tractors, 30 percent of its graders, 20 percent of its machine tools, 20 percent of its oilfield machinery, 27 percent of its textile machinery, and 15 percent of its trucks. Exports of chemicals are sizable with 25 percent of the sulfur black production being exported, 27 percent of penicillin, 30 percent of DDT, 26 percent of the carbon black, and 40 percent of the copper sulfate. Sales abroad are important to many of the other nonagricultural industries. Exports of lubricating oil equal 27 percent of production, paraffin wax 26 percent, turpentine 24 percent, and rosin 36 percent.

These statistics indicate the overall importance of foreign trade, both to agriculture and industry, but I would like to illustrate just how important foreign markets are to the United States cotton industry. The cotton producers have been through an exceedingly prosperous period since World War II. Only in 1 year, 1950, has it been necessary to impose marketing quotas and acreage restrictions. As a result, cotton producers have gone all out for full production and in the process great achievements have been made in production efficiency. Farms have been mechanized, recommended farm practices have been adopted, yields per acre have been increased, and in general cotton production has taken advantage of the opportunities afforded through science and technology for greater efficiency and lower costs. These achievements have been facilitated by the high level of farm production. Now, it is apparent that the cotton industry is facing the same old problems that it faced once before. First, there is greater competition in the fiber market at home; and secondly, export markets are shrinking.

The recent decline in cotton exports, which for the current season are averaging just about one-half of the rate for the last season, is the major cause for concern. Unless exports pick up soon, it looks as if marketing quotas will be inevitable for next year. This will require production controls. With production curtailment and lower prices, farm incomes will suffer. In this connection I might add that net farm income may very likely suffer to a greater extent than gross farm income. This is because farmers today who have mechanized their operations and have adopted other scientific and improved techniques have increased their cash operating costs as compared to a generation ago. Farmers will find it more difficult to cut back production today and continue to produce profitably. I might add, here, that this is not only true for cotton farmers, but for all farmers as well. The maintenance of our export markets will have a tremendous impact upon American agriculture's ability to continue its progress toward greater efficiency.

A large volume of production in agriculture as in industry leads to lower unit costs and prosperity.

The development of sound multilateral trade among the nations of the free world is our greatest weapon for combating Communist aggression. If we are to break the ties between the East and the West, we must develop a trade policy which will make it possible for our allies to secure the raw materials they require for economic stability. A third of Western Europe's trade used to be with the Iron Curtain countries of Eastern Europe. If we think it wise for security reasons to discourage East-West trade, it is incumbent on the United States to provide a climate which will permit Western Europe to develop its trade in the free world. If we are to keep Japan from trading with Red China and Manchuria, we must permit them to develop their trade in the free world also. There are tremendous possibilities for economic development and for trade in the rest of the Far East if the right policies are established by Japan and the rest of the world.

Trade is a two-way street. The fact that the economics of the industrial countries of Western Europe, Japan and the United States are not complementary does not make it easy. The United States is capable of supplying most of the raw materials needed by these countries, but unless we are willing to buy something—either goods or services—they have no way of paying for these raw materials. This is a delicate situation. Unless the United States recognizes this impasse, there appears to be no alternative but to permit Western Europe and Japan to reestablish trade with the Communists. Development of the underdeveloped areas is being encouraged and in the long run should provide expanding markets for the United States and the industrial nations of Western Europe and Japan. Greater private investments in the underdeveloped areas will stimulate economic development there and also stimulate trade. This, we are encouraging, but in the meantime I want to urge that we must do our best to devise a trade policy which is consistent with our own overall security requirements.

The economic aid programs since 1945 have bridged the gap, but we certainly should not look on such programs as the long-run solution.

I subscribe to the philosophy that it would be better for us to trade than to continue huge giveaway programs.

Western Europe also subscribes to the idea that trade should now supplant aid. Now that Western European and Japanese industries have recovered from the devastation of war, these countries feel that they are now able to earn their own way if given a chance.

To me, this seems logical. It certainly is more appealing than the continuation of economic aid on the scale that we have known in the past.

If the rest of the world is to have this chance, our trade policy should recognize that trade is a two-way street. Only a small increase in United States imports would be of great value to the rest of the world in obtaining the necessary dollars to buy the raw materials that they must have to be self-sustaining and should go a long way in helping us to balance our domestic budget.

The case for continuing the reciprocal trade program cannot be refuted. It is in the national interest. If restrictive amendments are tacked on the Trade Agreements Act, it will seriously affect our international trade relations. The rest of the world is already worried about United States actions which might make it more difficult for them to trade with us. If we let the trade-agreements program expire, it will compound the doubts among friendly foreign nations as to our future trade policy.

I am gravely concerned over the provision of H. R. 5495 which would pack the Tariff Commission. Increasing the membership from 6 to 7 members and providing that not more than 4 of the Commissioners shall be members of the same political party would be unfortunate. It would change the entire concept that the Tariff Commission should be a nonpartisan body. It would change the Tariff Commission from an objective fact-finding body to a political body and invite decisions based on political grounds rather than on merit. This would create instability in trade policy. The proposal to increase the Tariff Commission membership is an attempt by those who have opposed the trade agreements program from its inception in 1934 to reverse the principles of the program by making it a trade-restrictive measure. It is an attempt to achieve indirectly what could not be accomplished directly.

In conclusion, I wish to urge the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act of 1951 in its present form, without a single restrictive amendment. This is no time to compromise. If we do, we will be compromising ourselves, our economic well-being, our international role of leadership, and our economic and political security.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS].

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, I favor passage of the bill but am opposed to the crippling amendments in the bill. I shall support the Cooper amendment to be offered to improve the measure.

The great Committee on Ways and Means is to be congratulated in favorably reporting and recommending for passage a further extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. As we all must recognize, the Reciprocal Trade Agreements program has been one of the most important and far-reaching statutes ever enacted by the Congress. I have urged previously that the act be favorably reported without nullifying amendments. It is gratifying that the rule has been adopted for continuing the extension of the trade-agreements program. The bill should be extended for the customary period of 2 years, rather than the 1-year extension recommended by the committee. In addition, may I say that while a study commission, authorized by the new bill, may have some merit, I do not think that such a study commission is either necessary or desirable. It is a great mistake to increase the membership of the Tariff Commission from 6 to 7 members as proposed in this bill. Traditionally the Tariff Commission has been a nonpartisan, fact-finding body, and it should not be made a political and partisan body to make decisions on economic policies which involve not only the welfare of our own Nation but of the other nations of the free world.

My great interest in this legislation is accentuated by the fact that I have the honor to represent the district formerly represented so ably by the distinguished and pioneer advocate of better trade relations with other nations, Judge Cordell Hull, a beloved son of Tennessee. After Judge Hull became Secretary of State, he wisely foresaw the need for revision of the United States foreign economic policy in the direction of freer trade for the promotion of peace with other nations of the world and for strengthening of the foundations of security.

The ultimate objectives of the United States foreign policy being peace, freedom and prosperity, every effort should be made to accelerate these objectives. Economic weakness in any part of the world is a threat to the strength and unity of free nations. We must not permit sectional interest to obscure the national interest, nor must we permit short-term interest and prejudices to jeopardize the long-term benefits of promoting freer trade and commerce among the nations of the world.

Today we are at the crossroads facing a fateful choice. Let us not turn back but go forward. We can adopt a restrictive policy that would reduce the volume of our exports which can be paid for only with earnings of foreign countries from their increased imports; or we can adopt a progressive policy which will enable us to continue our high productive capacity by maintaining and increasing our exports to friendly nations.

Maintaining production at peak capacity means that consumer capacity must be expanded—the Reciprocal Trade Agreements program greatly aids in effecting this purpose.

The last available figures in our Nations exports show that foreign markets consume 39 percent of our rice, 38 percent of our cotton, 37 percent of wheat and flour, and 26 percent of American-produced tobacco. Agricultural exports reached a total of $4 billion and manufactured goods, a total of $3 billion. The reciprocal trade program has greatly facilitated this commerce.

International trade is a two-way street and we must buy if we expect to continue to sell our agriculture and manufactured products to other nations.

Let us defeat the crippling amendments here proposed and continue to design a trade policy of promoting the widest possible trade for our American products, which will, in turn, greatly aid in the promotion of our own prosperity and world peace.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE].

Mr. LANE. Mr. Chairman, Einstein himself would feel like a split personality after trying to reconcile all the contradictions that pop up in any discussion of reciprocal trade.

If he came from New England he would know that the textile industry there—or what is left of it—is battling for its life and there would be nothing academic about that fact.

At the same time he would realize that foreign nations must have a chance to sell some of their goods here, or else, we would have to keep on giving them money. That is, if we wanted to have some allies in the struggle against communism.

Neither complete free trade nor Smoot-Hawley protectionism are practical in the world of 1953. These are the horns of the dilemma. The right course, and the workable course, is somewhere in between. It is the flexible formula of negotiation, otherwise known as the Trade Agreements Act.

Every nation must have markets for its goods. But no nation can open its doors to a flood of foreign products that would put its own people out of work. Even within a country as the United States, there is a difference between one product and another, insofar as foreign competition is concerned. Some industries, like textiles, need protection, because foreign textiles of the same quality but manufactured at slave wages, can undersell our products in American stores. By contrast, the automobile industry, by its superior productive methods, has nothing to fear from the sale of foreign cars in the United States. It can pay high wages and still beat foreign competition in the home market. Besides, most nations cannot maintain an automobile industry of their own.

The nub of the situation is that some of our industries need protection and others do not.

That is why some Members of Congress can consistently support the basic philosophy of reciprocal trade, while insisting on certain exceptions to the general rule.

Because of the district I represent, that is my position.

The national interest requires the extension of the Trade Agreements Act with proper safeguards to lessen those world-wide trade tensions which so often lead to war. Take the case of Japan, now in the camp of the free world. It has temporarily lost its natural market—China. If it is not to make a deal with the Communists, in order to survive, it must find compensatory markets elsewhere. That means that we must open up part of that market to some Japanese goods in the United States or risk the alienation of Japan.

I said some Japanese goods—meaning those that do not conflict with our basic industries.

At the same time, our prime duty is to remember that the purposes of the original reciprocal Trade Agreements Act of 1934 included "restoring the American standard of living" and "overcoming domestic unemployment."

Some may counter by saying that conditions now, are much different from the situation in which we found ourselves in 1934.

True in many, if not most respects.

But in several large communities of New England, so-called mill cities, we have had serious unemployment for several years.

Without escape clauses or peril-point protection their position might become desperate. New industries do not move in overnight to take up the slack. We must at least maintain what textile industries we have, until the transition is accomplished.

Our present plight is due to the southward trend of the industry, where labor costs and wages are lowest. We do not believe in going backward, by canceling the legitimate gains that labor has made after such a struggle. Even the South will find that its present low textile wages will have to go up.

The differentials between northern and southern wages in the textile industry have been enough to cause a severe dislocation which has left us with a large and continuing labor surplus.

But the differentials between New England textile wages and those of foreign textile industries are extreme.

Without duties to equalize the cost of production, the use of countervailing duties, and the prevention of unfair practices, including dumping in import trade, our embattled textile industry is done for.

The report on the New England textile industry by the committee appointed by the conference of New England Governors' published a short time ago finds that—

> The major explanation of New England's decline in textiles is the large differential between wage costs in that area and other parts of the United States. As the report states: "In highly competitive markets an addition of a few cents a yard in the cost of producing cloth in any one area eventually means loss of sales and brings on operating deficits and resultant loss of employment."

As between the United States and foreign competitors in the textile industry, there is a vast difference in wages. The average hourly wage in the United States is from 200 percent to 1,200 percent higher than foreign competitors in the textile field.

If we should lose but 10 percent of our home market to foreign textile producers, the economic setback would amount to $1,342,929,000. Employment would drop by 105,000. In addition, the Federal Government would lose $32 million of income taxes from displaced textile workers.

Trade, not aid is the objective of our international economic policy. I cannot avoid mention of the fact that, on the domestic scene, the United States Government is providing neither trade nor aid to the labor-surplus areas of New England.

Indifference to our domestic struggle is serious enough, but further and deliberate damage through lack of protection against foreign competition would be disastrous.

I did not make up these figures. They are a matter of record, and everyone has access to them.

Those who ignore them, or tamper with them, are answerable to every American who is unemployed through no fault of his own.

In my humble judgment, H. R. 5495, like most pieces of legislation, is not the best of bills, but we have no other choice.

It is an interim measure for 1 year that will attempt, as it states, to "foster the highest possible levels of trade consistent with the national securiy and a strong domestic economy."

It is better than having no basis for agreement.

Therefore, with reservations, and hoping for corrective amendments, I am going to support the basic purposes of H. R. 5495.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. FRAZIER].

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. Chairman, the present Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act which we are asked to extend is a far cry from the original trade agreement philosophy of Cordell Hull. By snipping here and snipping there, protracted interests have succeeded in inducing Congress not merely to whittle down the effectiveness of the trade-agreements program; they have converted it from a law intended to stimulate foreign trade to one designed to restrict it. Let there be no mistake about it, the present Trade Agreements Act is nine-tenths protectionist legislation.

Some people forget very quickly and sometimes conveniently. When President Roosevelt and the Democratic Congress assumed office in 1933 the country was economically sick—desperately so. The sparkling effect of the leadership that descended upon Washington was manifest in all departments of economic life and Government. Before long the wheels of industry again moved and the farmers acquired new hope.

The cumulative sluggishness of foreign trade that had been nourished by the

Smoot-Hawley Act and the retaliation that it engendered abroad soon encountered determination on the part of the new Government to do something about it. Reciprocity had been talked about and tried many times in previous years. In fact, just before his assassination in Buffalo, N. Y., President McKinley, notwithstanding his long background of protectionism, saw the light and urged two-way trade through reciprocity. But nothing came of it. All the attempts that followed called for congressional ratification and the many strenuous and sincere efforts on the part of individuals who attempted to negotiate agreements came to naught. It was as clear as crystal to those who really wanted action that commercial reciprocity is not workable if ratification of every detail of every agreement by a parliamentary body is required. The group pressures are too great.

Cordell Hull, then Secretary of State, who had already devoted the better part of a normal life-span to liberalization of the tariff, knew this. He had been in Congress and had seen at first hand the day-to-day behavior of protectionists before the Ways and Means Committee and Congress generally. Since he wanted to do something about it he saw to it that legislation was introduced that, above all else, was practical. The result was the Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act of 1934, an act that was intended to break the log-jam of foreign trade by facilitating the international movement of goods by lowering tariff barriers. It delegated to the President, within clearly stated limits, the power to enter into executive agreements with other countries for the purpose of lowering trade barriers. Moving cautiously, while establishing the executive machinery necessary to plan and negotiate agreements, Secretary Hull succeeded in unshackling trade and at the same time in establishing safeguards for every legitimate domestic producing interest.

Between 1934 and 1947 the President, utilizing the interdepartmental machinery that had been set up under the leadership of Secretary Hull, entered into 29 bilateral trade agreements with individual foreign countries. Under these agreements tariff rates were reduced or bound against increase by the United States on products accounting for close to 70 percent of this country's dutiable imports. On the export side the United States received many valuable concessions from foreign countries, both in terms of concessions on specific items and in terms of general treatment of its commerce. Between 1935 and 1947 United States exports to countries with which the United States had agreements in effect before January 1, 1948 increased from $1,600,000,000 to $11,700,000,000. In the earlier year this trade accounted for about 70 percent of total United States exports, but by 1947 it accounted for almost 82 percent.

In 1945 the act was strengthened and the President was granted the power to reduce rates to 50 percent of those in effect in 1945 instead of, as provided for in the original act, to those in effect in 1934. Since 1934, the Trade Agreements Act has been extended seven times and we are now called upon to extend it for the eighth time.

In most of the congressional hearings on the renewal of the Trade Agreements Act there has been heated controversy regarding the effectiveness of the program. Even at their best, statistics should be used with great caution. In a world as upset as it is in this mid-20th century, there are so many unusual variables that it is almost impossible to isolate cause-and-effect relationships. To claim flatly that the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act brought about world peace manifestly would be false. However, the fact that the world has been plunged into two great world wars within a single generation and seems to be moving rapidly toward a third, does not prove that the Trade Agreements Act was not a force for world peace. A small boat equipped with a small outboard motor can battle upstream valiantly and still be washed downstream by the flood. Does this mean that the motor should be discarded altogether or that the boat needs a stronger motor? The trade-agreements program, gentlemen, as a force for loosening the straitjacket on world trade, needs strengthening, not weakening. Who, honestly, will deny that world trade is a force for peace? Countries that trade together in good will are not the countries that tend to fight each other on the field of battle. I have no sympathy with those who would discard what is good simply because it has not resulted in quick perfection.

Many conflicting forces have been at work throughout the life of the trade-agreements program to confuse statistical cause-and-effect relationships. But such official statistics as are available clearly indicate that the program has been headed in the right direction and that it has clearly resulted in discernible beneficial effects. The official statistics show that imports from countries with which we have had trade agreements have increased substantially more than have imports from the countries with which we had no trade agreements.

Between 1934 and 1945 imports from countries with which the United States had trade agreements increased by 196 percent, whereas imports from all other countries increased by only 65 percent. The increase in imports of nonagricultural products was particularly outstanding, with imports from the trade-agreement countries increasing by 228 percent, compared with an increase of 118 percent from non-trade-agreement countries.

On the export side, United States trade with trade-agreement and non-trade-agreement countries increased at about the same rate between 1934 and 1945—between 330 and 385 percent. Exports of agricultural products, however, increased more to the trade-agreement than to the non-trade-agreement countries—236 percent and 173 percent, respectively.

Since 1947 trade agreements have been negotiated multilaterally. The first large trade conference, participated in by 23 countries, was convened in Geneva in 1947. Out of it came the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, under which the United States signed trade agreements with each of the other 22 countries and each of them in turn entered into agreements with the United States and most of the other countries in attendance. This conference was followed by subsequent negotiations at Annecy, France, in 1949, and at Torquay, England, in 1951. The agreements now in effect include 34 contracting parties and the trade covered accounts for about four-fifths of the world's total. Most of the countries with which the United States had bilateral trade agreements prior to 1947 have come under the general agreement.

As a result of these years of negotiating, the United States has reduced or bound almost 2,600 rates affecting products with a trade coverage of over $2.5 billion, or 95 percent of our dutiable imports in 1949.

All of these accomplishments were achieved under the Trade Agreements Act in its original, unadulterated form. As early as 1947, with the advent of the 80th Congress, the adulteration process began. Through the years, with a huge crescendo whenever renewal hearings were held, the opponents of the program did their best to cripple the act through amendments. They called them perfecting amendments; in actual fact, they were crippling. Until the 80th Congress came to power, however, the forces of reaction were unable to make any serious inroads into the act or the program.

Meanwhile, the administration was introducing safeguards of its own to insure against serious injury from imports. In the Mexican Trade Agreement of 1942 there was included a so-called escape clause which reserved the right to withdraw a concession which resulted in unforeseen injury to any domestic producing interest. By agreement with the congressional committee the administration agreed that this escape clause would be included in all new trade agreements. The 80th Congress was not satisfied, however, and wrote a so-called peril-point amendment into the law.

Under the peril-point amendment the President, before entering into a trade agreement with any foreign country, is required to inform the Tariff Commission of the commodities upon the imports of which he contemplates making concessions. The Tariff Commission, after hearings and study, is then required to advise the President of the points beyond which, in its opinion, he cannot go in reducing tariffs without imperiling the producers of the products in question. What President, particularly one who is aware of the political pressures involved, would dare go beyond the points set by the Commission? And how far do you suppose realistic Tariff Commissioners will be willing to go in the face of the high tariff pressures that are snowballing upon them? Let us be realistic about this. The peril-point and the escape-clause provisions are protectionist devices intended to intimidate those who see the national interest from doing what is necessary to enhance

it. These amendments to the act represent abject surrender to the special interests. Those who have put the heat on Congress to strangle imports would sell the national interest down the river for a mess of special interest porridge.

It is significant that no important trade agreements have been made under the law in this emasculated form. The 81st Congress immediately repealed the crippling amendments and restored the act to its original form. It remained that way until 1951, when Congress imposed the peril-points and the escape-clause provision in even stronger form.

And now, under the Simpson bill, we are asked not to restore the act to its original workable form, but to modify it still further in the direction of ineffectiveness. The changes that the Simpson bill will make in the present act would make it into an exclusively protectionist measure.

Congress should be aware of the fact that, speaking practically, no real lowering of international trade barriers will be possible as long as the act contains such provisions. It is unworkable except as an instrument for imposing greater restrictions. The only part of the present act which will be used, indeed, is the escape procedure. For practical purposes even the peril-point provision will be a dead letter, since the President already has told the Congress that he does not intend to use the act, at least in the coming year, for the purpose of entering into new tariff-lowering negotiations.

Under the escape-clause provision, with the Tariff Commission weighted down heavily on the side of protection, there will be a veritable flood of complaints of injury or anticipated injury. We can expect to see a steady stream of greater and greater pressures exerted upon the Tariff Commission and the White House to undo much of the good work that has been done through the past 19 years.

I am interested in the national welfare. I want to see my country maintain an honorable peace. I want to see a strong free world that will be able to resist Communist advance by the force of its own character. I do not think that the United States can go it alone. I believe that we need strong allies and, further, that the way to keep our allies on our side is to live and let live.

The issue is no longer merely the economic wealth of the United States. It is peace and security. In fact, it is our very survival as a free nation that is at stake. Under the circumstances I want to do all that I can to keep our country from running backwards, from undoing the good work that has been done.

Were it politically feasible I would hold out for the restoration of the original Trade Agreements Act as conceived and perfected by Cordell Hull. I do not, for one moment, believe that we are fooling anybody, other than ourselves, when we claim that renewal of the present act is a step toward trade liberalization. We certainly are not fooling our allies. Yet, to pass no act at all would make it abundantly clear to everybody that we are determined to return to the days of Messrs. Smoot and Hawley. To extend the act in its present form is just slightly better than nothing. If we pass it we at least retain the symbol, the shell, of a once-vital program.

Meanwhile those of us who want to continue the tradition of Cordell Hull will fight to put the country back on the right track, the track that leads to practical international economic cooperation, and ultimately to world peace through understanding and good-will, not to isolationism. It is my fervent hope that the Congress that comes into power in January 1955 will have the few additional votes that will be necessary to bring this about.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD].

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Chairman, I find myself in a position today of having to vote against a 1-year extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. Because I believe in the basic purposes and principles underlying reciprocal-trade agreements, it is with regret that I oppose this extension.

I am cognizant of the fact that the great Democrat Party of which I am a member has long been the exponent of free trade. I realize, too, that we are living in a world which has been reduced by the miracles of modern science to a small community, and that if we expect to live happily, peacefully, and prosperously with our neighbors, we must work with them and trade with them. This is an age in which nations desiring to enjoy independence must, of necessity, be interdependent. The principle of reciprocity in trade is sound and desirable in my view. It is imperative that we make agreements whereby foreign markets will be open to our goods, and our markets will be open to other countries enabling them to earn dollars with which to purchase commodities produced by American industry.

However, to vote for H. R. 5495 which provides for a 1-year extension of the Trade Agreements Act but which fails to provide adequate protection for American industries is unthinkable. World trade is a two-way street, not a dead end or a blind alley. It involves rules of fair competition, it involves rules of reciprocity, it involves American jobs, the American standard of living, and national security. I know that one who desires to protect the industries of America so that a livelihood can be obtained by the men and women in them is quite likely to be labeled a protectionist and an opponent of international trade. But I do not believe that consideration of the welfare of our own people is a dastardly notion, nor do I agree that a legislator of this mind is automatically opposed to world trade or reciprocal agreements.

For many weeks we have been bringing to the attention of the Congress facts concerning the existing conditions in the coal industry and other industries. It has been repeatedly pointed out that unrestricted importation of residual oil from Venezuela and the Netherlands Antilles is hurting American industries and creating unemployment and underemployment. Residual oil is a leftover product of oil refineries, and those who produce it are tempted to sell it for any price in order to get rid of it. Forty-eight percent of this leftover product has been dumped on American east-coast markets where it is used in electric utility and manufacturing plants, whereas only 6 percent of the more desirable and more needed byproducts of the crude oil throughout is sold to the United States. Last year 127 million barrels of residual oil were dumped upon American markets, displacing 31 million tons of coal. This amount represents an increase of 300 percent in residual-oil importations over a period of 6 years and it was great enough to deprive the coal industry of $151 million in revenues last year, miners and their families of $75¾ million in wages, the railroads of $86 million in revenues, railroad employees of $43 million in wages, and National, State, and local tax coffers of $34 million in taxes. As a result of the excessive importation of this foreign leftover oil, domestic oil producers have curtailed activities leading toward the exploration and development of new oil-fields. Capital investments in the coal industry have been impaired and future progress has been impeded. Mines have closed, and this industry upon which we must depend most for fuel and power in time of need has been made to suffer.

West Virginia is the greatest bituminous-coal producer in the United States. Coal mining is the major industry and it involves 65 percent of our overall State economy. Since January 15 of this year over 70 mines have closed in West Virginia, more than 30 of which have been in my district, the Nation's largest coal-producing congressional district. Thousands of men have left the State to seek employment elsewhere. Many of these men are past 40 years of age and have had experience only in coal mining. Not only does the miner suffer, but the situation has set up a chain reaction which is felt in barber shops, filling stations, retail stores, wholesale houses, schools, and churches. A chain is only as strong as its weakest link. Coal is the weak link in the chain of our national economy. If we continue to permit unrestricted importation of foreign residual oil, I fear that the impact of economic distress in the coal fields will eventually make itself felt in other parts of the Nation.

We are told that in the year 1975 American industry will need 800 million tons of coal—70 percent more than the total production last year. This estimation is based upon conditions existing in a peaceful world. If at any time we should be at war, of course, the demand would be even greater. In peace or in war how can we expect our coal-mining industry to keep pace if we are going to deprive it of its markets, destroy its initiative, and deplete its manpower? Furthermore, in view of the fact that reports indicate that Russia today possesses six times the number of submarines possessed by Hitler at the beginning of World War II, how can we expect, in the event of total war, to keep our oil lifeline open if we depend upon foreign

sources for supply? I contend that we should give every encouragement to the protection and development of a healthy coal industry, an industry which will be called upon to supply coal—not only for heat and power, but also as the basic product from which many, many chemicals and synthetic fuels will be derived.

H. R. 5495 fails of this purpose. It does not afford this needed protection to the coal industry, to the glass industry, nor to certain other domestic industries. Under the rule by which this bill has been brought to the floor we are even precluded from amending it to include such protection. The bill, while providing for the extension of an act which is basically desirable, penalizes American domestic industries and the men and women engaged in them, and at the same time enriches a few giant oil companies, benefiting but little the people of Venezuela and a couple of small islands in the Caribbean. I know that there is a faint possibility that H. R. 5496, a bill which would give our industries the protection they need, may be brought before the House later, but that is not likely. My vote against the bill before us is a protest in behalf of the American people to whom I first owe my allegiance. I urge my friends here to vote in like manner. To do otherwise is to cheat ourselves and those who come after us.

In Edwin Markham's Parable of the Builders we are told the story of a certain rich man who had it in his heart to do good. One day as he was out walking over his broad estate he came upon a little hut down in a valley in which lived a poor carpenter with a large family. The following morning the rich man called the carpenter to his side and placed before him the plans for a beautiful building. He said, "I want you to build me a house just like this one over on that sunny hill. I want you to procure only the choicest of materials and use only the finest of labor, for I want it to be a good house." With that, he went away leaving it all to the builder.

After he had gone the carpenter said to himself, "This is my chance." He skimped a little here and he skimped a little there. He used twice as much sand and half as much cement in the foundation as the specifications called for. He used the poorest of materials and the cheapest of labor in order that he might have more money for himself.

At length the rich man returned. The carpenter walked up to him and offered him the keys, and as he did so, he said, "That is a very fine house I built for you over on that sunny hill."

"Good," said the rich man. "I am glad that it is a good house, because I have intended all along to give it to you when it was finished. The house is yours."

The carpenter walked away broken-hearted. How industriously he had been cheating himself. As he walked away with the keys in his hands, he said over and over again to himself, "Oh, if I had only known that I was building for myself."

Each of us is working on a building. It is the building of America. Let us take care as we build for the future, lest we find like the carpenter when it is all too late that we have been cheating ourselves.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER].

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, some of those who have appeared before me plainly stated they want the Tariff Commission to be a partisan commission. It seems to me I have heard the President of the United States and I have heard the leaders of the Republican Party and the leaders of the Democratic Party appealing for a nonpartisan foreign policy. A foreign policy must be based to some extent on the reciprocal trade agreements program. Here is a Republican leadership in the House on the Committee on Ways and Means advocating partisanship on one of the most important programs facing the United States. Therefore, they are overriding the will of not only the President but the will of four of the members of the Cabinet. In addition to that, Mr. Chairman, the President has been all over the country, and his Cabinet Secretaries and Assistant Secretaries have been all over the country advocating a 1-year extension without any amendments whatsoever in this reciprocal trade agreements program. Here we have another example of the leadership in the House of Representatives absolutely opposing the program of the President as well as the program of the Republican Party.

Mr. Chairman, when the Secretary of the Interior threw out the suggestion that "You will go before a new commission in effect if you want relief," he was trying to sweeten up some of the Republican opposition to an extension of this program for 1 year. He, in effect, told the world "You will get consideration if you go before that commission now." He might just as well have said "We will knock out the heart of this reciprocal trade agreements program and the nonpartisanship part of it, which has existed for 40 years. We are going to do things on a partisan basis." That is what I think the Secretary, Mr. McKay, meant when he tried to sweeten up the Republicans so that they would vote for an extension.

Mr. Chairman, for 40 years this Commission has been nonpartisan. But now we are to have something quite different. As for the witnesses who did appear against an extension—there were many of them, but what kind of witnesses were they? Mr. Chairman, they were the same witnesses who have appeared in opposition to this program every time it has been up for renewal.

The members of the Ways and Means Committee knew in advance what they were going to say. In fact, they repeated everything that they had said 2 years ago, 3 years ago, 6 years ago—ever since the commencement of the program. So we did not get any new information from them. So we have the same opposition. And it is surprising to me, Mr. Chairman, that there is this insistence on partisanship. I am very glad, though, that those who oppose the program are not trying to conceal the fact that they want a partisan Tariff Commission.

You know what was in the original Simpson bill. It proposed to take from the President of the United States any discretion whatsoever. Under the original Simpson bill the President would have been compelled to accept the recommendation of the partisan Tariff Commission without regard to the foreign policy of the United States, without regard to many of the factors that enter into a decision by the President of the United States. It meant just taking away the power from their own President—absolutely. And that is what they have in mind for the future.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that this is one of the most—well, I might say dangerous moves that this Congress could take. It is notice to the whole world that we are going to change our policy with regard to building up the economies of foreign countries; to change our whole policy with regard to giving them an opportunity to sell their goods; to change the whole policy which has been for them to be able to sustain themselves and to provide some military defense. Our friends of the free world must have a sound economy in order to build some kind of a military defense for their own country's protection and for the help of the free world at large.

Mr. Chairman, the notice that will be given to the world at large, to the countries who are now our friends, will be that we are going back to an isolationist economy; that we are not going to help them in the future. And that is what they are fearful of right now. I know what they are saying down in South America, especially the friends of communism: "Don't depend on the United States." That is what some are saying now, much to my regret.

Mr. Chairman, the continuation of the present trade agreements program is as much, if not more, in our own self-interest as it is in the interest of other free nations of the world. We must remember that although less than 7 percent of the population of the world is in the United States, we produce about one-half of the industrial goods of the world. Also, we are far from being self-sufficient now, and we are steadily becoming less self-sufficient. This is due to the growth of our population and our ever-increasing per capita consumption of goods, with the consequent depletion of our natural resources.

The economic isolationists among us ignore these facts. They also ignore the fact that one of the most effective defenses against world communism is an expanded and liberalized trade agreements program. We have given and received commitments from various free nations in the world, looking toward our mutual defense and economic welfare. To retract from the philosophy of our trade agreements program toward the isolation of the Smoot-Hawley days, even for a moment, would cause serious repercussions among the free nations of the world and here at home.

Expanded international trade is the cheapest and most effective way to fight

communism. If we should need proof of this, we can get it by noting that the Soviet bloc is hoping to encourage trade between itself and our friendly allies. This is an attempt to drive an economic wedge between the free nations of the world. Russia would be greatly benefited by trading her agricultural goods and raw materials for manufactured goods, so as to free her factories producing these goods to build war materials. A cut in foreign trade and aid could do nothing but play into the hands of the Communists at this time.

Through the Marshall plan, the Economic Cooperation Administration, and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, we have helped reestablish the war-torn industries and economies of the free nations of the world, and strengthened our mutual security. We did this in order to help the free nations become self-sustaining. These programs have cost the taxpayers billions of dollars, and we have put 7 years of effort in them. Any attempt to cut down on the flow of imports into this country would tend to defeat our own purposes which we have strived to accomplish through these programs.

Since 1914, the excess of our exports over imports has been around $100 billion. This has meant that we have drained the other nations of the world of their gold, which we have now buried at Fort Knox, that they have defaulted on their loans, and that we have greatly damaged our own national wealth and welfare. How anyone can fail to see that it is essential that we increase our foreign trade in order to prosper here at home and help provide for our national security, while at the same time contributing to the prosperity and the well-being of the free world, I cannot understand.

It seems to me that the taxpayers of this country can very appropriately ask us why there is a movement in Congress this very day to cut down on our imports rather than expand them; why we keep gouging them for money to pay for aid to friendly nations, while at the same time requiring them to pay a much higher price for the goods which they have to buy than they would have to if our imports were increased. They could also very appropriately ask why they should have to subsidize domestic industry through high tariffs and trade protection.

The prosperity of the free nations of the world is necessary for our own prosperity, and our own prosperity depends to a very great extent on wise foreign economic policies. If we put penalties on imports, we are at the same time putting penalties on exports. If we spend dollars on imports, we are at the same time creating a demand for exports.

The protectionists apparently do not realize, or at least do not seem to realize, that if we let our exports sink to the level of our imports, not only will there be stagnation on our farms and in our industries at home, but there will also be stagnation abroad. They do not seem to realize that the free nations of the world must trade in order to live, and that if they cannot trade with us, they will be forced to trade with the Soviet bloc to a great and likely damaging extent.

If they argue that a favorable balance of trade is an excess of exports over imports, how can they answer the fact that such a situation means that we are giving away a good part of our national wealth and refusing to accept payments in foreign goods in return?

Would they have us to continue indefinitely foreign economic aid? Would they have us reduce our domestic production? Would they have us continue the resulting tax burden on our already overburdened taxpayers? And must the taxpayers continue to subsidize protected industries in the United States?

Mr. Chairman, it is hard for me to believe that in this day and time it is necessary that these questions still be asked. However, they must be. The attempt in the bill which we are considering today to change the nonpartisan nature of the Tariff Commission so as to make it a political, partisan body is a step backward toward the protectionist days of Hawley and Smoot. The eyes of the free nations of the world are upon us, because of their concern about the action which we may take here today, and the adverse effect which it could have on them. The eyes of the communistic countries of the world are upon us today, because they are hoping that we will take this backward step which we are being urged to take.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, if ever there was a time when it was important for the United States to have vigorous and loyal allies that time is now. In this atomic age the admonition to keep our powder dry means far more than building stockpiles of weapons and the airplanes to deliver them.

If we are to avoid a shooting war, if we are to guard our civilization against the complete corrosion of totalitarianism, we who believe in representative government by free men must win the battle for the hearts and minds of men. This is a battle that cannot be won by radio propaganda telling others how good we think we are. It can be won only by example. We must demonstrate that we say what we mean and that we mean what we say.

It does no good—in fact, it does much harm—to preach economic cooperation and leadership in our major political speeches, while making day-to-day decisions that point in the opposite direction. The peoples of other lands will judge us by what we do rather than by what we say. Have we not, in fact, urged that the Iron Curtain countries be judged by what they do rather than by what they say? We are now confronted by a test of our own sincerity. What we do in our foreign trade policy will be far more effective than countless expressions of hope for international cooperation in general.

We have before us a bill to extend the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act in its present form for another year, pending a thorough study of the problem of formulating an economic policy for the United States by a Commission to be created for the purpose. We have a choice to make: We can move backward, we can stand still, or we can move forward.

To move backward at this critical juncture in world affairs would be tantamount to dropping a spark in oil-soaked sawdust. If we legislate new shackles designed to make the lowering of international trade barriers even more difficult or likely than at present we shall give a clear signal to other free countries that they will have to go it alone. If we do not buy their goods, even while urging them not to trade with the Iron Curtain countries, with whom can we expect them to trade? Is the blame theirs, or is it ours, if because their goods are barred from our shores, they turn to such markets as they can develop? Although the bill before us would continue, at least nominally, the power of the President to negotiate trade agreements, it contains a built-in practical joker. It would expand the Tariff Commission from 6 to 7 members, thereby destroying that body's bipartisan character and transforming it into an arm of the administration. Such action would be directly contrary to the 37-year old philosophy of the Tariff Commission. That organization is supposed to be bipartisan in composition in order that it may advise Congress and the President on tariff and other commercial policy matters. To destroy the balance between its Republican and Democratic membership would be to destroy the Tariff Commission idea and to give the green light to the Tariff steamroller.

Our second choice is to move forward. That is what I should like to see this Congress do. The Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act should be restored to its original form and stripped of all crippling amendments. This Congress should do more than merely extend the act in its present emasculated form. Repeal of the peril-point and escape-clause amendments would go far toward uniting the Western countries in a feeling of genuine economic cooperation. Even if we were not to make any new trade agreements the very fact that we would have demonstrated by legislative action that we have no intention of moving backward along the road of intensified trade restriction would help allay the suspicions and the fears of the countries to the west of the Iron Curtain.

Our third choice is to renew the act in its present form, pending further study. Although such action would provide no guaranty that the United States is to move forward toward greater international economic cooperation, such action would signalize our intention of holding the line pending the formulation of a firm and enlightened national policy. Even if the President of the United States decides not to enter into any new trade agreements in the immediate future the authorization to do so would be there if world conditions should develop so as to make further negotiation desirable.

No one, in truth, can say that the reciprocal trade-agreements program has

not been successful. The trade-agreements program, initiated in 1934, together with the other recovery measures initiated by the Roosevelt administration, halted the vicious contracting spiral of the American economy and world trade and restored the self-confidence of the entire Nation. It was like a breath of fresh air dissipating the dreary fog of the great depression.

From 1934 to 1945 the President was authorized, under the terms of the original Trade Agreements Act, to lower duties to 50 percent of their 1930 levels in exchange for concessions by other countries in favor of our exports. In 1945 this power was extended, making it possible for the President to reduce rates to 50 percent of their 1945 levels.

Between 1934 and 1947, the first 13 years of the life of the Trade Agreements Act, the President concluded 29 bilateral agreements. In 1947, the United States, together with 22 other countries, held the first multilateral conference for the reduction of tariff barriers at Geneva, Switzerland, from which emerged the Geneva Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. Since then a number of other countries have acceded to the agreement so that it now has 34 contracting parties whose trade accounts for approximately four-fifths of the world's total. In exchange for the 2,500 rates which the United States has either decreased, or bound against increase, we have received many valuable export concessions.

In 1942, with the war emergency at hand, the administration introduced an escape clause into all new trade agreements. It was a true escape clause in that it opened the way for modification of concessions if increases in imports resulting from any trade-agreement reduction in rate brought about unforeseen injury. Always, however, the final decision was that of the President, who judged such modification in the light of the national interest.

The 80th Congress, and later the 82d, saw fit to write into the law the so-called peril-point provision which requires that the Tariff Commission perform the magician act of notifying the President, in advance, of the limits to which he might go in lowering tariffs without leading to injury to domestic producers. What a thousand Solomons could not possibly do the Tariff Commissioners are commissioned by law to do. Small wonder that their recommendations are supersafe and conservative.

The 82d Congress added the new escape-clause provision which puts the President right on the hot seat whenever he dares to overrule, even in the national interest, a finding of the Tariff Commission that some producer somewhere has been hurt, or might be hurt, by imports. And now the forces of reaction want to go even further and take away from the President even the power to veto the recommendations of the Tariff Commision. Those who reason this way see no difficulty in the fact that, even though the President has the power to veto an act of the full Congress, he would by such legislation be denied the right to veto acts of the Tariff Commission, which is a creature of the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, let us not be fooled by pious expressions of concern for the welfare of producers. The tariff diehards would improve the Trade Agreements Act by perfecting amendments. They would not slug the act to death with a broad-ax. Never. They would slit its throat with a sharp razor blade.

The fact remains that no important trade agreements have been negotiated while the peril-point and escape-clause amendments have been in effect. If we really desire to liberalize world trade we shall have to legislate workable legislation. The present act is not workable and neither is the bill before us. A vigorous program requires vigorous legislation, the kind that we had under the original Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act as inspired by that great world-trade leader, Cordell Hull.

Mr. Chairman, the present law is bad enough without making it worse by making the Tariff Commission a partisan body. It was not necessary for the Republican leaders to go to this extent. The 10 Democratic members of the Ways and Means Committee favored the extension of the present law, and all that was necessary for President Eisenhower and the Republican leaders was to get 3 of the Republican members of the committee to vote for such an extension.

Instead, political expediency was employed and the result, a further marked weakening of reciprocal trades agreements legislation.

And this comes at a time when the Soviet Union is making a determined effort to drive a wedge between the free countries of the world, and the main weapon they are using now is the economic appeal, for we know that the Soviet Union and Communist China are making attractive offers for trade.

On this morning we see in the New York Times a news item from Europe, and I quote:

> The Kremlin clearly hopes that the reduction of the United States dollar assistance abroad and the maintenance of the United States tariff barriers preventing the growth of a "trade, not aid" policy will force Europe to develop commerce with the Eastern bloc.

Several months ago all we heard about was "trade not aid." Anyone with common sense knew there was nothing to that, for it was nothing but another deceiving slogan. Everyone knows now it is so. Whatever action will be taken to enable proper international trade to take place, which is most desirable, and which will not be injurious to our own economy will be through the passage of an effective law enabling reciprocal trade agreements to be enacted, and the making of such agreements. The customs simplification act will also be helpful. And yet, in addition to the peril-point and escape-clause provisions of the present law the attempt is being made to make the Tariff Commission a partisan board. This will have a serious effect on all existing trade agreements. If we do not remove unnecessary barriers and permit friendly countries to trade with us we force them to trade elsewhere. In the world of today this action is not in the national interest of our country.

Throughout the past 37 years there has been more than a gentleman's agreement that the Tariff Commission should be bipartisan, 3 Democrats and 3 Republicans. The 64th Congress which was composed of 228 Democrats, 197 Republicans, and 9 others in the House, and 56 Democrats and 40 Republicans in the Senate, established this bipartisan commission. In the 71st Congress in 1930, consisting of 267 Republicans, 163 Democrats and 1 other in the House; and 56 Republicans, 39 Democrats, and 1 other in the Senate, an effort was made to increase the membership to 7. That effort failed. During the past 20 years no effort was made by Democratic administrations to increase the membership. It was not even thought of.

There should be enough independent Republicans to stop this from going through today. You will remember that not so many years ago there were only 89 Republican Members in the House, yet we Democrats did not even think of doing this at that time.

There were compelling reasons in 1916 why this Commission was made bipartisan that are just as compelling, and more so, today. It was then and is now recognized:

(a) That the setting of rates is a scientific national and international question and not purely a political matter.

(b) That tariff rates being of vital importance to our country, and now of future peace, should not be subjected to manipulation on a political basis.

(c) That the Commission should be so constituted that the members could resist the power and influence of pressure groups seeking special privileges or considerations at the expense of the country as a whole, and more broadly of our international interest.

(d) A Commission that could look at the whole economic situation on questions coming before it in an objective manner.

(e) That the Tariff Commission to enjoy confidence must be above politics.

(f) The most effective way to accomplish the maximum beneficial results was to have a bipartisan and not a partisan Commission.

Throughout the past 20 years we Democrats felt the best interests of our country in the field of tariff rates within the limits prescribed by law would be best served by a bipartisan Commission. Despite the fact our leaders have not been consulted much to date during this present term and by the present administration, the Democrats in Congress are giving President Eisenhower bipartisan support.

There is an old saying that "action speaks louder than words." The majority party has the responsibility of showing by its actions it wants that bipartisan support to continue.

This move is a message to the Democrats that years of custom, or what might be termed more than a gentleman's agreement going back to 1916 is meaningless to the Republican leadership, that they will use us, but arbitrarily

disregard the Democrats whenever political expediency within their own party dictates it.

That is an action which will destroy bipartisan support, for bipartisan support must work both ways.

The leadership for bipartisan support must come from the majority party, by the doing of those things, the regard for the feelings, and the position of the minority party, that will justify and result in bipartisan support.

The increase in the membership of the Commission is disruptive of bipartisan support.

Everyone knows the reason for this and practically every Member knows it is wrong. While it might have been necessary to get the bill out of the committee, this does not mean that the House is bound by any actions or agreements based on expediency. The bill is now before the House.

A vote for the national interest of our country and at the same time a vote that will strengthen, not disrupt, the bipartisan support in Congress that President Eisenhower wants, that he is seeking, that he is getting to date, will be a vote for a bipartisan 6-member Commission and not for a partisan 7-member Commission.

As I said before, we all know the reasons for this. We know it is a compromise, we know it is based upon expediency and we know it is a compromise between Republicans. Yet since 1916 with Democratic Congresses and Republican Congresses in power this six-man body has continued. We now come to a time when the world is faced with great danger—atheistic communism. We have had this bipartisan Commission for 37 years. We need it just as much today, probably more so than at any time during the past 37 years.

Why not let us go forward, Republicans and Democrats, working in unity and in bipartisan support of those matters that are in the interest of our Nation, not in support of Dwight Eisenhower, as leader of the Republican Party but of Dwight Eisenhower as the President of the United States.

This action today is nothing but a message to the Democratic Party: We will use you and we will abuse you.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I am very happy that this bill carries a provision for a commission to study foreign trade. There are many things such a commission should go into. I would like to mention at least three of them.

I hope that they will develop the facts that will assist in restoring the traditional trade patterns of the world. Those patterns have practically disappeared by reason of wars and state trading. There was a time when the American farmer had an opportunity to feed a part of the millions of people in Europe. That market has gone unless you consider the giving away of your merchandise as trade.

The second thing I hope they will go into is the matter of ascertaining whether or not in our trade agreements programs of recent years we have not sacrificed our agricultural markets for industrial markets. There are many who believe that in the expansion of our industrial markets we have gone to countries that produce practically nothing but raw materials, and in order to make a market for America's industry they have sacrificed the agricultural market and have unduly encouraged farm imports. Many farm leaders believe that.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that the study commission will bring in a report that will enable the carrying out of a program that does not sacrifice one segment of American economy for another segment. And, the third point that I hope they will cover is this: That they will do something to reduce the trade barriers of the world. There are more barriers to trade now than have ever existed at any time in the history of our country. I refer to state trading quotas, embargoes, sterling blocks, Empire preferences, currency manipulations, and the many other practices which are today preventing a free flow of commerce.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON].

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I have made extensive speeches on the floor of the House in the past against reciprocal trade agreements. I am not going to make an extensive speech at this time. I am going to, however, try to prove to this committee that there is at least one man in the House that is not confused on the issues.

Mr. Chairman, in January 1937, as a new Member of this House, I was 1 of 13 who voted "no" against the extension of the reciprocal trade agreements for a 3-year period. That was the first extension asked. I have voted "no" on every extension since, and I expect to vote "no" on this extension. So, so far as I am concerned, I may be mistaken, but I am certainly not confused on the issues.

Now why have I been voting "no" all through the years? Well, as I read the blueprint outlining the functions of this Government I find in that blueprint that the function of the legislative branch of the Government is to decide upon and arrange and levy tariffs. So, I have been opposed to the reciprocal trade agreements all through the years because I claim it is a direct violation of the Constitution of the United States for the legislative branch to turn over to the executive branch the responsibility and the obligation that duly belongs upon our shoulders. That is fundamental with me, and that is the reason.

Now, about the Simpson bill that is before us, I actually told the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SIMPSON] when he presented his first bill to us, with all of those restrictions as well as quotas in it, "Dick, I will vote for this bill because it is a step back toward the Congress assuming its proper functions." Since then all restrictions have been removed from the bill that is now before us therefore I will vote "no" on the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES].

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, as is apparent to the membership, there is really only one item of controvery in this bill and that relates to the membership of the Commission.

Listening to the debate, I have been quite intrigued to hear the Democrats speak out with such great concern over the Tariff Commission, because fundamentally their concern in the past has been only one of weakening the Tariff Commission and subjugating it to the State Department. As far as the trade agreements and our tariff policy are concerned, they have always wanted the tariff policy to be out of the picture. They have wanted the tariff policy and trade policy determined not by the Tariff Commission but by the State Department.

You remember the debates in the 80th and 81st Congresses when we attempted to establish the peril point and escape clauses and give the Tariff Commission some real responsibility and functions. They fought it. "We do not want the Tariff Commission anyplace in this picture." That really was the word that went out. They have not changed their position. They still do not want a strong and effective Tariff Commission. That is why they want to keep it in a position where it can function with the least effectiveness, namely, as a six-man Commission. They would enjoy seeing the Tariff Commission stalemated by 3 to 3 decisions.

I am tempted to wonder somewhat when I hear the gentleman from Massachusetts crying about who is going to have control of this Commission. In the first place, let us remember that no matter what party labels they might have or what we might say in the law, it is the President of the United States that appoints the members of the Commission. Certainly they cannot contend that increasing the membership is going to make it more difficult for the President of the United States. Who is going to appoint the additional man? The President of the United States.

As the situation exists today what we have is a Commission four of whose members are appointees of prior administrations. They carry over. No matter what we do, we will have four members who were appointed either by President Truman or by President Roosevelt. That means that even with a 7-man Commission 4 of the members will have been appointed by previous Democrats. I am not criticizing any members of the Tariff Commission, but let me say that only 2 members of the Tariff Commission are being appointed by President Eisenhower. One appointment has been made. There is a Republican vacancy which he can fill at this time. I cannot help but feel that the real and underlying reason the Democratic spokesmen oppose increasing the membership of the Commission is that they do not want to disturb the 4 to 2 division of the committee—4 members appointed by

Democrat Presidents, 2 members appointed by a Republican President.

It is only reasonable and proper that the membership of this Commission should be increased from 6 to 7.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KNOX].

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Chairman, I am not in complete harmony with the provisions of the bill H. R. 5495. I am not opposed to the President's request for an extension of 1 year. However, I do believe that as far as the legislative and executive branches of the Government are concerned, they should be kept apart. They should make their own studies.

As far as changing it from a 6- to a 7-man membership is concerned, I believe it is in the best interest of our Nation that we should have a decision on all of the questions that arise before the Tariff Commission.

I am not one that cannot compromise my thinking. Therefore, I am going to support H. R. 5495.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remaining time on this side to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN].

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, this to me has been a very interesting debate and one on rather a high level. Some speeches on my right have been made that I would like to adopt as my own, because I think the Members who made them have gone into this matter from a very deep and fundamental standpoint.

We must debate this change from a 6- to 7-man membership during general debate because under the circumstances there can be only 5 minutes on a side when the amendment is offered to strike this 7-man provision out of the bill.

I heard a gentleman over here, I think it was the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES], talking about these bipartisan commissions and the votes thereon. I happened to have a part in the creation of the Federal Power Commission, the Federal Trade Commission, and the Federal Securities and Exchange Commission. I happen to be the author of three of the laws that the Securities and Exchange Commission administers.

There was a reason for that—a good reason. It was so that every section of the country and all ideas concerning these matters should be represented on the various commissions. But that does not stand on all fours with the Tariff Commission at all. They deal entirely with matters domestic—nothing foreign. This Tariff Commission and this reciprocal trade bill we are considering this afternoon deal with far-reaching, fundamental, worldwide, and sometimes world-shaking problems. For 37 years, since 1916, under 25 years of Democratic administration and 12 years of Republican administration, no President of our country has ever advocated that this Commission be other than a 6-man Commission; that no more than 3 from either party be members of this Commission at the same time.

We heard a great deal in recent years about packing boards and commissions and courts. It rang through these Chambers and throughout the length and breadth of the country that a President of the United States wanted to pack the Supreme Court of the United States. Well, there has never been in the history of legislation a more deliberate attempt to subvert the original ideas that came into being with the creation of the Tariff Commission than what we are going to vote on in this House in a little while.

I read the President's message on taxation. The first two paragraphs of it contained deep criticisms of the administrations that preceded his. Of course, we have a deficit. We have an unbalanced budget for 1953 and we are going to have one a great deal more out of balance in 1954 and worse out of balance in 1955. We have to keep up trade and commerce with all the world in order to keep up the national income of this country and to have our people able to pay taxes. We have to have an income from the farm and the factory to be able to pay taxes to the greatest business in the world—the business of the United States of America. I want to say to the President with reference to this very partisan message, which he sent up here on the tax bill, that if I have ever known an administration in 40 years where the composition of the other body and of the House of Representatives required nonpartisan cooperation, this present Republican administration needs it more than any administration I have ever known. Just to be constantly criticized on the floor of the House and in other places, including the other end of the Avenue, for the things that have been done in the past does not set very well with some of us who want to cooperate with any President who occupies the White House because we do not hate Republicans in the White House like a lot of people hated Democratic Presidents in the White House in the past. I feel bad to hear and read some of the things which were said about Democratic Presidents not only politically but personally in the past. We want to cooperate. That is why we are voting for this bill today. We think reciprocal trade arrangements will save our country. I do not see how anyone, with world conditions what they are, and since we have become a great surplus-producing country, can think that we could possibly operate under the provisions of the old Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act. The gentleman from Tennessee talked about trade that we have had with the world and how much it has increased since we started working under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] and others called attention to what this means. It is going back on the very thing for which the Tariff Commission was created. It was a nonpartisan or no-partisan Tariff Commission. As the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES] said a while ago, we needed a decision from that Commission. That Commission has been split a few times, but there has never been a 3-to-3 vote on a matter involving the escape clause.

So I think, as we come to a vote on this matter, if I were in the majority I would not do this to the Tariff Commission, and I hope that enough gentlemen on the other side will join us to carry this out as it was originally intended.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I have heard a lot of statements made on the Democratic side—maybe they are made in good faith, I do not know—statements that this administration is not doing very well, and that it is not doing so well with the Congress. Let me just say to you gentlemen that we are getting along all right. We are proceeding with our program and we are proceeding with it today. And here again you will see that degree of cooperation between this Republican Congress and the Republican administration that is going to characterize everything we are going to do.

Of course, I want to say to the people on our side of the aisle that nothing would please the Democrats better than to see us divided and fighting with one another. But it just has not been that way and it is not going to be that way.

In this measure I am supporting the administration position. And let me say that there was no dictation about it. I was present at the White House when this whole matter was discussed.

Let me say to you that this proposition, as it stands today, with the addition of a member to the Tariff Commission, is in line with the administration position and completely acceptable to them.

May I also say that I think it is a completely reasonable position which all of us can support.

The people on my right ought to recognize, as I recognize, that no one ever gets his way completely in legislation. To listen to this argument some might say that the addition of another member to the Tariff Commission is going to destroy the whole reciprocal trade agreements program. Ultra protectionists say it does not mean anything at all. I think that probably in the middle lies something near the truth.

As far as the addition of a member is concerned, it is not going to wreck any program. But I will tell you what it will do. It will provide a situation under which, to some degree at least, there may be a reflection of the views of the President of the United States.

The Members on the Democratic side talk about how they are supporting President Eisenhower, and once in a while they do—principally when it suits their own convenience or their own situation. But if they are talking about supporting him, as the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES] pointed out, the President should be allowed to appoint this additional member to the Tariff Commission. So, necessarily, that man must be acceptable to him and will reflect his views. So what are you concerned about? Why all the to-do about it?

As a matter of fact, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania pointed out, the duties of the Commission have been broadened. And I might say, parenthetically, that the present Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act is substantially as it was enacted by the Republican 80th Congress.

In view of the broadening of the powers of the Tariff Commission; in view of the fact that certainly the Eisenhower administration should have in some measure some authority in respect to the political and economic problems before the country. For those reasons I say the addition of a member to the Tariff Commission is justified.

The criticism has been made of the fact that the administration did not come down here and right away, before the Secretary of Commerce had hardly taken his oath, come out with a full-fledged, full-blown, far-reaching foreign economic policy covering all phases of the problem.

Now let me just say to my friends on this side—or on either side—who may have thought that answers and information were not quite definite enough, the administration has taken over a tremendous job. There was some controversy about how much of a mess there was before the election, but, believe me, as we have been looking into some of it, it really was as bad as anyone suggested. There have been tremendous things to do and you could not expect the administration to come up here immediately with a fulfilled policy. So what have they done? They have said to extend this program for a year and then we will create a commission to study this whole proposition, go into all the different angles and come up with recommendations which in the final analysis, may I say to my colleagues on the Ways and Means Committee, will come to them for their final determination. To my mind that is a completely sensible and reasonable approach; it is in compliance with the administration program. I cannot see how it can do harm to anybody's deep convictions. That being the situation, I hope that the amendment that is to be offered will be defeated, and I hope this measure will go on to passage in order that it may go to the other body, action be had on it there, and we get on with the other business before the Congress.

As to the Republican position generally on foreign trade, let me read from the platform—and I think we can all subscribe to this. This is what the administration seeks to do:

We favor the expansion of mutually-advantageous world trade. To further this objective we shall press for the elimination of discriminatory practices against our exports, such as preferential tariffs, monetary license restrictions, and other arbitrary devices. Our reciprocal trade agreements will be entered into and maintained on a basis of true reciprocity, and to safeguard our domestic enterprises and the payrolls of our workers against unfair import competition.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired, all time for general debate has expired. Under the rule the bill is considered as having been read for amendment.

The bill reads as follows:

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

TITLE I—FOREIGN-TRADE AGREEMENTS

SEC. 101. Extension of authority.

The period during which the President is authorized to enter into foreign-trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended and extended (19 U. S. C., sec. 1351), is hereby extended for a further period of one year from June 12, 1953.

SEC. 102. Time for certain reports by Tariff Commission.

The first paragraph of subsection (a) of section 7 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951 (19 U. S. C., sec. 1364) is hereby amended by striking out "1 year" and inserting in lieu thereof "9 months." In the case of any application made under such first paragraph before the date of the enactment of this act, the United States Tariff Commission shall make its report not later than whichever of the following is the earlier: (1) 1 year after the application was made, or (2) 9 months after the date of the enactment of this act.

TITLE II—UNITED STATES TARIFF COMMISSION

SEC. 201. Membership and terms of office.

(a) In general: Subsections (a) and (b) of section 330 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (19 U. S. C., sec. 1330), are hereby amended to read as follows:

"(a) Membership: The United States Tariff Commission (referred to in this title as the 'Commission') shall be composed of seven Commissioners appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. No person shall be eligible for appointment as a Commissioner unless he is a citizen of the United States, and, in the judgment of the President, is possessed of qualifications requisite for developing expert knowledge of tariff problems and efficiency in administering the laws administered by the Commission. Not more than four of the Commissioners shall be members of the same political party.

"(b) Terms of office: The term of office of a Commissioner shall expire 7 years from the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed; except that any Commissioner appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term."

(b) Effective date: Notwithstanding section 330 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended by subsection (a)—

(1) the term of office of any Commissioner in office on the date of the enactment of this act, and the term of office of any Commissioner appointed to fill a vacancy in a term of office which commenced before such date of enactment, shall expire at the time provided therefor by such section 330 as in effect on the day prior to such date of enactment;

(2) the term of office of the Commissioner appointed to succeed the Commissioner whose term of office expires June 16, 1953, shall expire at the close of June 16, 1959; and

(3) the first term of office of the additional Commissioner provided for by the amendment made by subsection (a) shall expire at the close of June 16, 1960.

TITLE III—ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMISSION ON FOREIGN ECONOMIC POLICY

SEC. 301. Establishment of the Commission.

There is hereby established a bipartisan commission to be known as the Commission on Foreign Economic Policy (in this title referred to as the "Commission".)

SEC. 302. Membership of the Commission.

(a) Number and appointment: The Commission shall be composed of 17 members as follows:

(1) Seven appointed by the President of the United States;

(2) Five appointed from the Senate by the Vice President of the United States; and

(3) Five appointed from the House of Representatives by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

(b) Political affiliation: Of the first class of members specified in subsection (a), no more than 4 members shall be from the same political party. Of the second and third classes of members specified in subsection (a), no more than 3 members from each class shall be from the same political party.

SEC. 303. Organization of the Commission.

The President shall designate the member of the Commission who shall be the Chairman, and the member who shall be the vice chairman.

SEC. 304. Quorum.

Four members of the class specified in paragraph (1) of section 302 (a), 3 members of the class specified in paragraph (2) thereof, and 3 members of the class specified in paragraph (3) thereof shall constitute a quorum; but a lesser number may conduct hearings.

SEC. 305. Compensation of members of the Commission.

(a) Members of Congress: Members of Congress who are members of the Commission shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services as Members of Congress; but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

(b) Members from the executive branch: The members of the Commission who are in the executive branch of the Government shall each receive the compensation which he would receive if he were not a member of the Commission, but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

(c) Members from private life: The members from private life shall receive not to exceed $75 per diem when engaged in the performance of duties vested in the Commission, plus reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of such duties.

SEC. 306. Staff of the Commission.

(a) Appointment of personnel: The Commission may appoint such personnel as it deems advisable, without regard to the civil-service laws, and shall fix the compensation of such personnel in accordance with the Classification Act of 1949, as amended. The Commission may procure temporary and intermittent services in accordance with section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C., sec. 55a), but at rates not to exceed $75 per diem for individuals. The Commission may reimburse employees, experts, and consultants for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of their official duties and make reasonable advances to such persons for such purposes.

(b) Certain laws not to apply: Except for members of the Commission appointed by the Vice President or the Speaker of the House, and except for any member of the Commission who may be appointed by the President from the executive branch of the Government, service of an individual as a member of the Commission, employment of an individual pursuant to the first sentence of subsection (a), and service by a person pursuant to the second sentence of subsection (a), shall not be considered as service or employment bringing such persons within the provisions of section 281, 283, 284, or 1914 of title 18 of the United States Code, or section 412 of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, as amended (22 U. S. C., sec. 1584), or section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U. S. C., sec. 99).

SEC. 307. Expenses of the Commission.

There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, so much as may be

necessary to carry out the provisions of this title.

SEC. 308. Report—Expiration of the Commission.

(a) Report: Within 60 days after the 2d regular session of the 83d Congress is convened, the Commission shall make a report of its findings and recommendations to the President and to the Congress.

(b) Expiration of the Commission: Ninety days after the submission to the Congress of the report provided for in subsection (a) of this section, the Commission shall cease to exist.

SEC. 309. Duties of the Commission.

(a) In general: The Commission is directed, within the framework of our foreign policy and national security objectives, to examine, study, and report on the subject of the foreign economic policy of the United States and to recommend policies, measures, and practices that will encourage further investment overseas and currency convertibility, and foster the highest possible levels of trade consistent with the national security and a strong domestic economy.

(b) Certain of the matters to be considered and reported on: Without limiting the general scope of the direction to the Commission contained in subsection (a), the Commission shall consider, and shall report on, the following matters:

(1) (A) Applicable provisions of the Constitution of the United States;

(B) Laws, regulations, and practices of the United States relating to international trade, including such matters as tariffs, customs, customs administration, trade agreements, peril-point and escape procedures, opinions and decisions thereon of the United States Tariff Commission and the President, import and export quotas, monetary licenses, countervailing duties, and procurement preferences;

(C) Departments, agencies, boards, commissions, bureaus, and other instrumentalities of the United States having jurisdiction over, or dealing with, these matters;

(D) Laws, regulations, and practices and official instrumentalities of other nations concerned with similar subject matters;

(E) Pertinent statistics on international trade; and

(F) Balance of payments, nation by nation; and the causes and effects of, and proposed remedies for, excessive imbalances.

(2) Relationship of our foreign economic policies to, and their influences on, our total foreign policy; and the proper relationship of each to the other.

(3) Effect of our foreign aid and military defense programs on international trade and international balance of payments.

(4) Foreign markets of trading nations—extent and nature; and the effect thereon of wars, other emergencies, technological advances, international relations, and other pertinent factors.

(5) International instrumentalities, organizations, and agreements and practices affecting trade, such as the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, Customs Unions, Organization for European Economic Cooperation, International Wheat Agreement, cartels, European Payments Union, European Coal and Steel Community, and International Monetary Fund.

(6) Foreign investment capital and the flow of investment capital between nations—need thereof—restrictions thereon—inducements necessary to encourage—role of the Export-Import Bank and of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

(7) Effects on international trade of factors such as costs of production and pricing, labor practices and standards, general living standards, currency manipulation, inconvertible currencies, official inflationary policies, currency devaluations, exchange controls and licenses, quotas, embargoes, dumping and pricing practices, multiple currencies, bilateral trade agreements, barter arrangements, customs procedures, marking and transit problems, concealed regulations of exports and imports, preferential tariff systems, most-favored nation treatment, government monopolies, state-controlled economies, state trading, and state-subsidized trading.

(8) Effect of existing and proposed trade policies on the promotion of peace and security and the betterment of political, social, and economic life, domestic and foreign.

SEC. 310. Powers of the Commission.

(a) Hearings and sessions: The Commission or, on the authorization of the Commission, any subcommittee or member thereof, shall have power to hold hearings and to sit and act at such times and places, within the United States or elsewhere, to take such testimony, and to make such lawful expenditures, as the Commission or such subcommittee or member may deem advisable.

(b) Obtaining official data.—The Commission is authorized to request from any department, agency, or independent instrumentality of the Government any information it deems necessary to carry out its functions under this title; and each such department, agency, and instrumentality is authorized to furnish such information to the Commission, upon request made by the chairman or by the vice chairman when acting as chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any committee amendments?

Mr. REED of New York. There are none.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments which are permissible under the rule?

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment permissible under the rule.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COOPER: On page 2, line 15, strike out all of title II, United States Tariff Commission.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment will strike out title II of the pending bill which is the Tariff Commission packing provision of this bill. It has been interesting to me to listen to some of the statements made here, and especially to the alibis offered by the distinguished gentleman from Indiana. The fact is that the Tariff Commission from its inception has always been treated, recognized, and maintained as a nonpartisan Commission. It was so created in 1916 under the administration of President Wilson in response to a message from him asking that the Commission be created.

One of the strongest witnesses who has ever appeared before the Ways and Means Committee in support of the reciprocal trade agreements program was the Republican Chairman of the Tariff Commission, Mr. Robert Lincoln O'Brien.

I remember well when he appeared before the Ways and Means Committee in January 1937, in support of the first extension of the Trade Agreements Act. He said that he had been a lifelong Republican, and called attention to the fact that he had voted the straight Republican ticket in the general election of 1936 from Landon on down. He casually remarked, "I voted with increasing enthusiasm the farther down the ticket I went."

Mr. O'Brien was appointed by President Hoover, he was reappointed by President Roosevelt. He was appointed by the President who signed the Smoot-Hawley tariff bill, he was reappointed by the President who signed the reciprocal trade-agreements bill. How can you have anything more nonpartisan than from Smoot-Hawley to reciprocal trade and from Mr. Hoover to Mr. Roosevelt? That certainly is as nonpartisan as anything can be.

The Tariff Commission has existed throughout the 37 years as a nonpartisan commission charged with the responsibility of finding the facts and reporting them. Under the law as it now stands the Tariff Commission has the duty to make these findings of fact and then report to the President under the escape clause provision. The President not only has the power and appoints the members of the Tariff Commission but under the law he can either accept or reject any recommendation that it makes. Even if the recommendation is unanimous he still has discretionary authority to completely reject that recommendation. So there is no reason for this effort here today to increase the Tariff Commission membership.

It has existed throughout all these years as a nonpartisan fact-finding body and that is the way it should continue to exist. That is the purpose of the amendment I have offered, to allow the Tariff Commission to continue as a nonpartisan agency, as it has been under all administrations of the past, Republican administrations and Democratic administrations, during Republican control of the Congress and during Democratic control of Congress. There has never been at any time a disposition on the part of the Congress to change the nonpartisan character of this Commission and it is more important now than ever before that this Commission shall remain nonpartisan and a fact-finding agency.

To change it now to a partisan political commission would simply mean that the effort will be made to change reciprocal trade agreements that have been negotiated in the past and that have been entered into. So I appeal to you on this occasion to stand by the historic principle that has been maintained through the years and retain this important Tariff Commission as a nonpartisan and as a fact-finding agency, so that this program may be carried on in the future as it has been in the past, in a nonpartisan manner.

Mr. Chairman, title II of the bill under consideration would increase the membership of the Tariff Commission from 6 to 7 members and provide that "not more than 4 of the commissioners shall be members of the same political party."

This provision would make a very drastic and basic change in the Tariff Commission. Ever since the establishment of a permanent Tariff Commission in 1916, the Congress has always intended that it be a nonpartisan, fact-finding body, and has been very careful to insure that it be kept this way.

I think it is very significant that this proposal is sponsored by those who have opposed the reciprocal trade agreements program from its very inception. They argue that this packing of the Tariff Commission is designed to avoid the possibility of an evenly split decision in escape clause proceedings. How they in good conscience can argue this I do not know, because the record shows that there has never been an evenly split decision of the Tariff Commission in escape clause proceedings. There has always been a finding of injury or of no injury by either a unanimous vote or a majority vote.

The real purpose of this proposal can be gathered from the very language in it, to the effect that "not more than four of the commissioners shall be members of the same political party." Regardless of all other arguments, it is an attempt to make the Tariff Commission a partisan body so that the sponsors who have been unable to defeat the purposes of the trade agreements program can, by packing the Commission, accomplish this by indirect means.

I would like to point out that under this bill the President would still recommend the appointment of members of the Commission, and he would still have his discretionary authority to accept or reject the Commission's recommendations. What could be gained by increasing the membership of the Tariff Commission in light of these two facts? It is doubtful that any claim could be fairly made that an additional member on the Tariff Commission would expedite the work of the Commission in arriving at decisions. It is certain that to make the Commission a political body will invite the filing of applications for relief, and in this way would automatically increase the burden of work on the Tariff Commission.

A seven-man Tariff Commission would very probably invite decisions based on political grounds rather than on merit. Such decisions would be more open to rejection by the President than would be objective decisions.

A very big objection to making the Tariff Commission a political body is the uncertainty which would be created in the minds of other friendly free nations of the world as to the course our trade policy might take. They would never be able to expand their production and trade with any assurance that they would be able to secure a market in this country. Success in their attempts would invite retaliation from special-interest groups in this country.

I cannot believe that the Members on either side of the aisle can in good conscience go along with this proposal to make the Tariff Commission a political body, since the Congress has jealously guarded the nonpartisan, fact-finding nature of the Tariff Commission ever since its inception in 1916.

The determination of economic facts must be made by experienced, trained, and objective persons. Political considerations can have no legitimate part in such determinations.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BAILEY moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, may I preface my remarks by saying that I have no apology to offer my colleagues of the House for availing myself of this opportunity to say some things about the pending legislation that I was unable to say because of the type of rule under which this legislation is being presented. I would also remind my colleagues who represent districts similar to the one I represent, in which are found vast amounts of industry and of domestic producers that are harrassed by excessive imports, that there is nothing in this legislation as it is to be continued for 1 more year to relieve that situation. I would like also to make clear the position of the President of the United States on this particular matter, and I am quoting from his speech, The Eisenhower tax program, containing the full text of the President's May 19 address to the Nation:

We live in an age of peril.

We must think and plan and provide so as to live through this age in freedom—in ways that do not undermine our freedom even as we strive to defend it.

To watch vigilantly on the military front must never mean to be blind on the domestic front. In our present world—in this kind of prolonged tension and struggle—a crippled industry or a demoralized working force could be the equivalent of a lost battle.

Mr. Chairman, 2 years ago in the reenactment and extension of the Trade Agreements Act, the Congress sought to lessen the discrimination and inequalities in our trade policies by writing into the new legislation the peril-point and escape-clause provisions. This comes about as the result of bipartisan action and represented a 2 to 1 majority.

The peril point fixed a floor below which rates on imports could not be lowered without imperiling the existing domestic industries and the producers of farm and other products.

The escape clause went a step further and provided safeguards against injury or threat of injury to domestic producers, harassed by excessive foreign imports.

Instead of the relief expected, the most ardent supporters of these amendments were disappointed at finding the Tariff Commission so "packed" that most applicants never even qualfied for hearings, and of those that did, a majority were rejected or the Commission was deadlocked on a 3 to 3 vote.

The Simpson bill, H. R. 4294, which the House Ways and Means Committee failed to report favorably, would have solved most of the shortcomings of the present Reciprocal Trade Act. One change in particular was important. The President's power to disregard the findings of the Commission has been abused in the case of the new treaty with the Republic of Venezuela where the then President exceeded his authority granted by the Congress to change the rate of import duties under certain limitations.

I want the RECORD to show that I am not basically opposed to the idea of the present reciprocal trade policies. What is needed is equal treatment of all domestic industries and producers so that impact of foreign imports will be spread equally and will not destroy the economy of any industry or cause the loss of employment in certain areas as is the case under the present law.

May I say to my colleagues that a joint resolution, which I shall sponsor with a Member of the Senate, will be introduced declaring the Venezuelan reciprocal trade agreement null and void on the ground that the President exceeded the authority granted him by the Congress in fixing the rates in that treaty.

I might also say to my colleagues that putting through this bill today in the manner in which it has been put over is not going to be the last that Congress hears of this matter. I can assure you that you are not going to have any peace or quietude around here so long as you let a condition exist that is developing in the coal industry, in the independent oil industry, and in the railroad industry of this country.

Since I appeared before the Committee on Ways and Means 3 weeks ago, in which I reported that 171 mines were closed in the State of West Virginia, there have been 16 additional mines closed. I have a list of 14 more that will close before the first of July. At that time there were 33,000 miners out of employment and 9,000 railroaders. At the present time there are more than 40,000 miners and probably 12,000 to 15,000 railroaders out of employment. The situation is growing worse day by day, and the Congress cannot disregard the situation affecting one of its basic industries that is so necessary in our defense effort.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the motion offered by the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. Chairman, the bill before us, H. R. 5495, is the President's program. It ought to pass. The administration is supporting this measure. No quotation can be produced indicating the contrary.

The President and his official family are for this measure today, they are for it as written, for it as reported out of the Committee on Ways and Means, and for it in its form at this time.

I also call your attention to the fact that the Tariff Commission will continue to be a bipartisan commission. There is nothing in that language that takes that identity and that quality away from it. It will continue to be a commission where both major parties will be represented. The only change in the Tariff Commission is the change in size. Shall we have 6 or shall we have 7 members? In other words, it means the establishment of a Commission that can function, that can determine its administrative procedure, that can conduct a study and bring in a report without being stalled on dead center by the lack of a majority.

I ask you, of what value is any commission or any court that cannot render a majority opinion? It does not mean

that in rendering a decision the majority will follow partisan lines. There is nothing in this proposal that says there must be 4 Republicans there. There will be, but this will be a permanent law for a long time. This is an improvement in the Tariff Commission, so that you can have a workable Commission.

A commission consisting of an equal number is not conducive to orderly procedure. Its findings leave matters open to question.

I also call your attention to the fact that this bill does not disturb the power of the President.

The President will still have the power and authority, after receiving a report from the Tariff Commission, to make his decision in the light of his information for the good of the country. But this change will enable the President to know the majority opinion of the Commission. If a 7 to nothing decision comes in, he can disregard it and take a course contrary to that decision. Any allegation that this is destroying a bipartisan commission of many years standing cannot be supported by any fact in logic or in truth whatever.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

The motion was rejected.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER].

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee will be defeated. Frankly, I have been wondering for some time why it is that the opposition to the bill object to making the Commission 7 instead of 6. I believe I have an answer right now. The answer is that under Democratic administration, and particularly since June 16, 1952, there were three Democrats on the Commission and the President failed to fill the vacancies which would have equalized the membership at three from each party. Consequently, it was not nonpartisan. It has not been nonpartisan. It has on the contrary been a definitely partisan Commission.

Mr. Chairman, it is no undertaking to freely admit that the party in power does have a responsibility whether it be in the field of Federal communications, in interstate commerce, or the Treasury, or in any department of our Government. The party in power does have a responsibility and that same responsibility applies to the party in power with respect to the Tariff Commission and this matter of foreign trade. Certainly the Republican Party is not going to run away from the position it has maintained for years, that we are a party that does guarantee to the American workingman a place to work and a place where his product may be sold in a free, competitive market. That is what our party stands for. It is one of the great party principles which has not been eliminated. It is one of the principles which I hope the party will ever maintain for unless we have a place for men to work, there will be no work for the workingman. I believe that by increasing the membership of the Tariff Commission from 6 to 7, and providing that no party shall have more than 4 of those 7 members, we are increasing the protection to the American workingman and to his employer in certain areas. In what areas? In those areas where today the American employer is forced to come to the Tariff Commission and beg for relief because his industry is being put out of business by reason of foreign competion. Each of you have in your respective congressional districts more than one, I venture to say, industries which today are endangered by foreign competition. I want to protect those jobs. I do not want to have to go home and say to a man who has been working in the mines, or to a man who has been working on the railroad, or who has been working in a textile mill, "Because your Congress has permitted the tariff to be cut so low, we are going to follow the recommendations of President Truman's Bell committee, and we are going to say to you, 'Mr. Miner, the time has come for you to give up mining. The time has come for you to go to school as Mr. Bell's committee recommended and to learn to do something else. The time has come for you to take up your family and move from the beautiful hills of Pennsylvania or West Virginia and go into some other State and there become a cog in that machine that we know as the mass-production business'." All that this bill does in this controversial section is to make a little bit more certain that there will be a little bit more protection for the employer who seeks to provide jobs for those men who live in your district and who want to continue to do the work for which they have been trained.

I hope—I hope earnestly—that you will oppose the amendment.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Is it not a fact that the purpose of inserting the so-called peril-point and escape clauses that we put in, in the 80th Congress, and which have been retained in the law since that time, was to give that degree of protection to which the gentleman refers?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Why, certainly.

Mr. HALLECK. Does it not follow, in view of the mechanics by which it operates, that the Tariff Commission must be responsive to the will of the Congress in that regard?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. The words in the law mean nothing whatever unless we provide the machinery by which they can be carried out. And we have failed to provide that machinery in recent years. Since June of 1952, there have been 13 cases rejected, where the employers had sought to get relief. And of those 13, 10 were passed when the membership of the Tariff Commission was other than equal.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. COOPER. I am sure the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] does not want the statement to stand that the peril-point and escape clauses have been in the law since the 80th Congress.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. They were put in by the 80th Congress. The Democrats immediately knocked them out when they came back into power in order to prevent protection to the American workingman. The Democrats knocked them out and we put them back in last year over the opposition of the majority of the Ways and Means Committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

The question now recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER].

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt, on a division, there were—ayes 115, noes 152.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HOEVEN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 5495) to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 275, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I am.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi moves to recommit the bill H. R. 5495 to the Committee on Ways and Means with instructions to report the same back forthwith with the following amendment: On page 2, line 15, strike out all of title II, United States Tariff Commission.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, on this vote I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 185, nays 215, not voting 30, as follows:

[Roll No. 52]

YEAS—185

Abbitt	Aspinall	Boggs
Abernethy	Barden	Boland
Addonizio	Barrett	Bolling
Albert	Battle	Bonner
Alexander	Bennett, Fla.	Boykin
Andrews	Bentsen	Brooks, La.
Ashmore	Blatnik	Brooks, Tex.

Brown, Ga.
Buchanan
Burleson
Byrne, Pa.
Camp
Campbell
Canfield
Cannon
Carlyle
Carnahan
Case
Celler
Chatham
Chelf
Chudoff
Cooley
Cooper
Crosser
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson, Ill.
Deane
Delaney
Dingell
Dodd
Dollinger
Donohue
Donovan
Dorn, S. C.
Dowdy
Doyle
Durham
Eberharter
Edmondson
Elliott
Engle
Evins
Fallon
Feighan
Forand
Forrester
Fountain
Frazier
Friedel
Fulton
Garmatz
Gary
Gathings
Gentry
Gordon
Granahan
Grant
Green
Gregory
Hagen, Calif.
Hale
Haley
Hardy
Harris
Harrison, Va.
Hart
Hays, Ark.
Hébert
Heller
Herlong
Heselton
Holifield
Holtzman
Howell
Ikard
Jarman
Javits
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Jones, N. C.
Karsten, Mo.
Kelly, N. Y.
Keogh
Kilday
King, Calif.
Kirwan
Klein
Kluczynski
Lane
Lanham
Lantaff
Lesinski
Long
Lucas
Lyle
McCarthy
McCormack
McMillan
Magnuson
Mahon
Marshall
Matthews
Metcalf
Miller, Calif.
Miller, Kans.
Mills
Morrison
Moss
Moulder
Multer
Murray
Norrell
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Brien, Mich.
O'Brien, N. Y.
O'Hara, Ill.
Passman
Patman
Pfost
Pilcher
Poage
Polk
Preston
Price
Priest
Rabaut
Rains
Rayburn
Reams
Rhodes, Pa.
Richards
Riley
Rivers
Robeson, Va.
Rodino
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Rooney
Roosevelt
Selden
Sheppard
Shuford
Sieminski
Sikes
Smith, Miss.
Smith, Va.
Spence
Steed
Sullivan
Sutton
Teague
Thomas
Thompson, La.
Thompson, Tex.
Thornberry
Trimble
Tuck
Vinson
Walter
Watts
Wheeler
Wickersham
Wier
Williams, Miss.
Wilson, Tex.
Winstead
Yates
Yorty
Zablocki

NAYS—215

Adair
Allen, Calif.
Allen, Ill.
Andersen, H. Carl
Andresen, August H.
Angell
Arends
Auchincloss
Ayres
Bailey
Baker
Bates
Beamer
Becker
Belcher
Bender
Bennett, Mich.
Bentley
Berry
Betts
Bishop
Bolton, Frances P.
Bolton, Oliver P.
Bonin
Bosch
Bow
Bramblett
Bray
Brown, Ohio
Brownson
Broyhill
Budge
Burdick
Busbey
Byrd
Byrnes, Wis.
Carrigg
Cederberg
Chenoweth
Chiperfield
Church
Clardy
Clevenger
Cole, Mo.
Cole, N. Y.
Colmer
Coon
Corbett
Cotton
Coudert
Cretella
Crumpacker
Cunningham
Curtis, Mass.
Curtis, Mo.
Curtis, Nebr.
Dague
Davis, Wis.
Dawson, Utah
Dempsey
Derounian
Devereux
D'Ewart
Dondero
Dorn, N. Y.
Ellsworth
Fenton
Fino
Fisher
Ford
Frelinghuysen
Gamble
Gavin
George
Golden
Goodwin
Graham
Gross
Gubser
Hagen, Minn.
Halleck
Hand
Harden
Harrison, Nebr.
Harrison, Wyo.
Harvey
Hays, Ohio
Hess
Hiestand
Hill
Hillelson
Hillings
Hinshaw
Hoeven
Hoffman, Ill.
Holt
Hope
Horan
Hosmer
Hruska
Hyde
James
Jenkins
Jensen
Johnson
Jonas, Ill.
Jonas, N. C.
Judd
Kean
Kearney
Kearns
Keating
Kelley, Pa.
Kersten, Wis.
Kilburn
King, Pa.
Knox
Krueger
Laird
Latham
LeCompte
Lovre
McConnell
McCulloch
McDonough
McGregor
McVey
Mack, Wash.
Mailliard
Mason
Meader
Merrill
Merrow
Miller, Md.
Miller, Nebr.
Miller, N. Y.
Mollohan
Morano
Morgan
Mumma
Neal
Nelson
Nicholson
Norblad
Oakman
O'Konski
O'Neill
Osmers
Ostertag
Patterson
Pelly
Perkins
Phillips
Pillion
Poff
Prouty
Radwan
Ray
Reece, Tenn.
Reed, Ill.
Reed, N. Y.
Rees, Kans.
Regan
Riehlman
Robsion, Ky.
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Mass.
Sadlak
St. George
Saylor
Schenck
Scherer
Scott
Scrivner
Scudder
Secrest
Seely-Brown
Shafer
Sheehan
Short
Simpson, Ill.
Simpson, Pa.
Smith, Kans.
Smith, Wis.
Springer
Staggers
Stauffer
Stringfellow
Taber
Talle
Taylor
Thompson, Mich.
Tollefson
Utt
Van Pelt
Van Zandt
Velde
Vorys
Vursell
Wainwright
Wampler
Warburton
Weichel
Westland
Wharton
Widnall
Williams, N. Y.
Wilson, Calif.
Wilson, Ind.
Withrow
Wolcott
Wolverton
Young
Younger

NOT VOTING—30

Buckley
Bush
Condon
Dies
Dolliver
Fernandez
Fine
Fogarty
Gwinn
Hoffman, Mich.
Hunter
Jackson
Kee
Landrum
McIntire
Machrowicz
Mack, Ill.
Madden
Martin, Iowa
O'Hara, Minn.
Patten
Philbin
Powell
Rhodes, Ariz.
Roberts
Shelley
Small
Whitten
Wigglesworth
Willis

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Willis for, with Mrs. Kee against.

Mr. Landrum for, with Mr. McIntire against.

Mr. Patten for, with Mr. Hunter against.

Mr. Madden for, with Mr. Bush against.

Mr. Fogarty for, with Mr. Dolliver against.

Mr. Whitten for, with Mr. Martin of Iowa against.

Mr. Roberts for, with Mr. Rhodes of Arizona against.

Mr. Fine for, with Mr. Hoffman of Michigan against.

Mr. Mack of Illinois for, with Mr. Jackson against.

Mr. Machrowicz for, with Mr. Gwinn against.

Mr. Philbin for, with Mr. Wigglesworth against.

Mr. Buckley for, with Mr. Small against.

Until further notice:

Mr. O'Hara of Minnesota with Mr. Dies.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the billl.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 363, nays 34, answered "present" 1, not voting 32, as follows:

[Roll No. 53]

YEAS—363

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adair
Addonizio
Albert
Alexander
Allen, Calif.
Allen, Ill.
Andersen, H. Carl
Andresen, August H.
Andrews
Angell
Arends
Ashmore
Aspinall
Auchincloss
Ayres
Baker
Barden
Barrett
Bates
Battle
Beamer
Becker
Belcher
Bender
Bennett, Fla.
Bentley
Bentsen
Berry
Betts
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bolton, Frances P.
Bolton, Oliver P.
Bonin
Bonner
Bosch
Boykin
Bramblett
Brooks, La.
Brooks, Tex.
Brown, Ga.
Brown, Ohio
Brownson
Broyhill
Buchanan
Burdick
Burleson
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Camp
Campbell
Canfield
Cannon
Carlyle
Carnahan
Carrigg
Case
Cederberg
Celler
Chatham
Chelf
Chenoweth
Chiperfield
Chudoff
Church
Clardy
Cole, N. Y.
Colmer
Cooley
Coon
Cooper
Corbett
Cotton
Coudert
Cretella
Crosser
Crumpacker
Cunningham
Curtis, Mass.
Curtis, Mo.
Curtis, Nebr.
Dague
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Tenn.
Davis, Wis.
Dawson, Ill.
Dawson, Utah
Deane
Delaney
Dempsey
Derounian
Devereux
D'Ewart
Dingell
Dodd
Dollinger
Dondero
Donohue
Donovan
Dorn, N. Y.
Dorn, S. C.
Dowdy
Doyle
Durham
Eberharter
Edmondson
Elliott
Engle
Evins
Fallon
Feighan
Fenton
Fino
Fisher
Forand
Ford
Forrester
Fountain
Frazier
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton
Gamble
Garmatz
Gary
Gathings
Gavin
Gentry
George
Goodwin
Gordon
Graham
Granahan
Grant
Green
Gregory
Gubser
Hagen, Calif.
Hale
Haley
Halleck
Hardy
Harris
Harrison, Nebr.
Harrison, Va.
Hart
Harvey
Hays, Ark.
Hébert
Heller
Herlong
Heselton
Hess
Hiestand
Hill
Hillelson
Hillings
Hinshaw
Hoeven
Hoffman, Ill.
Holifield
Holmes
Holt
Holtzman
Hope
Horan
Hosmer
Howell
Hruska
Hyde
Ikard
James
Jarman
Javits
Jensen
Johnson
Jonas, Ill.
Jonas, N. C.
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Jones, N. C.
Judd
Karsten, Mo.
Kean
Kearney
Kearns
Keating
Kelly, N. Y.
Keogh
Kersten, Wis.
Kilburn
Kilday
King, Calif.
King, Pa.
Kirwan
Klein
Kluczynski
Knox
Krueger
Laird
Lane
Lanham
Lantaff
Latham
LeCompte
Lesinski
Long
Lovre
Lucas
Lyle
McCarthy
McConnell
McCormack
McCulloch
McDonough
McGregor
McMillan
McVey
Mack, Wash.
Magnuson
Mahon
Mailliard
Marshall
Matthews
Meader
Merrill
Merrow
Metcalf
Miller, Calif.
Miller, Kans.
Miller, Md.
Miller, Nebr.
Miller, N. Y.
Mills
Morano
Morrison
Moss
Moulder
Multer
Mumma
Murray
Nelson
Nicholson
Norblad
Norrell
Oakman
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Brien, Mich.
O'Brien, N. Y.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Neill
Osmers
Ostertag
Passman
Patman
Patterson
Pfost
Pilcher
Pillion
Poage
Poff
Polk
Preston
Price
Priest
Prouty
Rabaut
Radwan
Rains
Ray
Rayburn
Reams
Reece, Tenn.
Reed, N. Y.
Rees, Kans.
Regan
Rhodes, Pa.
Richards
Riehlman
Riley
Rivers
Robeson, Va.
Robsion, Ky.
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Mass.
Rogers, Tex.
Rooney
Roosevelt
Sadlak
St. George
Schenck
Scherer
Scott
Scrivner
Scudder
Seely-Brown
Selden
Sheehan
Sheppard
Shuford
Sieminski
Sikes
Simpson, Ill.
Simpson, Pa.
Smith, Va.
Smith, Wis.
Spence
Springer
Stauffer
Steed
Stringfellow
Sullivan
Sutton
Taber
Talle
Taylor
Teague
Thomas
Thompson, La.
Thompson, Mich.
Thompson, Tex.
Thornberry
Tollefson
Trimble
Tuck
Van Pelt
Van Zandt
Velde
Vinson
Vorys
Vursell
Wainwright
Walter
Wampler
Warburton
Watts
Weichel
Westland
Wharton
Wheeler
Wickersham
Widnall
Wier

Williams, Miss.	Winstead	Yorty
Williams, N. Y.	Withrow	Young
Wilson, Calif.	Wolcott	Younger
Wilson, Ind.	Wolverton	Zablocki
Wilson, Tex.	Yates	

NAYS—34

Bailey	Hagen, Minn.	Perkins
Bennett, Mich.	Hand	Phillips
Bishop	Harden	Reed, Ill.
Bow	Harrison, Wyo.	Saylor
Bray	Hays, Ohio	Secrest
Budge	Jenkins	Shafer
Busbey	Kelley, Pa.	Short
Byrd	Mason	Smith, Kans.
Clevenger	Mollohan	Staggers
Cole, Mo.	Morgan	Utt
Golden	Neal	
Gross	O'Konski	

PRESENT—1

Smith, Miss.

NOT VOTING—32

Buckley	Hunter	Pelly
Bush	Jackson	Philbin
Condon	Kee	Powell
Dies	Landrum	Rhodes, Ariz.
Dolliver	McIntire	Roberts
Ellsworth	Machrowicz	Shelley
Fernandez	Mack, Ill.	Small
Fine	Madden	Whitten
Fogarty	Martin, Iowa	Wigglesworth
Gwinn	O'Hara, Minn.	Willis
Hoffman, Mich.	Patten	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Landrum for, with Mrs. Kee against.

Mr. Dies for, with Mr. Smith of Mississippi against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Bush with Mr. Powell.
Mr. Ellsworth with Mr. Fernandez.
Mr. Hunter with Mr. Roberts.
Mr. Jackson with Mr. Buckley.
Mr. McIntire with Mr. Fine.
Mr. Martin of Iowa with Mr. Shelley.
Mr. O'Hara of Minnesota with Mr. Whitten.
Mr. Pelley with Mr. Willis.
Mr. Rhodes of Arizona with Mr. Patten.
Mr. Small with Mr. Mack of Illinois.
Mr. Wigglesworth, with Mr. Madden.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Texas, Mr. DIES. If he were present he would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members of the House may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on June 15, 1953, the President approved and signed a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 4664. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes.

SHOWING OF VOICE OF AMERICA FILMS

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, on tomorrow afternoon at 5 o'clock in the caucus room of the Old House Office Building, the State Department has agreed to show two moving-picture films entitled "With These Hands" and "The Local Union." They are showing these at the request of the Georgia delegation. We had our attention called to these films with certain criticisms of the Voice of America for using them. The State Department tells me that other delegations have called about the films. So this announcement is made in order that any person who has had complaints about the films, and would like to see them for himself or herself, can see what these films are about. The showing will be held tomorrow afternoon, Tuesday, June 16, in the caucus room at 5 o'clock.

DOCTORS' DRAFT ACT

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 4495) to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, so as to provide for special registration, classification, and induction of certain medical, dental, and allied specialist categories, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 550)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4495) to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, so as to provide for special registration, classification, and induction of certain medical, dental, and allied specialist categories, and for other purposes, having met after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, and 23, and agree to the the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"examination;

"(D) periods of active duty for training entered into subsequent to the enactment of this subparagraph, as defined in subsection 101 (c), Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952 (66 Stat. 481); and

"(E) periods of active service which terminate subsequent to April 30, 1953, in other than an Armed Force terminated by orders which specify that such termination is without the approval of the agency concerned."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"The period of active duty that any such person may be required to perform shall not exceed (A) twenty-four months if he has had less than nine months of active service, as defined in paragraph 4 (i) (4) and (5) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended; (B) twenty-one months if he has had at least nine but less than twelve months of such service; (C) eighteen months if he has had at least twelve but less than fifteen months of such service; (D) fifteen months if he has had at least fifteen or more months of such service; since September 16, 1940, but prior to the date of his order to active duty under this subsection."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: ", on July 1, 1953,"; and on page 7 of the bill, in lines 23 and 24, strike out "under the provisions of the Act of September 9, 1950, as amended," and insert in lieu thereof "on the basis of active service, as defined in section 4 (i) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, rendered prior to the date of his latest entry on active duty,"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In line 9 of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment, immediately after "(c)", strike out "The" and insert in lieu thereof "Effective July 1, 1953, the"; and the Senate agree to the same.

DEWEY SHORT,
LESLIE C. ARENDS,
W. STERLING COLE,
CARL T. DURHAM,
PAUL J. KILDAY,
Managers on the Part of the House.

LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
STYLES BRIDGES,
RALPH E. FLANDERS,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
HARRY FLOOD BYRD,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4495) to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, so as to provide for special registration, classification, and induction of certain medical, dental, and allied specialist categories, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Senate amendments to the House bill did not change the basic philosophy of the

doctors' draft law. There were however some areas of difference between the two versions none of them of a highly controversial nature.

The House version of the bill included "active duty for training" within the definition of active duty and active service. A Senate amendment eliminated "active duty for training" from the definition of active duty or active service and aded a new subparagraph which expressly excludes recognition of such service subsequent to the enactment of the bill. The House receded from its disagreement with the Senate on this point but changed the Senate amendment so as to credit "active duty for training" for those now performing such duty even though it might extend beyond the effective date of this amendatory Act. Thus, the conference report now provides that persons entering into a period of "active duty for training" after the effective date of the act will not be permitted to count that service as active duty or active service for the purposes of the doctors' draft law.

The Senate version of the bill added a provision not originally contained in the House bill which provides that the Secretary of Defense may prescribe an oath of service or obedience, in lieu of the oath of allegiance now prescribed by statute, for aliens appointed as commissioned officers under the doctors' draft law. Since aliens will now be permitted to serve as commissioned officers in the armed services under the doctors' draft law and since they might well be in danger of expatriation should they take an oath of allegiance to the United States the House conferees accepted the Senate amendment.

Another Senate amendment contains a provision not contained in the original House bill, which excludes as creditable service, periods of active duty terminating subsequent to April 30, 1953, in other than an armed force, which service was terminated by orders stating that the termination is without approval of the agency concerned. Since this clause will close a loophole which special registrants might take advantage of with respect to duty with the Public Health Service the House agreed to the Senate amendment.

Probably the most important Senate amendment which was not contained in the House bill is that part of the conference report which amends the Career Compensation Act of 1949 so as to provide that physicians and dentists coming on duty as reserve or regular officers after July 1, 1953, and prior to July 1, 1955, will be entitled to the $100 per month equalization pay now provided for all doctors and dentists who entered the Armed Forces as reserve or regular officers and are now serving as such. The Senate amendment not only extended the date for which doctors and dentists may qualify for the additional $100 per month pay but also added veterinarians to the persons eligible for this equalization pay. Under the Senate amendment all veterinarians serving on active duty or entering on active duty after July 1, 1953, will be entitled to the $100 incentive pay now provided for physicians and dentists.

Another very important provision of the conference report is that dealing with periods of obligated service. The House bill established 2 periods of obligated service for special registrants—24 months of service for all physicians and dentists except those who served 12 months or more since September 16, 1940. Under the House bill these persons were required to serve only 17 months. The Senate amendment deleted the provision providing for 24 and 17 months of obligated service and substituted in lieu thereof 5 periods of obligated service based upon a prescribed amount of prior military service between September 16, 1940, and the date of the order to active duty. Thus under the Senate amendment special registrants with less than 6 months of prior active service would have been required to serve 24 months; special registrants with 6 or more but less than 9 months of prior service would have been required to serve 21 months; special registrants with 9 or more but less than 12 months of service would have been required to serve 19 months; special registrants with over 12 but less than 15 months of service would have been required to serve 17 months; and special registrants with 15 or more months of prior service would have been required to serve 14 months. The House conferees were of the opinion that 5 different periods of required service involved excessive administrative problems and in addition the House conferees were of the opinion that the minimum of 14 months of service was too short. Thus the conferees agreed upon four periods of obligated service as follows: Special registrants with less than 9 months of prior active service will be required to serve 24 months; special registrants with 9 or more but less than 12 months will be required to serve 21 months; those with 12 or more but less than 15 months will be required to serve 18 months, and those with 15 or more months of prior service will be required to serve only 15 months.

There is one remaining Senate amendment which should be thoroughly discussed. That is the Senate amendment which was not originally contained in the House bill which defines as active service any duty performed by physicians and dentists while employed by the Panama Canal Health Department between September 16, 1940, and September 2, 1945.

This amendment is only applicable to five persons and its inclusion in the conference report should not be construed as an acceptance by the conferees of both the House and Senate that civilian service during World War II is equivalent to military service. The five physicians and dentists who will be affected by this amendment present an unusual set of circumstances which led the conferees to the conclusion that their service should be recognized. These doctors presented themselves during World War II to their local draft board for induction into the armed services or applied for commissions. And it was at the urging of the local draft boards that they accepted an assignment as a physician or dentist with the Panama Canal Health Department. In this respect they were quite similar to physicians and dentists who served in our own Public Health Service.

The testimony before the Senate Armed Services Committee contains a letter from the chairman of a local advisory committee who served as such during World War II to the effect that these doctors were assured that this service with the Panama Canal Health Department would count as military service. The conferees were also impressed with the fact that service with the Panama Canal Health Department was for all intents and purposes military duty. The doctors affected by this amendment worked with and under uniformed military personnel in the armed services. There is little to distinguish between doctors serving with the Panana Canal Health Department and doctors who served with the Public Health Service in the same area. Even an examination of the salaries paid these doctors indicates that they received approximately the same or less than they would have received had they been commissioned as officers in the armed services.

The conferees, recognizing the discriminatory nature of the doctors' draft law, were of the opinion that there was full justification, with respect to the doctors who served with the Panama Canal Health Department, for counting this service as active service for the purposes of the doctors' draft law, but only for the purposes of the doctors' draft law. Such service will not be recognized as military service for any other purpose. It is only because of the manner in which these doctors were asked to serve in the Panama Canal Zone and the fact that they served for long periods of time and served under military personnel and in most cases treated military personnel that the conferees can justify the inclusion of this service as creditable service for purposes of the doctors' draft law. There was no financial gain to the doctors involved and they did serve as physicians and dentists. Because of these factors their service is included, but such action is not to be considered as a precedent for the acceptance of any other type of civilian service as equivalent to military service.

Remaining amendments in the conference report are technical in nature and do not affect the substance of the conference report. Some technical changes were made in the section which permits the release of physicians and dentists upon application who would not otherwise be subject to induction or order to active duty had service which is creditable in the conference report been in effect at the time of their induction or order to active duty. Technical changes were necessary to make sure that the section would be applicable to those whose prior service would have precluded them from induction or order to active duty at the time of their latest entry upon active duty, but service subsequent to their latest entry on active duty will not be used in determining their status with respect to their application for discharge or early release.

DEWEY SHORT,
LESLIE C. ARENDS,
W. STERLING COLE,
CARL T. DURHAM,
PAUL J. KILDAY,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in a brief explanation of the conference report at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, because of the tremendous interest shown by the membership, as well as by the general public, I would like to take this opportunity to explain just what the conference report does with respect to the drafting of doctors.

There were six areas of difference between the House and Senate versions of H. R. 4495. Four of them were minor. The Senate eliminated "active duty for training" from the definition of active duty and active service and we accepted this amendment, but protected those serving now on active duty for training.

The Senate amended the bill so as to provide for an oath of obedience for aliens, since aliens may now be commissioned as doctors under the bill. Since it would be unfair to require an alien to take an oath of allegiance to the United States and thus endanger his citizenship

with his own country, we agreed to this change.

The Senate also closed a possible loophole for certain doctors who might otherwise enter on active duty with the Public Health Service and thereafter leave after only a few days and be placed in priority IV. We agreed to this amendment which closes that loophole. It must be remembered that there is no authority existing in law to keep Public Health Service doctors on active duty, without their consent.

Then, the Senate amended the bill so as to provide that service with the Panama Canal Health Department would be counted as active service, for the purposes of the doctors' draft law. This is only applicable to five persons. The evidence indicated that there were unusual circumstances surrounding these cases and that simple justice and equity required that this service be credited. We are not opening the door in any way to other civilian service and I think the statement of the managers adequately covers this point.

Perhaps of greater importance is the Senate amendment which established 5 periods of obligated active service based upon the amount of previous service.

You will recall that the House bill provided for only 2 periods of service; namely, 24 months of service for all doctors, except those who served 12 months or more since September 16, 1940. These doctors, under the House bill, would have been released after 17 months. The Senate bill created 5 periods of obligated service starting with those with less than 6 months of prior service and ending with those with 15 or more months of prior service. Periods of active duty ran from a maximum of 24 months to a minimum of 14 months. The House conferees, recognizing the discriminatory nature of this legislation, were willing to accept this refinement in the House bill, but we objected to the 14 months' minimum service and the 5 different periods of obligated service. The conference report provides for 4 periods of obligated service, as follows: Doctors with less than 9 months of previous service will be required to serve 24 months; doctors with 9 months of prior service, but less than 12 months, will be required to serve 21 months; those with 12 or more, but less than 15 months, will be required to serve 18 months; and those with 15 months or more of prior service will be required to serve only 15 months.

Now, let us analyze the situation at this point to see just what obligation doctors now have. Supposing a doctor served for 22 months as an enlisted man during World War II and then was admitted to an Army specialized training program to complete his medical study. Upon completing his education he went on active duty for 5 months and then was released to inactive duty. Where does he stand under the doctors' draft bill? Well, under the new bill, all of his previous service will count and if he is now serving on active duty because he was a priority II doctor, he will be released upon application as soon as practicable, but in no event later than 90 days after this bill becomes law. Then, because he has prior service, he will go into priority IV and, because he has more than 21 months of total service, he cannot be inducted under the doctors' draft law.

Let us take a priority II doctor now serving on active duty who had 18 months of previous service and has since been recalled and has completed 4 months of active duty. He will be released as soon as practicable, but in no event later than 90 days after the enactment of this legislation, upon application, and since he had 18 months of prior service, he will be placed in priority IV. Then, because he now has a total of 22 months of active duty, he cannot be drafted under the doctors' draft law.

Let us take a priority II doctor who had 10 months of service following his education at Government expense. He has since been recalled. How much time will he have to serve? Well, since he has over 9 months, but less than 12 months of prior service to his credit, he will be required to serve 21 months in his new period of active duty.

Now, let us take a priority II doctor with 16 months of prior service following his education, at Government expense. Where does he stand under the doctors' draft law? Well, since he has had over 15 months of prior service, he will be released upon completion of 15 months of active service in his new period of active duty.

I think these illustrations will give you an idea of what we have attempted to do. We tried to be as liberal as possible, taking into consideration all of the equities involved. We realize that the priority II doctors, because they were deferred or educated at Government expense, have an obligation to serve their Nation. But we wanted to give them credit for their prior service and that is what the conferees have agreed to. I repeat that this is discriminatory legislation and that justifies the liberality provided in this proposed legislation and, in my opinion, justifies the four varying periods of obligated service.

There is one remaining amendment which must be discusssed and that is the Senate amendment which the conferees agreed to which extends the $100 per month incentive pay for physicians and dentists for those who enter on active duty as reservists or regulars after July 1, 1953, and prior to July 1, 1955.

The Senate amendment also extended this incentive pay to veterinarians. Since they are liable for induction and since their educational qualifications are nearly equal to those of physicians and dentists, we agreed to the inclusion of veterinarians. There are approximately 745 veterinarians now on active duty in the Armed Forces so it can be seen that the cost for including these doctors will not be great.

Now, the House might well ask why we did not originally consider amending the House bill so as to provide for the $100 a month incentive pay for those entering on active duty after July 1, 1953. We did not because it was the Senate that had asked the Department of Defense to make a special study of incentive pay. We felt that the Senate, having requested the study and having the advantage of the report of that Commission, was in a better position to consider whether or not this incentive pay should be extended beyond July 1, 1953. Our committee is not and has not been opposed to incentive pay for doctors, because we realize the discriminatory nature of the doctors' draft law. We are fully aware of the expenses incurred by doctors in securing an education which would not otherwise be compensated for on the pay provided for officers in the grade in which they are called to active duty under the doctors' draft law. We also recognize that the Armed Forces would get practically no Regular doctors without this incentive pay as a stimulus for requests for Regular commissions. Thus, we agreed to this amendment and as a result, physicians, dentists, and veterinarians entering on active duty as Reserve or Regular officers after July 1, 1953, but prior to July 1, 1955, will be entitled to a $100-a-month bonus so long as they remain on active duty.

This, Mr. Speaker, summarizes the conference report. I think we have done as good a job as is possible, considering the complicated nature of the subject. I urge the entire membership to support the conference report.

Mr. DURHAM. 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 North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, I believe the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreements between the House and the amendments of the Senate to H. R. 4495 made some improvements in the bill as passed on the House side. The only amendment in which I was not in full accord was the Senate amendment which granted to five doctors, who served in the Panama Health Department between September 16, 1940, and September 2, 1945, military credit. This amendment applies only to these five personnel and its inclusion is made plain in the conference report and should not be construed that civilian service is equivalent to military service. The facts were presented to us and proved without a doubt that these five doctors were convinced they were serving as military personnel. I believe the conferees have written a fair and equitable measure.

Mr. RIVERS. 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 South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, so that the record will be crystal clear on the question of the conferees report on the doctors draft legislation, it is interesting to note that my amendment which lowered the prior service period from 1940 from 21 months to 17 months, and which was not in controversy is still a part of the bill. It means that any physicians

or dentists having served 17 months since 1940, prior to being recalled, will be released as soon as practicable, and not later than 90 days, and the provision giving credit for the accumulative service is retained in the bill. A case where a physician or dentist has served 17 months prior to being recalled, and who has served an additional time, making his total service 21 months is placed in priority IV, and cannot be recalled, but if he has served less than a total period of 21 months, then he goes in priority IV and is subject to recall the same as other priority IV doctors, after the priority III doctors national quota has been exhausted.

It will be noted that the report of the managers fully explains the so-called sliding-rule proviso giving credit for past service.

FAYVILLE, MASS., TORNADO DISASTER

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have inserted as part of my remarks a statement which I received at my request from Dr. R. R. Gasser, who is the medical director of the Veterans' Administration Hospital, the Cushing Hospital at Framingham, Mass. There were approximately three truckloads of debris picked off the grounds of the station the day after the tornado, Wednesday, June 10, 1953. The largest piece being 4 feet by 8 feet of three-eighths inch plywood with white shingles attached, apparently a part of a prefabricated building blown in from an unidentified area.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw the attention of the House to the fact that the hospital was organized for disaster relief within an hour and a half after they learned of the tornado, a very remarkable feat. They had secured very promptly 95 pints of blood. It was a very remarkable performance. They were perfectly organized to meet a great emergency just a few hours afterwards.

Mr. Speaker, I visited the terrible tornado-damaged area in Worcester, on Thursday morning, and I found the greatest courage among the people who were badly injured, courage among the people who had lost their relatives. They were still searching for the bodies in the devastated area. I did not hear a complaint while I was there. Our distinguished colleague, Mr. DONOHUE, from Worcester, Mass., I found was giving the greatest of cooperation; from such people down to the man, perhaps, who had the least to do with the running of the city or the Government, I found nothing but courage; not a complaint did I hear from the people who had lost members of their family, or who had lost their homes.

I was amazed at the organization that had already been set up in 24 hours to alleviate distress.

Mr. Speaker, I introduced six resolutions asking the Government departments for full and complete information with respect to whether there is any connection between the tornadoes, which have recently occurred in the United States and the recent explosions of atomic bombs. I am hoping within the 7 legislative days—they are privileged resolutions—to get word back as to what is considered to be the cause.

Everywhere I had people ask me what the Government thought was the cause, or the possible cause, or the probable cause of the tornadoes. They had never had anything like this before in the State of Massachusetts and we hope never will have it again.

I feel, Mr. Speaker, that the public is entitled to have all of the information that the Government departments can give. The people are the ones that pay the bills, and who suffer the losses when a tornado takes place. The least we can do is to secure every bit of information.

(The report referred to is as follows:)

CUSHING HOSPITAL.
Framingham, Mass., June 11, 1953.

To: Deputy Administrator, Veterans' Administration, Central Office, Washington, D. C.

Subject: Narrative report—disaster.

1. At about 6 p. m., June 9, 1953, a call was received at the hospital by the medical officer of the day from an unidentified person to dispatch all available ambulances to the Fayville Post Office, Fayville, Mass., which was reported to have been demolished injuring or killing 30 to 40 persons.

2. Fayville, Mass., is located about 5 miles from the Cushing Veterans' Administration Hospital, Framingham, Mass.

3. Because of personnel and budgetary limitations, no ambulance drivers are on regularly scheduled duty after 4:30 p. m.

4. The Assistant Manager was notified of the call for assistance.

5. The State police barracks at Framingham, Mass. was contacted to ascertain the validity and extent of the disaster.

6. When informed that a tornado had ripped through central Masachusetts and all available medical help was needed, three ambulances were immediately dispatched to Fayville, Mass. Two nurses accompanied the ambulances. Plan B of the station's disaster plan was put into effect.

7. All chiefs of services and available staff were notified to report to the hospital at once.

8. The local radio station, WKOX, Framingham, Mass., was utilized to call to the hospital all available off-duty employees and blood donors.

9. While awaiting arrival of patients, donors were bled. Ninety-four pints of blood were obtained. Fifty additional beds were readied and staffed to care for any type of case.

10. By 7:30 p. m., every department of the hospital was in operation and several hundred casualties could have been cared for if required.

11. Throughout the evening, contact was maintained with the Massachusetts State police, the local Civil Defense Administration, the local radio station, and the police department of the city of Worcester, Mass., the latter city having borne the brunt of the tornado disaster.

12. One casualty was brought to the hospital by a private ambulance—Mr. Lewis J. Ward, West Main Street, Westboro, Mass., age 64 years, World War 1 veteran; diagnosis, dislocated femur, fractured pelvis.

13. Our ambulances, in the meantime, were under the supervision of the State police and assisted in carrying injured and dead to the hospitals in Worcester, which is approximately 20 miles from the Cushing Veterans' Administration Hospital. The ambulances returned to the station at approximately 1 a. m., June 10, 1953.

14. About 11 p. m., June 9, 1953, the hospital was informed by the Worcester city police that all casualties were being cared for and no additional blood nor hospital beds were required. After word was received that the situation in the Worcester area was under control, approximately 200 additional volunteer donors were dismissed.

15. The personnel called in for the emergency duty were dismissed at 11:30 p. m.

16. Having experienced an actual disaster emergency and placed into operation our preconceived disaster plan B, the results exceeded the most wishful thoughts of management.

17. Every department was adequately staffed within 1½ hours of the original call and we could have cared for upward to 300 severely injured.

18. The response to the call for emergency duty by full-time personnel, regular volunteers, and the general public was a most gratifying experience.

19. A telegram was dispatched to the Deputy Administrator, Veterans' Administration, Washington, D. C., at 9:05 p. m., June 9, 1953, in accordance with Manual M11-SF-1, Disaster, Emergency Relief, and Civil Defense Planning.

20. This situation sustained no damage to personnel, patients, or buildings thereon.

21. Approximately three truck loads of debris was picked off the grounds of the station the next day, Wednesday, June 10, 1953. The largest piece being 4 by 8 feet of ⅜-inch plywood with white shingles attached apparently a part of a prefabricated building blown in from an unidentified area.

22. Photographs of blood-donor scenes and the debris are attached as well as clippings from the local newspaper which had sent a reporter to the hospital as soon as the disaster became known.

23. During the morning following the disaster, June 10, 1953, this station performed liaison duty between the area medical director's office and the Veterans' Administration Hospital, Rutland Heights, Mass., because of lack of communication facilities between the two points.

24. Ascertaining the facts that no serious damage existed in Rutland, the number of casualties which they were caring for and relaying the request for neurosurgeons who were needed at the Veteran's Administration Hospital, Rutland Heights. This liaison was made possible through the Massachusetts State Police with whom this station enjoys excellent rapport.

R. R. GASSER, M. D.,
Manager.

Copy to: Chief medical director, VACO, area medical director, VARO.

BOOK BURNERS—SPEECH OF THE PRESIDENT AT DARTMOUTH COLLEGE COMMENCEMENT

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 4 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the President made a glowing, statesmanlike speech at the Dartmouth College commencement. He criticized severely those whom he styled as book burners, those who are figuratively witch burners, who would stifle thought and smother ideas. He inveighed against those who would, with hobnail boots, trample

on our traditions of free speech and free press.

His words will become enshrined indelibly upon the tablets of history. But how about deeds, Mr. President? The State Department and the Secretary of State, Mr. Dulles, might well be instructed to cease and desist censoring and proscribing books in our overseas libraries; books on communism and books by fellow-travelers, and even books by worthy liberals. We can only fight evil—the evil of communism—with knowledge of communism. So spoke the President amidst the elms of Dartmouth and alongside its great library. He doubtless had in mind the self-defeating fear that is spreading over the land—due to some of the intemperate and vigilante tactics of a certain gentleman heading a certain investigating committee, although he did not name him.

The President courageously spoke out against a sort of "shotgun silence" and a hysterical fear that has settled upon the Nation.

His warning was timely but right in his own official household the warning goes unheeded. Should not the President in his wisdom suit action to word, undo the wrong now being done in our libraries of the United States Information Service units abroad where volumes are being culled out and tossed aside. Words are valueless unless followed by action; otherwise we have the anomaly of United States official book burning while the President wisely and courageously deplores censorship and inveighs against bullies and book burners.

We petition action as well as words, Mr. President, We ask this, Mr. President, with all due respect for and honor to you personally and officially.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, as the important business of the day did not permit the recognition of members for 1-minute addresses, I am extending my remarks by unanimous consent at this point. I did not wish to delay by as much as one day my commendation of the remarks of the President of the United States in his address at Dartmouth College on the subject of the burning of books. I am sure my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will agree that the President spoke in clear and courageous language what is in the thought of all America. We were horrified when Hitler issued his infamous order to burn the books. We are heartened and our America is glorified that the President of the United States has on the prestige of his high office reminded Americans that in the United States of America we give freedom to the thoughts of men and do not ape the ways of Hitler.

We who still believe in liberty in the spirit of the Bill of Rights commend our President for his Dartmouth College speech.

President Eisenhower spoke for all Americans who have faith in their country when he said:

> It is not enough merely to say I love America, and to salute the flag and take off your hat as it goes by and sing the Star-Spangled Banner.
>
> Liberty, won by the blood of heroes in the Revolutionary War, the Civil War, the Spanish-American War, World War I, World War II, and Korea, is no puny thing needing protection from alien ideas. It is beautiful, strong, and has the stamina to confront any adverse ideas and drive them to cover.
>
> In urging "Don't join the book-burners," President Eisenhower was speaking not to those men whose diplomas had made them fellow alumni with the great Daniel Webster. Rather he was urging the fainthearted and confused to take stock of their heritage and reaffirm their faith in those great spiritual values which have made the United States the leader of the world.
>
> Mr. Speaker, I trust that all my colleagues on the other side of the aisle will find in the remarks of the President of the United States at Dartmouth College the same heartening tones that they bring to my Democratic ears.

VETERANS' HOSPITAL PROGRAM

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, the much-discussed appropriation bill that contains funds for the veterans, all of the veterans, comes up for action tomorrow. I rise to remind the House of the pleasure that we feel that the veterans have won their and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs' fight and secured authorization for enough money to operate 114,000 beds.

I also rise to remind the House that there is a good deal of legislation in this appropriation bill and remind the chairmen of legislative committees and the members of such committees that if they allow increasing legislation in appropriation bills they will have no jurisdiction for their own committees and they might just as well retire and let the Appropriations Committee do the legislating. It is a very serious matter.

ONE HUNDRED AND SEVENTY-EIGHTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BATTLE OF BUNKER HILL

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. O'NEILL] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, this coming Wednesday, June 17, marks the 178th anniversary of the Battle of Bunker Hill. Every American, from whatever corner of the Republic he may come is familiar with the thrilling story that marks the beginning of this great Nation. Across the river from the Old North Church whose belfry but 2 short months before burned two lights eagerly watched by Paul Revere. The famous ride that ensued was the curtain-raiser for the mighty drama to follow and on June 17 of that momentous year the first act was unfolded on the slope of Bunker—or to be more precise—Breeds Hill.

Aware that General Howe, who was in command of the British troops in Boston Harbor, was about to seize the heights at Charlestown, the gallant troops of the Continental Army crossed from Cambridge, took possession of the heights and proceeded to throw up a redoubt on the lower slope of Breeds Hill. Working quietly through the night, they were not discovered until daybreak by the watchers on His Brittanic Majesty's warships, peacefully anchored in the river below.

These opened up an ineffective fire but it was soon apparent that to dislodge the American forces would call for an attack by the troops. Accordingly General Howe landed about 2,500 British regulars and they advanced against the Colonists in two divisions. The patriots held their fire until the British were within sure range.

Both divisions of British broke and retreated. The British rallied their forces and made a second charge; again they were forced to retreat. Finally on the third attack by the British, the Colonists having exhausted their ammunition, were forced to retreat.

The important factor of this great battle was the terriffic loss of the British, 1,054 having been killed; of the Colonists about 440 were killed or wounded, but the great result achieved was that the colonists were united to the conviction that this was war and must be fought as such.

Mr. Speaker, it is not my purpose to describe the battle in detail. That story has been recorded time and again in the course of the nearly two centuries which have elapsed since that bloody day. I will content myself with pointing out that, while indecisive in its immediate results, the battle of Bunker Hill is nevertheless one of the turning points of history, for on that bloody field it was demonstrated once and for all that the raw militia, the undisciplined Colonials, could and would fight. When Washington, journeying up to Boston in his new capacity as commander in chief of the Continental Army, met riders bearing dispatches concerning the battle, his first question is reported to have been, "Did the militia fight?" The temper of the American troops was tried and tested on that blazing June day of 1775, and from the high mark of valor and fortitude there achieved the Revolutionary Army never receded. As one historian puts it:

> The British won the hill, but the Americans won a moral victory of the first magnitude.
>
> Thereafter no one could truthfully say that untrained and undisciplined men would not fight; thereafter no man of sense in England thought that the king's troops would drive the Americans before them like a flock of refractory sheep.

Nowhere in the annals of American history can be found a more important factor in the winning and establishment of our great democracy than the famous Battle of Bunker Hill. The British won the hill, but the Continental Army won the will to fight for freedom. This

was the turning point in the battle for independence.

For over a century a great monument has crowned the heights of Bunker Hill. I refer, of course, to one of the Nation's most historic edifices, the Bunker Hill Monument.

I urge upon the Congress that this famous landmark of the struggle for independence be held in perpetual care for the people of the United States as a national shrine and park.

HELMUTH WOLF GRUHL — VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 177)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States:

To the House of Representatives:

I return herewith, without my approval, H. R. 1334, for the relief of Helmuth Wolf Gruhl.

The bill would provide for the retroactive payment of a child's insurance benefit under the Federal old-age and survivors insurance program of the Social Security Act to Helen Mann Gruhl for the use and benefit of Helmuth Wolf Gruhl on the wage record of Werner Gruhl for the period December 1942 to February 1947, amounting to $868.53.

The facts in the case are as follows: It appears that in 1931 Helen Gruhl married Werner Gruhl. In April 1932 a son, Helmuth Wolf Gruhl, was born of this marriage, and in 1935 Mrs. Gruhl separated from her husband and took her son from their home in Elizabeth, N. J., to Chicago, Ill., and ultimately to Madison, Wis. In June 1941 she obtained an absolute divorce from Werner Gruhl.

Werner Gruhl entered into another marriage. He died in November 1942, in Middlebury, Vt. Helen Gruhl, the mother of Helmuth Wolf Gruhl, stated that she had no knowledge of the death of her former husband until April 1947, but that she would have learned of the death and would have filed a claim for the child's insurance benefits as early as November 1942, if the widow of Werner Gruhl had not, in her petition for administration of his estate, erroneously made the statement that she was his sole heir. Mrs. Helen Gruhl made application on behalf of her minor son for child's insurance benefits under title II of the Social Security Act in June 1947, and such benefits were awarded retroactive to March 1947 in the amount of $17.03 a month. Such benefits were paid until the child reached the age of 18. Had she been informed, in 1942, of the death of her husband, and had timely application been made for the benefits, payment for the 51 months from December 1942 through February 1947 would have accrued to the benefit of the child, which would have amounted to $868.53. The Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance held that the provisions of the Social Security Act then in effect prevented the payment of retroactive benefits for the period covered by this bill. The action of the Bureau was upheld on appeal by a referee and by the Appeals Council of the Federal Security Agency.

The Social Security Act does provide for the payment of retroactive benefits for a limited period when the filing of an application is delayed after the individual is first eligible for payments. Under the law in effect before September 1950, which was applied in this case, this period was 3 months. The 1950 Social Security Act amendments have since increased the period to 6 months—effective with regard to months after August 1950.

The legislative history of the Social Security Act indicates that, in providing for retroactive benefits for only a limited period, the Congress took into account the fact that persons otherwise eligible for benefits might "not know of their right to benefits or, for some other reason, have delayed filing their applications"—House Report No. 728, page 40; Senate Report No. 734, page 47, 76th Congress. The courts have ruled that the fact that a claimant is unaware of his rights under the Social Security Act does not extend rights beyond the statutory period of grace when no application for benefits has been filed as required by statute.

I appreciate the fact that the limitation on retroactive benefits in the Social Security Act may seem like an unjust penalty to those who, as the child and the mother in this case, had no timely knowledge of the wage earner's death. However, provision against retroactive benefits in the law—except for a reasonable period to allow for normal delays—was not intended as a penalty or forfeiture, but to carry out the purpose of this insurance program. Old-age and survivors insurance benefits are primarily intended to provide a regular, though small, income to beneficiaries to help meet their current living needs. That purpose would not be served by lump-sum payments to individuals to cover previous months for which provision had already been made in other ways, as the present case illustrates. The child has passed the age of eighteen at which social insurance benefits for minors are cut off. Moreover, the facts that the father was not supporting the child and that the death of the father was not known to the mother and child for so long indicate that there was no continuing relationship between the father and the child and that the child was not dependent economically upon the father.

Special legislation permitting one individual to receive social insurance benefits under conditions identical with those in which benefits are denied to another is undesirable and contrary to sound principles of equity and justice. If any modification of a provision in the Social Security Act is needed, I believe that the Congress should make such changes in the basic law so they will be available to all persons equally. The Congress, on two separate occasions—in 1939 and 1950—has considered the question of retroactive benefits and has decided that the period should be definitely limited.

For these reasons, I feel compelled to return the bill without my approval.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 15, 1953.*

The SPEAKER. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal, and, without objection, the bill and message will be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

There was no objection.

THE STATE DEPARTMENT

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, the best news in today's paper is to the effect that the State Department has fired 2,600 people. It is just too bad it is not 5,000. I hope every other Cabinet member will read the newspaper today and follow suit.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. REED of New York in five instances and to include extraneous matter in each.

Mr. BENDER in five instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CRUMPACKER and to include a letter.

Mr. JENSEN and to include a letter and other data.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska and to include a speech by Ezra Taft Benson on the agricultural situation.

Mr. BENTLEY in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. O'KONSKI in regard to the Henry Kaiser enterprises.

Mr. LAIRD in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mrs. CHURCH and to include a news article.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts and to include a letter sent to every Member of Congress by the American Legion on H. R. 5690, the independent offices appropriation bill.

Mr. FINO and to include an address delivered by him yesterday.

Mr. BURDICK.

Mr. LANE in five instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida and to include an editorial.

Mr. WALTER and to include a news release from WRC.

Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana in two instances and to include a newspaper clipping and an editorial.

Mr. BOGGS and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FRAZIER.

Mr. HART and to include a newspaper item.

Mr. CELLER on four distinct subjects.

Mr. BYRD and to include extraneous material.

Mr. DODD.

Mr. LYLE and to include an article.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania in two instances, in one to include a resolution from the city of Jeannette, Pa., and in the other a resolution from the State Senate of Pennsylvania.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois.

Mr. EVINS and to include an article.

Mr. YOUNGER and to include an editorial.

Mr. KLEIN in four instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DEROUNIAN and to include an address by the President of the United States.

Mr. WILSON of California and to include an editorial.

Mr. UTT and to include extraneous matter.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GAMBLE and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HOLT and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HAGEN of Minnesota and to include extraneous matter, notwithstanding the fact it exceeds two pages of the RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $231.

Mr. O'KONSKI in three instances.

Mr. PRICE in three instances in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. RODINO in two instances.

Mr. RADWAN (at the request of Mr. ARENDS) and to include a resolution.

Mr. ROONEY in three instances in one to include an editorial from the Washington Post, in another an editorial from the Brooklyn Eagle and in the third a newspaper article.

Mr. MCCORMACK in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HÉBERT and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SHAFER in four instances.

Mr. ADDONIZIO and to include an editorial.

SENATE BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A bill and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1273. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to incorporate the American University," approved February 24, 1893, so as to clarify the relations between the Board of Trustees of the American University and the Board of Education of the Methodist Church, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. J. Res. 6. Joint Resolution to provide for a continuance of civil government for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 5174. An act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on June 12, 1953, present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 3307. An act to provide for the treatment of users of narcotics in the District of Columbia; and

H. R. 4664. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota (at the request of Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN), on account of illness.

Mr. FINE (at the request of Mr. DOLLINGER), for Monday, June 15, 1953, on account of important business.

Mr. PATTEN (at the request of Mr. EBERHARTER), for Monday, June 15, 1953, on account of official business.

Mr. POWELL (at the request of Mr. CELLER), indefinitely, on account of death in family.

Messrs. CLARDY, WALTER, and SCHERER (at the request of Mr. SCHERER), for June 17, 18, and 19, 1953, on account of hearings of the Un-American Activities Committee at Columbus, Ohio.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, June 16, 1953, at 12 o'clock noon.

OATH OF OFFICE, MEMBERS AND DELEGATES

The oath of office required by the sixth article of the Constitution of the United States, and as provided by section 2 of the act of May 13, 1884 (23 Stat. 22), to be administered to Members and Delegates of the House of Representatives, the text of which is carried in section 1757 of title XIX of the Revised Statutes of the United States and being as follows:

I, A B, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion, and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter, so help me God.

has been subscribed to in person and filed in duplicate with the Clerk of the House of Representatives by the following Member of the 83d Congress, pursuant to Public Law 412 of the 80th Congress, entitled "An act to amend section 30 of the Revised Statutes of the United States" (U. S. C., title 2, sec. 25), approved February 18, 1948: ROBERT T. ASHMORE, Fourth District of South Carolina.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

770. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed supplemental appropriations for the executive branch for the fiscal year 1954 in the amount of $17,455,000 (H. Doc. No. 176); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

771. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to convey to the State of North Carolina a tract of approximately 134 acres, together with buildings and improvements thereon, which the Bureau of Plant Industry, Soils, and Agricultural Engineering of this Department has been using as a cottonfield station"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

772. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the report on cooperation of the United States with Mexico in the prevention of foot-and-mouth disease for the month of April 1953, pursuant to Public Law 8, 80th Congress; to the Committee on Agriculture.

773. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, relative to the Department of the Navy proposing to transfer to the city of Chicago, Ill., the ex-German submarine *U–505*, to be established and maintained as a memorial, pursuant to section 1 of the act of August 7, 1946 (60 Stat. 897, as amended; 34 U. S. C. Supp. V, 546f); to the Committee on Armed Services.

774. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting a draft of a bill entitled "A bill to provide that United States commissioners who are required to devote full time to the duties of the office may be allowed their necessary office expenses"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

775. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting a letter showing a list of cases of certain aliens, and requesting that they be withdrawn from those before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

776. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the 24th report of action taken by the United States Maritime Administration, pursuant to section 217 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (Public Law 498, 77th Congress); 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 calender, as follows:

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 285. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 5690, a bill making appropriations for additional independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 553). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 1991. A bill relating to certain construction-cost adjustments in connection with the Greenfields division of the Sun River irrigation project, Montana: without amendment (Rept. No.

554). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1806. A bill to amend further the Federal Register Act, as amended; with amendment (Rept. No. 555). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1105. An act to incorporate the National Safety Council; with amendment (Rept. No. 556). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HESELTON: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 3792. A bill to amend part III of the Interstate Commerce Act, so as to authorize the Interstate Commerce Commission to revoke, amend, or suspend water carrier certificates and permits under certain conditions; with amendment (Rept. No. 557). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2557. A bill to amend the act of January 12, 1951, as amended, to continue in effect the provisions of title II of the First War Powers Act, 1941; without amendment (Rept. No. 558). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. REES of Kansas: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H. R. 5302. A bill to provide for an additional Assistant Postmaster General in the Post Office Department; without amendment (Rept. No. 559). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McCULLOCH: Committee on the Judiciary. House Concurrent Resolution 28. Concurrent resolution commemorating the 300th anniversary of the formation of Westmoreland County, Va.; without amendment (Rept. No. 560). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. McCULLOCH: Committee on the Judiciary. House Concurrent Resolution 85. Concurrent resolution to participate in Fourth of July, 1953, observance at Independence Hall, Philadelphia, Pa.; with amendment (Rept. No. 561). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CHIPERFIELD:

H. R. 5710. A bill to amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1951, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN:

H. R. 5711. A bill to extend certain benefits to persons who served in the Armed Forces of the United States in Mexico or on its borders during the period beginning May 9, 1916, and ending April 6, 1917, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. R. 5712. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the 200th anniversary of Columbia University; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BENTLEY:

H. R. 5713. A bill to amend the Railway Labor Act to enable employees covered by proposed union shop and checkoff agreements to vote to ratify or reject such agreements; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BURLESON:

H. R. 5714. A bill to authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to transfer certain surplus agricultural commodities to the Director for Mutual Security for sale to countries participating in the mutual security program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. COON:

H. R. 5715. A bill to authorize lending operations by the Klamath Indians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FINE:

H. R. 5716. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the 200th anniversary of Columbia University; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FORAND:

H. R. 5717. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the 200th anniversary of Columbia University; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HAGEN of Minnesota (by request):

H. R. 5718. A bill to limit the period for collection by the United States of compensation received by officers and employees in violation of the dual compensation laws; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H. R. 5719. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 5720. A bill relating to the tax treatment to be afforded under section 117 (j) (3) of the Internal Revenue Code in certain cases involving the sale, exchange, or conversion of land with unharvested crops thereon; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 5721. A bill to authorize the adoption of a certain rule with respect to the broadcasting or telecasting of professional baseball exhibitions in interstate commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HESELTON:

H. R. 5722. A bill to amend section 7 of the War Claims Act of 1948, with respect to claims of certain religious organizations functioning in the Philippine Islands: to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H. R. 5723. A bill to repeal the $75 work clause that applies to old-age and survivors insurance benefits under title II of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MAILLIARD:

H. R. 5724. A bill to amend section 2 of the act approved February 20, 1931, relating to the construction, maintenance, and operation of the San Francisco Bay Bridge; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MILLS:

H. R. 5725. A bill to authorize the adoption of a certain rule with respect to the broadcasting or telecasting of professional baseball exhibitions in interstate commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H. R. 5726. A bill for the relief of sufferers of casualty losses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PHILLIPS:

H. R. 5727. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SHAFER:

H. R. 5728. A bill to authorize the disposal of the Government-owned rubber-producing facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H. R. 5729. A bill to amend section 2 of the act approved February 20, 1931, relating to the construction, maintenance, and operation of the San Francisco Bay Bridge; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H. R. 5730. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain certain facilities to provide water for irrigation and domestic use from the Santa Margarita River, Calif., and the joint utilization of a dam and reservoir and other waterwork facilities by the Department of and Interior and the Department of the Navy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. UTT:

H. R. 5731. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain certain facilities to provide water for irrigation and domestic use from the Santa Margarita River, Calif., and the joint utilization of a dam and reservoir and other waterwork facilities by the Department of the Interior and the Department of the Navy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ENGLE:

H. R. 5732. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain certain facilities to provide water for irrigation and domestic use from the Santa Margarita River, Calif., and the joint utilization of a dam and reservoir and other waterwork facilities by the Department of the Interior and the Department of the Navy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska:

H. R. 5733. A bill to substitute a retailers' excise tax on mechanical lighters for cigarettes, cigars, and pipes in place of the existing manufacturers' excise tax on these items; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAGUE:

H. R. 5734. A bill to amend the Federal Seed Act of August 9, 1939 (53 Stat. 1275), as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DEMPSEY:

H. R. 5735. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of New Mexico, to hear, determine, and render judgment upon certain claims arising as a result of the construction by the United States of Elephant Butte Dam on the Rio Grande; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H. R. 5736. A bill to provide for the conveyance of the Bunker Hill Monument, Charlestown, Mass., to the United States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H. R. 5737. A bill for the relief of sufferers in designated tornado disaster areas for losses of real and personal property suffered in 1953 tornadoes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5738. A bill for the relief of sufferers in designated disaster areas for losses of real and personal property; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois:

H. R. 5739. A bill to permit fiduciaries in the District of Columbia to hold fiduciary property in the name of a nominee; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. WOLVERTON:

H. R. 5740. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, so as to protect the public health and welfare by providing certain authority for factory inspection, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

H. R. 5741. A bill to amend section 39 of the Trading With the Enemy Act of October 6, 1917, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CHIPERFIELD:

H. R. 5742. A bill to amend the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FISHER:

H. R. 5743. A bill to amend section 47c of the National Defense Act of June 3, 1916, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H. R. 5744. A bill to authorize payment of a monetary allowance in lieu of transportation in kind to members of the uniformed services who transport their dependents, baggage, and household effects in a house trailer; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 5745. A bill to allow members of the uniformed services to reside in trailers under certain circumstances without forfeiting their allowance for quarters; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H. J. Res. 277. Joint resolution authorizing the Federal National Mortgage Association to enter into agreements prior to construction to purchase mortgages on housing in disaster areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. RABAUT:

H. J. Res. 278. Joint resolution requesting the President to issue a proclamation designating an appropriate day as a national day of prayer and reparation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRAHAM:

H. Con. Res. 110. Concurrent resolution favoring the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. Con. Res. 111. Concurrent resolution favoring universal disarmament; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. METCALF:

H. Res. 286. Resolution to promote the general welfare by providing for an investigation into the causes and effects of silicosis and for more effective cooperation between the States and the Federal Government to bring about prevention and control of silicosis; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. Res. 287. Resolution providing additional compensation for one minority employee; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

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

By Mr. LANE: Memorial of the Senate of Massachusetts memorializing Congress to retain the New England regional office of the Wage and Hour Division of the United States Department of Labor in the city of Boston, and the branch office of said Division in the city of Springfield; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HESELTON: Resolutions of the State Senate of Massachusetts memorializing Congress to retain the New England regional office of the Wage and Hour Division of the United States Department of Labor in the city of Boston, and the branch office of said Division in the city of Springfield; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts: Memorial of the Senate of Massachusetts to retain the New England office of the Wage and Hour Division of the United States Department of Labor in the city of Boston and the branch office of the Division in the city of Springfield, Mass.; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the continued maintenance of Camp Roberts as a replacement-training center; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to act in the matter in relation to the enlistment in and strength of the California National Guard and California Air National Guard and the national manpower pool; to the Committee on Armed Services.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. ALLEN of California:

H. R. 5746. A bill for the relief of Shang-Chi Su; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H. R. 5747. A bill for the relief of Yousef Said Dahdah and his wife Charlotte Dahdah; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H. R. 5748. A bill for the relief of Jones Edmund Schlögl; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLARDY:

H. R. 5749. A bill for the relief of Maria Teresa Lubiato; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COUDERT:

H. R. 5750. A bill for the relief of Sergio Pezulich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEROUNIAN:

H. R. 5751. A bill for the relief of George Sotirios Samothrakis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DODD (by request):

H. R. 5752. A bill for the relief of Antonios N. Konstantakis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5753. A bill for the relief of Edward Barnett; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5754. A bill for the relief of Olindo Balboni, Mrs. Gisella Balboni, and Piero Balboni; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DORN of New York:

H. R. 5755. A bill for the relief of Edward C. Kempf; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINE:

H. R. 5756. A bill for the relief of Androniki Drakoules Gregoriou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5757. A bill for the relief of Francesco Reda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. R. 5758. A bill for the relief of Rodolfo Loera Chavez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLT (by request):

H. R. 5759. A bill for the relief of Edward A. Cornez, also known as Edward Abbey Kornitz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLTZMAN:

H. R. 5760. A bill for the relief of Nicholas Partheniades; his wife, Catherine; and their son, Constantine; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HYDE:

H. R. 5761. A bill for the relief of Edith Rickert Willson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. R. 5762. A bill for the relief of Suren Pelenghian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 5763. A bill for the relief of Milutan Lesa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H. R. 5764. A bill for the relief of Chandler H. Lapsley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REED of Illinois:

H. R. 5765. A bill for the relief of Henry C. Bush and other foreign service officers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H. R. 5766. A bill for the relief of Zoltan Schwartz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. R. 5767. A bill for the relief of Aron Gensel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5768. A bill for the relief of Joseph Galton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H. R. 5769. A bill for the relief of Wong Lai (also known as Wong Lee); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. R. 5770. A bill for the relief of Anthony Mario Zuclich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5771. A bill for the relief of Krsevan Spanjol; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5772. A bill for the relief of Robert E. Leibbrand; 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:

326. By Mr. HART: Petition of the Board of Commissioners of the city of Union City, N. J., memorializing the Congress of the United States to exercise extreme care and judgment in adopting reductions in the appropriations for the Veterans' Administration in order to insure that service, facilities, and benefits accorded and to be accorded disabled veterans and readjustment benefits for veterans of the Korean conflict shall be continued unimpaired and expanded where urgent need exists; to the Committee on Appropriations.

327. Also, petition memorializing the Congress of the United States that the Hoboken Typographical Union No. 323 go on record as endorsing the Murray-Dingell-Rhodes bill and urge all Senators and Congressmen to vote for its passage; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

328. By Mr. HIESTAND: Petition of Rev. A. G. Crockett and 62 other citizens, of Pasadena, Calif., and other nearby communities, urging support of H. R. 1227 to ban advertising of alcoholic beverages over radio and television and interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

329. By Mr. NORBLAD: Petition of Wesley J. Miller and 27 other citizens of Corvallis, Oreg., urging the enactment of H. R. 1227, to prohibit all liquor advertising through interstate commerce and over the radio and TV; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

330. By the SPEAKER: Petition of California Baptist Brotherhood, Fresno, Calif., relative to a resolution passed by the California Baptist Brotherhood recommending and endorsing the establishment of prayer and meditation rooms for the Members of the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States; to the Committee on House Administration.

331. Also, petition of the president, Wyandotte County Bar Association, Kansas City, Kans., relative to endorsing the enactment of S. 1663, which would increase the salaries of Members of Congress, judges of the United States courts, and United States attorneys; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

332. Also, petition of Mrs. J. B. Harris and others, Miami, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2446 and H. R. 2447, social-security legislation known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

333. Also, petition of Mrs. Sofia Peterson and others, Holly Hill, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2446 and H. R. 2447, social-security legislation known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

334. Also, petition of Birmingham B'nai B'rith Women, Birmingham, Ala., urging the revision of the McCarran-Walter Act Public Law 414; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

335. Also, petition of the Chinese Embassy, Washington, D. C., relative to transmitting a statement of the Legislative Juan of the Republic of China, stating opposition to any attempt to modify the principle of voluntary repatriation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT

In compliance with Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, title III, Regulation of Lobbying Act, section 308 (b), which provides as follows:

(b) All information required to be filed under the provisions of this section with the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate shall be compiled by said Clerk and Secretary, acting jointly, as soon as practicable after the close of the calendar quarter with respect to which such information is filed and shall be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate jointly submit their report of the compilation required by said law and have included all registrations and quarterly reports received for the first calendar quarter of 1953.

QUARTERLY REPORTS

The following quarterly reports were submitted for the first calendar quarter 1953:

(NOTE.—The form used for reports is reproduced below. In the interest of economy questions are not repeated, only the answers are printed and are indicated by their respective letter and number. Also for economy in the RECORD, lengthy answers are abridged.)

File two copies with the Secretary of the Senate and file three copies with the Clerk of the House of Representatives.
This page (page 1) is designed to supply identifying data; and page 2 (on the back of this page) deals with financial data.
Place an "X" below the appropriate letter or figure in the box at the right of the "Report" heading below:
"PRELIMINARY" REPORT ("Registration"): To "register," place an "X" below the letter "P" and fill out page 1 only.
"QUARTERLY" REPORT: To indicate which one of the four calendar quarters is covered by this Report, place an "X" below the appropriate figure. Fill out both page 1 and page 2 and as many additional pages as may be required. The first additional page should be numbered as page "3," and the rest of such pages should be "4," "5," "6," etc. Preparation and filing in accordance with instructions will accomplish compliance with all quarterly reporting requirements of the Act.

Year: 19------	REPORT PURSUANT TO FEDERAL REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT	P	QUARTER 1st	2d	3d	4th
		(Mark one square only)				

NOTE ON ITEM "A".—(a) In General: This "Report" form may be used by either an organization or an individual, as follows:
(i) "Employee".—To file as an "employee," state in Item "B" the name, address, and nature of business of the "employer". (If the "employee" is a firm [such as a law firm or public relations firm], partners and salaried staff members of such firm may join in filing a Report as an "employee.")
(ii) "Employer".—To file as an "employer," write "None" in answer to Item "B."
(b) Separate Reports.—An agent or employee should not attempt to combine his Report with the employer's Report.
(i) Employers subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their agents or employees.
(ii) Employees subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their employers.

A. ORGANIZATION OR INDIVIDUAL FILING.—(1) State name, address, and nature of business; (2) if this Report is for an Employer, list names of agents or employees who will file Reports for this Quarter.

NOTE ON ITEM "B".—*Reports by Agents or Employees.* An employee is to file, each quarter, as many Reports as he has employers; except that: (a) If a particular undertaking is jointly financed by a group of employers, the group is to be considered as one employer, but all members of the group are to be named, and the contribution of each member is to be specified; (b) if the work is done in the interest of one person but payment therefor is made by another, a single Report—naming both persons as "employers"—is to be filed each quarter.

B. EMPLOYER.—State name, address, and nature of business. If there is no employer, write "None."

NOTE ON ITEM "C".—(a) The expression "in connection with legislative interests," as used in this Report, means "in connection with attempting, directly or indirectly, to influence the passage or defeat of legislation." "The term 'legislation' means bills, resolutions, amendments, nominations, and other matters pending or proposed in either House of Congress, and includes any other matter which may be the subject of action by either House"—Section 302 (e).
(b) Before undertaking any activities in connection with legislative interests, organizations and individuals subject to the Lobbying Act are required to file a "Preliminary" Report (Registration).
(c) After beginning such activities, they must file a "Quarterly" Report at the end of each calendar quarter in which they have either received or expended anything of value in connection with legislative interests.

C. LEGISLATIVE INTERESTS, AND PUBLICATIONS in connection therewith:

1. State approximately how long legislative interests are to continue. If receipts and expenditures in connection with legislative interests have terminated, place ☐ an "X" in the box at the left, so that this Office will no longer expect to receive Reports.

2. State the general legislative interests of the person filing and set forth the *specific* legislative interests by reciting: (a) Short titles of statutes and bills; (b) House and Senate numbers of bills, where known; (c) citations of statutes, where known; (d) whether for or against such statutes and bills.

3. In the case of those publications which the person filing has caused to be issued or distributed, in connection with legislative interests, set forth: (a) description, (b) quantity distributed, (c) date of distribution, (d) name of printer or publisher (if publications were paid for by person filing) or name of donor (if publications were received as a gift).

(Answer items 1, 2, and 3 in the space below. Attach additional pages if more space is needed.)

4. *If* this is a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) rather than a "Quarterly" Report, state below what the nature and amount of anticipated expenses will be; and if for an agent or employee, state also what the daily, monthly, or annual rate of compensation is to be. *If this is a "Quarterly" Report, disregard this item "C 4" and fill out Items "D" and "E" on the back of this page.* Do not attempt to combine a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) with a "Quarterly" Report.

AFFIDAVIT

[Omitted in printing]

PAGE 1

NOTE ON ITEM "D".—(a) *In General.* The term "contribution" includes *anything of value.* When an organization or individual uses printed or duplicated matter in a campaign attempting to influence legislation, money received by such organization or individual—for such printed or duplicated matter—is a "contribution." "The term 'contribution' includes a gift, subscription, loan, advance, or deposit of money, or anything of value and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make a contribution"—Section 302 (a) of the Lobbying Act.

(b) IF THIS REPORT IS FOR AN EMPLOYER.—(i) *In General.* Item "D" is designed for the reporting of all receipts from which expenditures are made, or will be made, in accordance with legislative interests.

(ii) *Receipts of Business Firms and Individuals.*—A business firm (or individual) which is subject to the Lobbying Act by reason of expenditures which it makes in attempting to influence legislation—but which has no funds to expend except those which are available in the ordinary course of operating a business not connected in any way with the influencing of legislation—will have no receipts to report, even though it does have expenditures to report.

(iii) *Receipts of Multipurpose Organizations.*—Some organizations do not receive any funds which are to be expended solely for the purpose of attempting to influence legislation. Such organizations make such expenditures out of a general fund raised by dues, assessments, or other contributions. The percentage of the general fund which is used for such expenditures indicates the percentage of dues, assessments, or other contributions which may be considered to have been paid for that purpose. Therefore, in reporting receipts, such organizations may specify what that percentage is, and report their dues, assessments, and other contributions on that basis. However, each contributor of $500 or more is to be listed, regardless of whether the contribution was made solely for legislative purposes.

(c) IF THIS REPORT IS FOR AN AGENT OR EMPLOYEE.—(i) *In General.* In the case of many employees, all receipts will come under items "D 5" (received for services) and "D 12" (expense money and reimbursements). In the absence of a clear statement to the contrary, it will be presumed that your employer is to reimburse you for all expenditures which you make in connection with legislative interests.

(ii) *Employer as Contributor of $500 or More.*—When your contribution from your employer (in the form of salary, fee, etc.) amounts to $500 or more, it is not necessary to report such contribution, under "D 13" and "D 14," since the amount has already been reported under "D 5," and the name of the "employer" has been given under item "B" on page 1 of this report.

D. RECEIPTS (INCLUDING CONTRIBUTIONS AND LOANS):

Fill in every blank. If the answer to any numbered item is "None," write "None" in the space following the number.

Receipts (other than loans)

1. $_____Dues and assessments
2. $_____Gifts of money or anything of value
3. $_____Printed or duplicated matter received as a gift
4. $_____Receipts from sale of printed or duplicated matter

5. $_____Received for services (e. g., salary, fee, etc.)
6. $_____TOTAL for this Quarter (Add items "1" through "5")

7. $_____Received during previous Quarters of calendar year
8. $_____TOTAL from Jan. 1 through this Quarter (Add "6" and "7")

Loans Received

"The term 'contribution' includes a . . . *loan* . . ."—Sec. 302 (a).

9. $_____TOTAL now owed to others on account of loans
10. $_____Borrowed from others during this Quarter
11. $_____Repaid to others during this Quarter

12. $_____"Expense money" and Reimbursements received this Quarter

Contributors of $500 or more (from Jan. 1 through this Quarter)

13. Have there been such contributors? Please answer "yes" or "no": _____

14. In the case of each contributor whose contributions (including loans) during the "period" from January 1 through the last days of this Quarter, total $500 or more:

Attach hereto plain sheets of paper, approximately the size of this page, tabulate data under the headings "Amount" and "Name and Address of Contributor"; and indicate whether the last day of the period is March 31, June 30, September 30, or December 31. Prepare such tabulation in accordance with the following example:

Amount	*Name and Address of Contributor* ("*Period*" from Jan. 1 through _____, 19____)
$1,500.00	John Doe, 1621 Blank Bldg., New York, N. Y.
$1,785.00	The Roe Corporation, 2511 Doe Bldg., Chicago, Ill.
$3,285.00	TOTAL

NOTE ON ITEM "E".—(a) *In General.* "The term 'expenditure' includes a payment, distribution, loan, advance, deposit, or gift of money or anything of value and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make an expenditure"—Section 302 (b) of the Lobbying Act.

(b) IF THIS REPORT IS FOR AN AGENT OR EMPLOYEE. In the case of many employees, all expenditures will come under telephone and telegraph (item "E 6") and travel, food, lodging, and entertainment (item "E 7").

E. EXPENDITURES (INCLUDING LOANS) in connection with legislative interests:

Fill in every blank. If the answer to any numbered item is "None," write "None" in the space following the number.

Expenditures (other than loans)

1. $_____Public relations and advertising services
2. $_____Wage, salaries, fees, commissions (other than item "1")
3. $_____Gifts or contributions made during Quarter
4. $_____Printed or duplicated matter, including distribution cost
5. $_____Office overhead (rent, supplies, utilities, etc.)
6. $_____Telephone and telegraph
7. $_____Travel, food, lodging, and entertainment
8. $_____All other expenditures

9. $_____TOTAL for this Quarter (add "1" through "8")
10. $_____Expended during previous Quarters of calendar year

11. $_____TOTAL from January 1 through this Quarter (add "9" and "10")

Loans Made to Others

"The term 'expenditure' includes a . . . *loan* . . ."—Sec. 302 (b).

12. $_____TOTAL now owed to person filing
13. $_____Lent to others during this Quarter
14. $_____Repayment received during this Quarter

15. Recipients of Expenditures of $10 or More

In the case of expenditures made during this Quarter by, or on behalf of, the person filing: Attach plain sheets of paper approximately the size of this page and tabulate data as to expenditures under the following headings: "Amount," "Date or Dates," "Name and Address of Recipient," "Purpose." Prepare such tabulation in accordance with the following example:

Amount	*Date or Dates*	*Name and Address of Recipient*	*Purpose*
$1,750.00	7–11:	Roe Printing Co., 3214 Blank Ave., St. Louis, Mo.	Printing and mailing circulars on the "Marshblanks Bill."
$2,400.00	7–15, 8–15, 9–15:	Britten & Blatten, 3127 Gremlin Bldg., Washington, D. C.	Public relations service at $800.00 per month.
$4,150.00	TOTAL		

A. J. Carson Adkerson, 976 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Strategic minerals, including manganese.

A. Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Generally any legislation which will affect the aircraft industry.
D. (6) $4,466.07.
E. (2) $3,750; (7) $625.32; (8) $90.75; (9) $4,466.07; (11) $4,466.07.

A. W. L. Allen, 5913 Georgia Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The Commercial Telegraphers' Union, International (AFL), 5913 Georgia Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (See attached).[1]

A. Allied Wool Industry Committee, 327 North Van Ness, Fresno, Calif., and 414 Pacific National Life Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.
C. (2) H. R. 1427, parity protection amendment to the Agricultural Act of 1949.
D. (6) $9,591.05.
E. (2) $1,000; (3) $1,000; (7) $1,000; (9) $3,000; (11) $3,000; (15)[1]

A. W. R. Allstetter, the National Fertilizer Association, Inc., 616 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The National Fertilizer Association, Inc., 616 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation that might affect the manufacture or distribution of fertilizer or the general agricultural economy.
D. (6) $50.

A. Thomas H. Alphin, M. D., 1523 L Street, NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) All bills (Senate and House) relating to health and welfare.
D. (6) $1,900; (8) $1,900.
E. (7) $60.70; (9) $60.70; (11) $60.70

A. American Association of University Women, 1634 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Federal aid to education; qualified equal-rights amendment; strengthening the United Nations; protection of consumer against inflation and unfair trade practices; improvement of status of women; development of constructive foreign policy; strengthening of existing penal laws for sale of narcotics to minors. Opposed S. J. Res. 1, March 10, 1953.
E. (2) $2,100; (4) $60; (9) $2,160; (11) $2,160.

A. American Cancer Society, 47 Beaver Street, New York.
C. (2) Appropriations for public health.
E. (1) $5,416.65; (7) $1,298.18; (9) $6,714.83; (11) $6,714.83.

A. American Citizens Committee for Economic Aid Abroad, 124 East 70th Street, New York, N. Y. To support mutual security program for 1953 (insofar as the technical aid and economic assistance section of the program are concerned.
C. (2) Bills appropriating funds for economic assistance and technical aid to foreign countries; for such statutes and bills.
D. (6) $25.00.
E. (2) $12; (9) $12; (11) $12.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 203-A Liberty Life Building, Charlotte, N. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the cotton textile industry, including tariffs, corporate taxes, price, and production controls.
D. (6) $3,138.16.
E. (2) $2,641.45; (5) $249; (6) $108.11; (7) $139.60; (9) $3,138.16; (11) $3,138.16; (15).[1]

A. American Dental Association, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Legislation involving the dental health of the public or the practice of dentistry.
D. (6) $6,447.53.
E. (2) $6,101; (7) $346.53; (9) $6,447.53; (11) $6,447.53; (15).[1]

A. American Farm Bureau Federation, General office, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.; Washington office, 261 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (See schedule 2.)[1]
D. (6) $23,546.
E. (2) $14,542; (4) $2,166; (5) $1,922; (6) $563; (7) $355; (9) $19,548; (11) $19,548.

A. American Federation of Labor, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the interests of working people. (3) American Federationist.
E. (1) $6,838.41; (2) $14,964.51; (4) $4,063.77; (5) $940; (9) $26,806.69; (11) $26,806.69; (15).[1]

A. American Federation of the Physically Handicapped, 1370 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) To establish the Federal Agency for Handicapped; tax exemptions for handicapped and for those who support handicapped who cannot care for themselves; Federal Agency for Handicapped bills.
D. (6) $12,079.70.
E. (2) $900; (4) $720; (6) $40; (7) $50; (9) $1,710; (11) $1,710.

A. American Hospital Association, 18 East Division Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) All legislation which may affect the ability of hospitals to render good care or which may affect care for the American people.
D. (6) $13,123.20.
E. (2) $7,713.74; (4) $455.27; (5) $825.79; (6) $407.68; (7) $403.97; (8) $761.75; (9) $10,523.20; (11) $10,523.20.

A. American Hotel Association, a trade association, 221 West 57th Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) All bills and statutes of interest to the hotel industry.
D. (6) $123,967.59.
E. (See rider.)[1]

A. The American Humane Association, 135 Washington Avenue, Albany, N. Y., 1617 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) To promote the enactment of legislation within the field of work of the Association and conforming to the standards of the same. To discourage legislation below such standards.
D. (6) $660.83.
E. (5) $3; (6) $46.14; (9) $49.14; (11) $49.14.

A. The American Legion, National Headquarters, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
C. (See statement attached).[1]

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

D. (6) $57,688.96.
E. (2) $11,602.96; (4) $2,320.50; (5) $1,692.93; (6) $376.13; (7) $826.69; (9) $16,819.21; (11) $16,819.21.

A. American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) All prospective and existing legislation which may affect the life-insurance business.
D. (6) $6,238.62.
E. (2) $4,700.56; (5) $1,138.01; (6) $100; (7) $300.05; (9) $6,238.62; (11) $6,238.62; (15).[1]

A. American Medical Association, a corporation, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) The general legislative interest of the American Medical Association is to advance the science and art of medicine. The specific legislative interest of the American Medical Association at the present time is in the items referred to on pages 3 through 6 of this report.[1]
D. (6) $50,000.
E. (2) $29,689.61; (4) $134.48; (5) $7,204.21; (6) $955.68; (7) $1,642.41; (8) $5,291.88; (9) $44,918.30; (11) $44,918.30; (15).[1]

A. American National Cattlemen's Association, 515 Cooper Building, Denver, Colo.
C. (2) Support prices, standby controls, freeze order, reciprocal trade, buy American, reorganization of Department of Agriculture, public land legislation, etc.
D. (6) $54,488.92.
E. (2) $6,800; (6) $75.88; (7) $703.09; (8) $1,051.75; (9) $8,630.72; (11) $8,630.72.

A. American Nurses Association, Inc., 2 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) H. R. 3850, Federal grants-in-aid to nursing education legislation in area of social-security support; income-tax deductions for household help; revision of National Labor Relations Act; bills relating to various health programs are under study. (See attached sheet.[1]
D. (6) $453,144.35.
E. (2) $1,400; (5) $267.92; (6) $72.47; (7) $834.24; (9) $2,574.63; (11) $2,574.63; (15).[1]

A. The American Optometric Association, Inc., care of Dr. Leo G. Miller, 420 Sharp Building, Lincoln, Nebr.
C. (2) S. 632, H. R. 3921, 116, 2980, 2224, 2332, 257, 1817.
D. (6) $386.
E. (2) $1,800; (4) $45.39; (6) $21.80; (7) $16.42; (8) $3.25; (9) $1,886.86; (11) $1,886.86; (15).[1]

A. American Osteopathic Association, 212 East Ohio Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Bills affecting the public health.
D. (6) $451.07.
E. (2) $375; (5) $69; (6) $7.07; (9) 451.07; (11) $451.07.

A. American Paper & Pulp Association, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislative interests are those affecting the pulp and paper industry, its operations, practices, and properties.
D. (6) $230.
E. (2) $200; (6) $20; (7) $10; (9) $230; (11) $230.

A. American Parents Committee, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C., and 52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Support of Federal aid for school construction. Support of legislation providing national school health services. Appropriations to establish program of education for children of migratory workers.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

Bills to safeguard health and welfare of children of migratory workers. Appropriations for the Children's Bureau. Appropriations for the national school-lunch program. Emergency maternal and infant care, S. 2337.
D. (6) $5,134.50.
E. (2) $1,072.07; (4) $183.01; (5) $186.52; (6) $38.04; (7) $56.27; (8) $421.02; (9) $1,956.93; (11) $1,956.93.

A. American Petroleum Institute, 50 West 50th Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the petroleum industry.
D. (6) $35,245.
E. (2) $5,906; (5) $3,100; (6) $289; (6a) $1,764; (9) $11,059; (11) $11,059; (15).[1]

A. American Pulpwood Association, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislative interests are those affecting the pulpwood industry, its practices and properties.

A. American Retail Federation, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (See page 3.)[1]
D. (6) $42,037.19.
E. (2) $8,750; (4) $15.38; (5) $1,023.33; (6) $809.05; (7) $361.09; (9) $10.958.85; (11) $10,958.85 (see pp. 5 and 6).[1]

A. The American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) See Legislative policies, attached;[1] (3) Legislative policies, 1953.
D. (6) $2,157.16.
E. (2) $525; (4) $257.04; (5) $316.20; (6) $52.15; (7) $890.27; (8) $116.50; (9) $2,157.16; (11) $2,157.16; (15).[1]

A. The American Tariff League, Inc., 19 West 44th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $17,550.
E. (2) $9,128; (4) $1,369.29; (5) $1,631.85; (6) $225.50; (7) $867.37; (8) $728.88; (9) $13,950.89; (11) $13,950.89.

A. America's Wage Earners' Protective Conference, 424 Bowen Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) H. R. 4294, trade agreements bill.
D. (6) $3,180.
E. (2) $3,582.51; (8) $26; (9) $3,608.51; (11) $3,608.51; (see page 4).[1]

A. Angelina & Neches River Railroad Co., Keltys, Tex., et al.[1]
C. (2) Generally legislation affecting Texas railroads.
E. (2) $4,374.99; (8) $750.20; (9) $5,125.19; (11) $5,125.19; (15).[1]

A. Richard H. Anthony, the American Tariff League, Inc., 19 West 44th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $3,125.
E. (7) $283.88; (9) $283.88; (11) $283.88.

A. John R. Arant, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Measures affecting mining, such as income taxation, social security, public lands, stockpiling, monetary policy, etc.
D. (6) $900.
E. (7) $20.50; (9) $20.50; (11) $20.50.

A. Hector M. Aring, 826 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Johns-Manville Corp., 22 East 40th Street, New York. N. Y.
C. (2) Tax legislation, housing legislation, tariff legislation.
D. (6) $1,250.
E. (8) $861.88; (9) $861.88; (11) $861.88.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Arnold, Fortas, and Porter, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. ARO, Inc., Tullahoma, Tenn.
C. (2) The following rider to the Air Forces appropriation for research and development, defense appropriations bill, H. R. 7391: "Provided, that no part of such appropriation shall be used to make any payment to ARO, Inc., for the operation of the Arnold Engineering Development Center."

A. W. C. Arnold, 200 Colman Building, Seattle, Wash.
B. Alaska Salmon Industry, Inc., 200 Colman Building, Seattle, Wash.

A. ARO, Inc., Tullahoma, Tenn.
C. (2) The deletion of the proviso in H. R. 7391 which would prohibit payment of appropriated funds to ARO, Inc. (3) "In re ARO, Inc."
E. (4) $588.80; (7) $497.77; (9) $1,086.57; (11) $1,086.57; (15).[1]

A. Arthritis and Rheumatism Foundation, 23 West 45th Street, New York City.
C. (2) Appropriations for public health.
E. (1) $900; (7) $233.66; (9) $1,133.66; (11) $1,133.66.

A. The Associated General Contractors of America, Inc., Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (See statement attached.)[1]

A. Association of American Physicians and Surgeons, Inc., 360 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) The association concerns itself with only proposed legislation affecting physicians and surgeons in the practice of their profession.
D. (6) $1,500.
E. (4) $1,500; (9) $1,500; (11) $1,500.

A. Association of American Railroads, 929 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
B. (See rider D-14 for list of full member roads, AAR.)[1]
C. (See rider.)[1]
D. (6) $56,822.29.
E. (2) $35,063.32; (3) $10,000; (5) $4,976.41; (6) $376.50; (7) $1,100.77; (8) $5,305.29; (9) $56,822.29; (11) $56,822.29; (15).[1]

A. Association of American Ship Owners, 90 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.
D and E.[1]

A. Association of Casualty and Surety Companies, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y.
B. (See attached list of member companies.)[1]
C. (2) Legislation affecting casualty and surety companies.
D. (6) $1,863.69.
E. (2) $1,403.06; (4) $65.56; (5) $102.64; (6) $33.86; (7) $78.64; (8) $179.93; (9) $1,863.69; (11) $1,863.69.

A. The Association of Western Railways, 474 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) All Federal legislative proposals which do or may affect the western railroads.

A. Edward Atkins, 51 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
B. National Association of Shoe Chain Stores, Inc., 51 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation regarding labor laws and revenue act.
E. (2) $125; (11) $125.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Awalt, Clark & Sparks, 822 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) (See appended statement, p. 4.)[1]
D. (6) $6,250.
E. (6) $40.88; (7) $223.20; (9) $264.08; (11) $264.08; (15)[1]

A. Charles E. Babcock, Route 4, Box 73, Vienna, Va.
B. National Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics of the United States of North America, 3025-3029 North Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
C. (2) Control of immigration; improvement of free public schools; suppression of communism.
D. (6) $249.99.
E. (5) $70; (6) $1.50; (7) $11.34; (8) $1.50; (9) $84.34; (11) $84.34.

A. Frazer A. Bailey, 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2)[1].
D. (6) $3,125.

A. John A. Baker.
B. Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union of America, 1555 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo. (home office); 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (legislative office).
D. (6)[1].

A. H. M. Baldridge, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United States Cane Sugar Refiners Association, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. George W. Ball, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Employed by Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly & Ball, a law firm of which a client is the Chambers of Commerce of Venezuela, care of Caracas Chamber of Commerce, Sur 2, No. 30, Altos, Caracas, Venezuela, whose interest is the promotion of domestic and foreign private interests and commercial interests of its members.
C. (2) General interest in obtaining information on and opposing any legislation designed to increase tariffs or impose quotas on imports of petroleum products.

A. George W. Ball, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Employed by Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly & Ball, a law firm of which a client is Comite Franc-Dollar, 31 Avenue Pierre Ier de Serbie, Paris 8c., France (a branch of the Conseil National du Patronat Francais, a French manufacturers' association), whose interest is the development of French exports.
C. (2) General interest in obtaining information on legislation affecting imports into the United States; tariffs, quotas, etc., and communicating such information individually to other interested persons in the United States.

A. Joseph H. Ball, 1713 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Association of American Ship Owners, 90 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) During the period for which this report is filed, the registrant did support, advocate or oppose S. 1148 (war risk insurance), and S. 1081 (controls) amendments to the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, and independent offices appropriations for fiscal 1953 and 1954 (rider limiting valuation of vessels in requisition and war risk insurance cases).

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

E. (See p. 3 attached hereto and made a part hereof).[1]

A. J. H. Ballew, Stahlman Building, Nashville, Tenn.
B. Southern States Industrial Council, Nashville, Tenn.
C. (2) Support of legislation favorable to free enterprise system, and opposition to legislation unfavorable to that system.
D. (5) $2,156.30.

A. Hartman Barber, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employees, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
C. (2) Interested in all legislation affecting labor, especially railroad labor.
D. (6) $2,046.51.
E. (6) $137.02; (7) $313.60; (8) $287.50; (9) $738.12; (11) $738.12.

A. Robert C. Barnard, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Employed by Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly & Ball, a law firm of which a client is the Chambers of Commerce of Venezuela, care of Caracas Chamber of Commerce, Sur 2, No. 30, Altos, Caracas, Venezuela, whose interest is the promotion of domestic and foreign.
C. (2) General interest in obtaining information on and opposing any legislation designed to increase tariffs or impose quotas on imports of petroleum products.

A. Robert C. Barnard, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Employed by Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly & Ball, a law firm of which a client is Comite-Franc-Dollar, 31 Avenue Pierre ler de Serbie, Paris 8e, France (a branch of the Conseil National du Patronat Francais, a French manufacturers' association), whose*
C. (2) General interest in obtaining information on legislation affecting imports into the United States; tariffs, quotas, etc., and communicating such information individually to other interested persons in the United States.

A. Arthur R. Barnett, 1200 18th Street, NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) (See appended statement, p. 5.[1])
D. (6) $5,025.
E. (6) $37.99; (7) $384.60; (8) $43.09; (9) $465.68; (11) $465.68; (15) $19, 2–4–53, Fan & Bill's, Washington, D. C., restaurant; $20, 2–12–53, El Toro, Washington, D. C., restaurant.

A. Irvin L. Barney, room 412, Railway Labor Building, 10 Independence Avenue, Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood Railway Carmen of America, 4929 Main Street, Kansas City, Mo.
C. (2) All legislation of interest to railroad employees and labor in general.
D. (6) $2,125.

A. A. K. Barta, 810 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The Proprietary Association, 810 18th Street, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Bills affecting proprietary medicines industry.
E. (7) $125; (9) $125; (11) $125.

A. J. A. Beirne, CWA-CIO, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Communications Workers of America-CIO, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D. C.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

C. (2) Legislative matters affecting the interests of the membership of the union.

A. Julia D. Bennett, Hotel Congressional, Washington, D. C.
B. American Library Association, 50 East Huron Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2).[1]
E. (2) $1,451.25; (3) $21; (4) $118.45; (5) $8.53; (7) $157.79; (8) $2.25; (9) $1,759.27; (11) $1,759.27; (15).[1]

A. Ernest H. Benson, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
C. (2) All legislation affecting railroad employees in particular and labor in general.
D. (6) $4,500.

A. Mrs. Louella Miller Berg., 1634 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Association of University Women, 1634 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Federal aid to education; qualified equal-rights amendment; strengthening the United Nations; protection of consumer against inflation and unfair trade practices; improvement of status of women; development of constructive foreign policy; strengthening of existing penal laws for sale of narcotics to minors. Opposed Senate Joint Resolution 1, March 10, 1953.
D. (6) $1,350.

A. Joe Betts, 261 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2).[1]
D. (6) $318.75.
E. (7) $17.71; (9) $17.71; (11) $17.71.

A. Bigham, Englar, Jones & Houston, 99 John Street, New York, N. Y., and 932 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The American Institute of Marine Underwriters, the Association of Marine Underwriters of the United States, American Cargo War Risk Reinsurance Exchange, American Marine Hull Insurance Syndicate.
C. (2) General questions affecting the insurance of ships and their cargoes against marine risks; reparations; subrogation. Merchant Marine Act of 1936.
E. (5) $75.60; (9) $75.60; (11, $75.60.

A. John H. Bivins, 50 West 50th Street, New York, N. Y.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 50 West 50th Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the petroleum industry.

A. James C. Black, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Republic Steel Corp., Republic Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
D. (6) $600.
E. (7) $500; (9) $500; (1) $500.

A. Wm. Rhea Blake, 162 Madison Avenue, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 18, Memphis, Tenn.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the raw cotton industry.

A. Charles B. Blankenship, CWA–CIO, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Communications Workers of America, CIO, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D. C.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

C. (2) Legislative matters affecting the interests of the membership of this union.
D. (6) $2,788.58.
E. (2) $1,999.98; (7) $206.90; (8) $581.70; (9) $2,788.58; (11) $2,788.58.

A. Chester F. Bletch, 1756 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Maryland and Virginia Milk Producers Association, Inc., 1756 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Blue Cross Commission, 425 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) General interest in legislation for payroll deductions, war damage, economic controls, and hospital and health matters.
E. (2) $650; (8) $192.63; (9) $842.63; (11) $842.63.

A. Morton Bodfish, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Support all legislation favorable to thrift and home ownership and particularly helpful to savings and loan associations and cooperative banks in carrying out their thrift and home financing objectives and oppose legislation detrimental to home ownership and those institutions.
D. (6) $625.

A. John N. Bohannon, 75 Macon Avenue, Asheville, N. C., and 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Consolidated Natural Gas Co., 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation materially affecting business in general and particularly any changes in public policy concerning fuels—coal, oil, and natural gas, or action which affects supply, production, gathering, transportation, sales, or distribution of natural gas, and demand therefor. Specific legislative interests of above individual include: S. J. Res. 13, S. Res. 45, H. Res. 59; H. R. 1, H. R. 133, H. R. 134, H. R. 308, H. R. 321, H. R. 1282, H. R. 1601, H. R. 2120, H. R. 2238, H. R. 2679, H. R. 3707, H. R. 3764, H. R. 3769, H. R. 3892, H. R. 4198, H. R. 4291, H. R. 4311; S. 298, S. 525, S. 655–659, S. 1051, S. 1287, and all subsequently proposed amendments to the Natural Gas Act that may be offered or considered.
D. (6) $4,500.
E. (5) $448.57; (6) $318.50; (7) $1,132.70; (9) $1,899.77; (11) $1,899.77.

A. Sanford H. Bolz, 927 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Jewish Congress, 15 East 84th Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) To oppose anti-Semitism and racism in all its forms and to defend civil rights incident thereto.
D. (6) $125.
E. (7) 65 cents; (9) 65 cents; (11) 65 cents; (12) 65 cents.

A. Joseph L. Borda, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers.

A. R. B. Bowden, 608 Hibbs Building, Washington, D. C., and 100 Merchants Exchange, St. Louis, Mo.
B. Grain and Feed Dealers Association, 100 Merchants Exchange, St. Louis, Mo.
C. 2. Legislation affecting the grain and/or feed business.

A. Charles M. Boyer, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Reserve Officers Association of the United States, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation for development of a military policy for the United States which

will guarantee adequate national security; (3) the Reserve Officer.

A. D. H. Brackett, Post Office Box 622, Atlanta, Ga.

A. Joseph E. Brady, 2347 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

B. International Union of United Brewery, Flour, Cereal, Soft Drink, and Distillery Workers of America, 2347 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

C. (2) All legislation involving or in the direction of national prohibition, taxation of alcoholic beverages, etc. (3) The Brewery Worker.

A. Harry R. Brashear, 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Any legislation affecting transportation matters in which members of the association are interested.

A. James M. Brewbaker, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Manufacturers.

A. Dawes E. Brisbine, 952 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.

B. National Highway Users Conference, Inc., 952 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Federal grants-in-aid to States for highways, or repeal, modification, or extension of Federal excise taxes on motor vehicles, gasoline, oil, tires, or auto parts. Such "legislative interest" is primarily for analysis and reporting—(a) Revenue Act of 1951; (b) H. R. 4473 and the Senate version; (d) for modification of automotive excise-tax provisions.

A. W. S. Bromley, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

B. American Pulpwood Association, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Milton E. Brooding, 215 Fremont Street, San Francisco, Calif.

B. California Packing Corp., 215 Fremont Street, San Francisco, Calif.

C. (2) Legislation related specifically to food processing and farming.

D. (6) $1,000.

E. (6) $75; (7) $450; (9) $525; (11) $525.

A. Brown, Lund & Fitzgerald, Washington Loan & Trust Building, Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Electric Companies, Ring Building, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) H. R. 2289, H. R. 4351, S. 689 (Niagara power); S. 753, S. 1081 (economic controls); S. 1108 (relocation of utility facilities); independent offices appropriation, 1954; Interior Department appropriation, 1954; House Resolution 15 (commercial and proprietary activities of Government); House Resolution 12 (commercial and proprietary activities of Government); S. 106, H. R. 992 (organization of the executive branch).

D. (6) $8,166.66.

E. (2) $7,491.66; (5) $375; (6) $2.88; (8) $35.75; (9) $7,905.29; (11) $7,905.29.

A. Paul W. Brown, department 731, Sears, Roebuck & Co., 925 South Homan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

B. Sears, Roebuck & Co., 925 South Homan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) Postal legislation.

D. (6) $445.58.

E. (6) $1.65; (7) $336.45; (9) $338.10; (11) $338.10.

A. Russell B. Brown, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Independent Petroleum Association of America, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislation that might affect the petroleum industry.

E. (8) $9.80; (9) $9.80; (11) $9.80.

A. Thad H. Brown, Jr., 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Registrant is interested in any legislation—local, State, or Federal—which relates to the television-broadcasting industry.

A. John M. Brumm, Committee for the Nation's Health, 2212 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Committee for the Nation's Health, 2212 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Interested in all legislation regarding national health insurance and the following bills: H. R. 1817, S. 1052, S. 1153, H. R. 3582, H. R. 3586, H. R. 4128, S. 461, H. R. 3850, S. 994, H. R. 8, and H. R. 390.

E. (2) $2,374.98; (8) $10.89; (9) $2,385.87; (11) $2,385.87; (14) $10.89.

A. Henry M. Buckson, 405 Dorset Avenue, Chevy Chase, Md.

B. Florida Inland Navigation District, Citizens Bank Building, Bunnell, Fla.

C. (2) Potentially interested in all legislation affecting river and harbor works, flood control, and other water use and conservation, and related subjects.

D. (6) $1,350.

E. (6) $2.20; (8) $32.49; (9) $34.69; (11) $34.69.

A. Henry H. Buckman, 405 Dorset Avenue, Chevy Chase, Md.

B. The Vulcan Detinning Co., Sewaren, N. J.

A. George Bugbee, 18 East Division Street, Chicago, Ill.

B. American Hospital Assn., 18 East Division Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $1,562.51.

E. (7) $169.62; (9) $169.62; (11) $169.62.

A. George J. Burger, 250 West 57th Street, New York, N. Y. and 352 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Burger Tire Consultant Service, 250 West 57th Street, New York, N. Y., and National Federation of Independent Business, 352 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Interested in rubber tires bill, basing point legislation, antitrust law legislation, quantity discount case, spare tire monopoly, all legislation affecting independent small business.

D. (5) $2,779.84.

A. Donald T. Burke, 1200 18th Street, Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street, Washington, D. C.

D. (6) $1,875.

E. (7) $372.87; (8) $37.53; (9) $410.40; (11) $410.40.

A. Harold Burke, 115 Pearl Street, New York, N. Y.

B. United States Cane Sugar Refiners Association, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Burley & Dark Leaf Tobacco Export Association, Postoffice Box 860, Lexington, Ky.

D. (7) $2,635.50.

E. (2) $3,103.26; (5) $595.91; (6) $147.78; (7) $110.58; (9) $3,957.53; (11) $3,957.53.

A. Robert M. Burr, 155 East 44th Street, New York, N. Y.

B. National Electrical Manufacturers Association, 155 East 44th Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Legislation regarding excise taxes on electric refrigerators, electric ranges, electric water heaters, domestic electric appliances, commercial electric cooking equipment, electric fans, and legislation affecting imports of products into the United States.

D. (6) $186.78.

A. Orrin A. Burrows, 1200 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, 1200 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) All legislation dealing with the electrical workers in particular and labor in general, such as attempts by Congress to reduce annual and sick leave for Federal employees, and in support of unemployment insurance and severance pay and other liberal benefits for the workers.

D. (6) $2,874.99.

A. Eugene J. Butler, 1312 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Catholic Welfare Conference, 1312 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) All legislation affecting religious, charitable, and educational institutions and organizations.

A. Carl Byoir and Associates, Inc., 10 East 40th Street, New York, N. Y.

B. Schenley Industries, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Revenue Act of 1952. Internal Revenue Code.

E. (2) $175; (4) $55; (6) $10; (7) $35; (8) $115; (9) $390; (11) $390.

A. C. G. Caffrey, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 203-A Liberty Life Building, Charlotte, N. C.

C. (2) Customs Simplification Act; H. R. 2577, Trade Agreements Extension Act; S. 91, Cotton Products Identification Act of 1953; Emergency Stabilization Act of 1953; S. 595, price support; H. R. 3470, controlling inflation; amending and extending Defense Production Act of 1950; S. 800, Export-Import Bank Act; H. R. 2949, Export Control Act of 1949; amending the National Labor Relations Act, as amended.

D. (6) $760.20.

E. (6) $3; (7) $10; (8) $30; (9) $43; (11) $43.

A. James A. Campbell, room 716, AFGE, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Federation of Government Employees, room 716, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) All bills of interest to Federal Government employees and District of Columbia government employees.

D. (6) $2,692.27.

E. (7) $269.22; (9) $269.22; (11) $269.22.

A. Julian W. Caplan, National Retail Furniture Association, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Retail Furniture Association, 666 Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) Legislation affecting retail distribution of home goods. Appearance on S. 753 and S. 1081, control authority.

D. (6) $500.

E. (7) $100; (9) $100; (11) $100.

A. John L. Carey, 270 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. American Institute of Accountants, 270 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation affecting certified public accountants.
D. (6) $82.50.
E. (7) $42.72; (9) $42.92; (11) $42.92.

A. T. C. Carroll, Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
C. (2) Legislation of interest to railroad employees.

A. Henderson H. Carson, George Washington Inn, Washington, D. C., and 600 First National Bank Building, Canton, Ohio.
B. East Ohio Gas Co., 1405 East Sixth Street, Cleveland, Ohio.
C. (2) All legislation of interest to natural gas industry.
D. (6) $3,441.74.
E. (1) $28; (4) $15.62; (5) $5.50; (6) $45.60; (7) $165.40, $135.22; (8) $46.40; (9) $441.74; (11) $441.74.

A. Albert E. Carter, attorney at law, 1026 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Pacific Gas & Electric Co., 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $3,000.
E. (5) $634.86; (6) $49.80; (7) $190; (8) $178.20; (9) $1,052.86; (11) $1,052.86; (12) $1,052.86; (14) $1,267.07.

A. Clarence B. Carter, Post Office Box 798, New Haven, Conn.
B. Railroad Pension Conference, Post Office Box 798, New Haven, Conn.
C. (2) Enactment of H. R. 122 for 30-year retirement at half-pay based on 5 years of highest earnings, maximum annuity $200 per month. (3) Pension Conference Bulletin.
E. (6) $17.21; (7) $66; (9) $83.21; (11) $83.21.

A. D. E. Casey, American Taxpayers Association, Inc., 419 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Taxpayers Association, Inc., 419 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Benjamin F. Castle, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Milk Industry Foundation, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) The foundation has a general legislative interest in statutes or bills which affect the interests of milk dealers. Its only specific legislative interest at present is the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and any amendments thereto or extensions thereof which may affect the interests of milk dealers.

A. Larry Cates, Air Line Pilots Association, 1185 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. C. N. Sayen, Air Line Pilots Association, 55th Street and Cicero Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Aviation legislation, Railway Labor Act.
D. (6) $3,883.14.

A. Central Arizona Project Association, 510 Goodrich Building, Phoenix, Ariz.
C. (2) S. 75, Bridge Canyon Act; and H. R. 1500 and H. R. 1501, Bridge Canyon Act (known more frequently as central Arizona project bill) or as it may be renumbered or reintroduced. (3) The Case for Water in Central Arizona; Work for Water; California's Stake in Arizona's Share of Colorado River; What the Central Arizona Project Means to You; Truth; Settling Up Time; Facts You Should Know Respecting the Central Arizona Project; National Tax Benefits From the Central Arizona Project.
D. (6) $1,000.
E. (2) $5,204.13; (4) $371.57; (5) $847.82; (6) $199.24; (7) $504.78; (8) $2,268.68; (9) $9,396.22; (11) $9,396.22.

A. Central Public Utility Corp., 1017 Olive Street, St. Louis, Mo.
C. (2) Legislative interests consist of advocating before appropriate Members and committees of the Congress and administrative agencies, amendment of the Internal Revenue Code to provide for the inclusion, in subsection 458 (d) (2), of the principle now set forth in subsection 441 (9) (2).

A. William E. Chace, 616 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The National Fertilizer Association, Inc., 616 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation that might affect the manufacture or distribution of fertilizer or the general agricultural economy.
D. (6) $20.

A. Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) (See attachment.) [1]
D. (6) $998,088.44. (See attachment D, p. 7.) [1]
E. (9) $33,615.91 (see attachment E, p. 8) [1]; (11) $33,615.91.

A. Walter Chamblin, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers.

A. The Chase National Bank of the City of New York, 18 Pine Street, New York, N. Y.

A. The Christian Amendment Movement, 804 Penn Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.
C. (2) Promoting a proposed Christian amendment to the Constitution of the United States. (3) The Christian Patriot.
D. (6) $3,292.39.
E. (1) $60; (2) $3,930.37; (4) $880.68; (5) $139.73; (6) $24.26; (7) $679.23; (8) $146.76; (9) $5,861.03; (11) $5,861.03.

A. Abiah A. Church, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation—local, State, Federal, or international—which affects the broadcasting industry.

A. Robert M. Clark, 525 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co., 80 East Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Pending and prospective legislation affecting the interest of the railway company.
D. (6) $5,025.

A. Ann Thacher Clarke, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly & Ball, a law firm of which a client is the Chambers of Commerce of Venezuela, care of Caracas Chamber of Commerce, Sur 2, No. 30, Altos, Caracas, Venezuela.
C. (2) Any legislation designed to increase tariffs or impose quotas on imports of petroleum products.

A. Ann Thacher Clarke, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly & Ball, a law firm of which a client is Comite-Franc-Dollar, 31, Avenue Pierre ler de Serbie, Paris 8e, France (a branch of the Conseil National du Patronat Francais).
C. (2) General interest in obtaining information on legislation affecting imports into the United States; tariffs, quotas, etc.

A. Clear Channel Broadcasting Service (CCBS), 532 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) CCBS is opposed to any proposed legislation (such as S. 491 and H. R. 4004, 81st Cong.) calling for the duplication of class I–A clear-channel frequencies or the limitation of the power of class I–A standard broadcast stations. CCBS opposes ratification of the so-called NARBA agreement signed November 15, 1950.
E. (7) $19.75; (9) $19.75; (11) $19.75; (See pp. 3–4).[2]

A. Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly & Ball, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Chambers of Commerce of Venezuela, care of Chamber of Commerce, Sur 2, No. 30, Altos, Caracas, Venezuela.
C. (2) Any legislation designed to increase tariffs or impose quotas on imports of petroleum products.
E. (2) $81.84; (4) $120.55; (6) $35.90; (7) $197.83; (8) $13.51; (9) $1,249.63; (11) $1,240.63.

A. Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly & Ball, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Comite Franc-Dollar, 31, Avenue Pierre ler de Serbie, Paris 16e, France (a branch of the Conseil National du Patronat Francais, a French manufacturers' association (whose interest is the development of French exports to North America).
C. (2) Legislation affecting imports into the United States; tariffs, quotas, etc., and communicating such information individually to other interested persons in the United States.

A. Marcus Cohn, 1625 I Street NW., Cafritz Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The American Jewish Committee, 386 Fourth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Genocide, the President's civil-rights program, repeal of Public Law 414 (82d Cong.), Bricker resolution, Senate Resolutions 70 and 71), citizenship rights for aliens.
D. (6) $125.

A. C. Fred Coleman, Lewisville, Ark.
B. St. Louis Southwestern Railway Co. as assistant general claim agent with headquarters at Lewisville, Ark.
C. (2) S. 1461 known as time-lag bill.
D. (6) $233.50.
E. (7) $682.40; (9) $682.40; (11) $682.40.

A. Russell Coleman, 616 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The National Fertilizer Association, Inc., 616 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation that might affect the manufacture or distribution of fertilizer or the general agricultural economy.
D. (6) $100.

A. Howard O. Colgan, Jr., 15 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.
B. New York Stock Exchange, 11 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Proposed Federal tax legislation affecting the interests of the New York Stock Exchange and its members.
D. (6) $162.50.
E. (7) $8.64; (9) $8.64; (11) $8.64.

A. Colorado Associated Businessmen, Inc., 335 Symes Building, Denver, Colo.
C. (2) General legislative interests of the group is the taxing of competitive business

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[2] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

on the same basis without regard to exemptions under section 101 of the present Internal Revenue Code.
D. (6) $70.
E. (2) $125; (8) $15; (9) $162.50; (11) $162.50.

A. The Colorado Railroad Legislative Committee, 615 C. A. Johnson Building, Denver, Colo.

A. Colorado River Association, 306 West Third Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
C. (See p. 3 attached.)[1]
E. (1) $1,286.81; (2) $9,811.76; (3) $32.23; (4) $478.10; (5) $2,247.83; (6) $826.81; (7) $5,861.38; (9) $20,544.92; (11) $20,544.92.

A. Committee on National Affairs, 100 East 50th Street, New York, N. Y.
E. (4) $8.60; (8) $3; (9) $11.60; (11) $11.60.

A. Committee for the Nation's Health, 2212 M Street NW., Washington, D. C. (See attachment.)[1]
C. (2) Interested in all legislation regarding national health insurance and the following bills: H. R. 1817, S. 1052, S. 1153, H. R. 3582, H. R. 3586, H. R. 4128, S. 461, H. R. 3850, S. 994, H. R. 8, and H. R. 390.
D. (6) $6,795.89.
E. (2) $7,873.64; (4) $1,210.66; (5) $1,587.44; (6) $149.41; (7) $264.21; (8) $185.40; (9) $11,270.76; (11) $11,270.76.

A. Committee on the Present Danger, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Mutual security; military manpower.
D. (6) $7,876.37.
E. (2) $1,104.38; (5) $1,084.22; (6) $330.53; (7) $472.90; (8) $280.06; (9) $3,272.09; (11) $3,272.09.

A. Committee for Promotion of Tramp Shipping Under American Flag in Foreign Commerce, 80 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) The committee is interested in amending existing shipping legislation in order to extend operating and construction-differential subsidies to American-flag vessels engaged in so-called tramp trades. A bill to this effect has been introduced in the House as H. R. 5346.

A. Communications Workers of America-CIO, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislative matters affecting the interests of the membership of the union. (3) CWA News.
D. (6) $1,153,937.38.
E. (2) $3,874.98; (7) $307.75; (8) $701.55; (9) $4,884.28; (11) $4,884.28.

A. Arthur D. Condon, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Trucking Industry National Defense Committee, Inc.

A. John C. Cone, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Pan American World Airways System, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Aviation legislation that might have a bearing on the operation of Pan American World Airways System.

A. Conference of American Small Business Organizations, Inc., 407 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) For: H. R. 1 (taxes); S. 1 (construction amendments); House Joint Resolution 184 (commission); H. R. 4036 (commission); and similar bills. Against: H. R. 4090 (small business administration) in its present form.
D. (6) $20,625.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

E. (1) $6,230; (2) $5,560.02; (4) $1,563.70; (5) $1,629.12; (6) $155.71; (7) $370; (8) $1,828.63; (9) $17,337.18; (11) $17,337.18.

A. Congress of Industrial Organizations, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Support all legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare; oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives. (3) Legis-Letter.
D. (6) $8,050.85.
E. (2) $1,995; (3) $3,500; (4) $592.34; (5) $660; (6) $950; (7) $36.54; (8) $316.97; (9) $8,050.85; (11) $8,050.85.

A. Julian D. Conover, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Measures affecting mining, such as income taxation, social security, public lands, stockpiling, monetary policy, etc.
D. (5) $2,500.
E. (6) $30.30; (7) $60.45; (9) $90.75; (11) $90.75.

A. J. Milton Cooper, 505 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Coal Association, Southern Building, 15th and H Streets NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislative interests are general in character and those affecting the coal industry.
D. and E. (see attached).[1]

A. J. Milton Cooper, 505 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Lime Association, 927 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislative interests are general in character and particularly those affecting the lime industry.
D. and E. (see attached).[1]

A. J. Milton Cooper, 505 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. New York Stock Exchange, 11 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Federal tax legislation affecting the interests of the New York Stock Exchange and its members.
D. and E. (see attached).[1]

A. Wilmer A. Cooper, 104 C Street NE., Washington, D. C.
B. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 104 C Street NE., Washington, D. C.
C. (See p. 3 attached.)[1]
D. (6) $1,250.
E. (6) $1.85; (7) $144.82; (9) $146.67; (11) $146.67.

A. Cooperative Health Federation of America, 343 South Dearborn, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) All types of legislation which will raise the health standards in the United States, particularly by the process of voluntary action on the part of citizens.
D. (6) $300.
E. (2) 194; (5) $9; (6) $14; (9) $217; (11) $217.

A. John T. Corbett, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, B. of L. E. Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
C. (2) Legislation affecting labor and transportation.
D. (6) $3,741.
E. (5) $351.27; (6) $28.02; (9) $379.29; (11) $379.29.

A. Cordage Legislative Committee, 350 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $150.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. J. G. Corona, suite 101, 1405 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Western Union Telegraph Co., 60 Hudson Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) General legislative interests cover any legislative proposals affecting the interests of the telegraph company in addition to my administrative duties at the company's Capitol offices.
E. (7) $45; (9) $45; (11) $45.

A. Harold B. Corwin, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Retired Officers Association, Inc., 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any and all legislation pertinent to the rights, benefits, privileges, and obligations of retired officers, male and female, Regular and Reserve, and their dependents and survivors, of whatever nature, dealing with personnel matters, pay and retirement benefits, and pensions, studying and analyzing bills, preparing statements for presentation to the cognizant committees, and principally the Committees on Armed Services, the Committees on Veterans' Affairs, and the committees dealing with various privileges, opportunities, and obligations of the personnel involved. (3) The Retired Officer.
D. (6) $400.

A. Council of State Chambers of Commerce, 1722 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Federal taxation, Federal expenditures, social security, and labor relations.
D. (6) $21,910.
E. (1) $18,424.94; (4) $3,102.20; (5) $1,081.03; (6) $743.66; (7) $4,747.90; (8) $164.23; (9) $28,263.96; (11) $28,263.96.

A. W. W. Coxe, 108 North Jefferson Street, Roanoke, Va.
B. Norfolk & Western Railway Co., 108 North Jefferson Street, Roanoke, Va.

A. M. F. Crass, Jr., 246 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Manufacturing Chemists' Association, Inc., 246 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the chemical industry.
D. (6) $244.50.

A. Edward B. Crosland, 195 Broadway, New York, N. Y., and 725 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) S. 1108, to amend Federal-Aid Highway Act; H. R. 5, H. R. 1034, H. R. 1271, H. R. 2524, excise taxes; H. R. 408, H. R. 477, H. R. 3552, bills relating to interception of telephone messages; H. R. 1524, National Park Service bill; S. 753 and S. 1081, price- and wage-control legislation; and bills relating to labor matters.
D. (6) $4,875.01.

A. Leo J. Crowley, Equitable Building, Denver, Colo.

A. Cummings, Stanley, Truitt & Cross, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Estate of Arnold Adler, 1011 Commerce Building, Kansas City, Mo.
C. (2) Amendment of Technical Changes Act of 1949, as amended, with respect to grantors dying after January 1, 1951.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Cummings, Stanley, Truitt & Cross, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Estate of Margery Durant Green, 1 Atlantic Street, Stamford, Conn.
C. H. R. 607, a bill to amend section 8 of the act to amend certain provisions of the Internal Revenue Code (Public Law 378, 81st

Cong.) to permit persons under a disability to take advantage of same.
E. (7) $2; (9) $2; (11) $2.

A. Cummings, Stanley, Truitt & Cross, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Estate of W. D. Johnson, deceased, 900 Walnut Street, Kansas City, Mo.
C. (2) H. R. 608, a bill to amend section 811 (d) of the Internal Revenue Code so as to limit its application in certain disability cases.
E. (6) $6.55; (7) $4.25; (9) $10.80; (11) $10.80.

A. John C. Cuneo, Post Office Box 1054, Modesto, Calif.
B. The Townsend Plan, Inc., 6875 Broadway Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio.
C. (2) The Townsend bills in Congress, H. R. 2446, H. R. 2447.
D. (6) $3,340.89.
E. (4) $1,263.71; (5) $617.91; (6) $127.42; (7) $87.52; (8) $123.33; (9) $2,219.89; (11) $2,219.89.

A. Ralph E. Curtiss, 944 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Licensed Beverage Association, 420 Seventh Street, Racine, Wis.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting tavern and restaurant industry.
D. (6) $2,100.
E. (6) $14.81; (8) $1.72; (9) $16.53; (11) $16.53; (12) $22.91.

A. William L. Daley, 911 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Newspaper Publishers' Association, National Editorial Association, 222 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) All legislation affecting press management, production, and other operational matters.
D. (6) $825.
E. (5) $53; (6) $43.83; (8) $55.75; (9) $152.58; (11) $152.58.

A. John A. Danaher, 50 State Street, Hartford, Conn., and 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The Firestone Tire & Rubber Co., Akron, Ohio.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the manufacture, sale, and distribution of automobile tires.

A. John A. Danaher, 50 State Street, Hartford, Conn., and 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The B. F. Goodrich Co., 500 South Main Street, Akron, Ohio.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the manufacture, sale, and distribution of automobile tires.

A. John A. Danaher, 50 State Street, Hartford, Conn., and 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Revere Copper & Brass, Inc., 230 Park Avenue, New York City.
D. (6) $3,000.
E. (6) $53.61; (9) $53.61; (11) $53.61.

A. Sherlock Davis, 1117 Barr Building, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United States Cuban Sugar Council, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Anything which pertains to sugar or trade with Cuba. The Sugar Act of 1948 (Public Law 388, 80th Cong.) and 1951 amendments thereto (P. L. 140, 82d Cong.).

A. Robert N. Denham, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Continental Baking Co., 630 Fifth Avenue, New York City.
C. (2) Labor relations and general industrial regulatory legislation.
D. (6) $2,508.02.
E. (6) $8.02; (9) $8.02; (11) $8.02.

A. B. B. Derrick, 1756 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Maryland and Virginia Milk Producers Association, Inc., 1756 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. R. T. DeVany, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers.

A. Disabled American Veterans, 1423 East McMillan Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
C. (2) The DAV is interested in legislation affecting war veterans, their dependents, and survivors of deceased veterans.
E. (2) $5,066.60; (7) $51.10; (9) $5,117.70; (10) $5,117.70; (11) $5,117.70.

A. Disabled Emergency Officers of the World Wars, 1604 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation affecting disabled veterans and their dependents and survivors of deceased veterans.
E. (2) $2,750; (9) $2,750; (11) $2,750.

A. Walter L. Disbrow, 900 F Street NW., room 314, Washington, D. C.
B. Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the United States Government, 900 F Street NW., room 314, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Retention and improvement of the Civil Service Retirement and United States Employees Compensation Acts.
D. (6) $1,244.03.
E. (7) $85.50; (9) $85.50; (11) $85.50.

A. Doctors for Freedom, Medical Arts Building, Houston, Tex.
C. (2) General legislative interests in the medical field. Specifically, Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1953 was opposed.
D. (6) $266.26.
E. (4) $150.12; (8) $14.45; (9) $121.45; (11) $121.45.

A. Al Dodge, Keshena, Wis.
B. Menominee Tribe of Indians, Menominee Indian Agency, Keshena, Wis.
C. (2) Favor enactment of S. 1014 and H. R. 2828.

A. Homer Dodge, 1244 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc., 205 East 42d Street, New York City.
C. (2) Any proposed legislation or policies involving a constitutional question.
D. (6) $915.

A. Doherty, Rumble, Butler & Mitchell, E-1006 First National Bank Building, St. Paul, Minn.
B. Iron Ore Lessors Association, Inc., W-1481 First National Bank Building, St. Paul, Minn.
C. (2) Amendment of Internal Revenue Code. H. R. 604; H. R. 2691; in favor of the bills.
E. (6) $42.92; (7) $384.20; (9) $427.12; (11) $427.12.

A. W. J. Donald, 155 East 44th Street, New York, N. Y.
B. National Electrical Manufacturers Association, 155 East 44th Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation regarding excise taxes on electric refrigerators, electric ranges, electric water heaters, domestic electric appliances, commercial electric cooking equipment, electric fans, and legislation with respect to amendment of the Labor-Management Relations Act.

A. James L. Donnelly, 120 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Illinois Manufacturers Association, 120 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) All legislation of general interest to manufacturers. (3) Industrial Review.

A. Robert F. Donoghue, 657 Warner Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Pacific American Tankship Association, 25 California Street, San Francisco, Calif.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the merchant marine, particularly the tanker division thereof, including without limitation amendments relating to titles 14, 33, and 46 of the United States Code, Annotated, the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, Transportation Act of 1940, appropriations relating to agencies charged with the duty of administering laws affecting transportation, etc.
D. (6) $900.

A. J. Dewey Dorsett, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Association of Casualty and Surety Companies, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation affecting casualty and surety companies.
D. (6) $99.

A. C. L. Dorson, 900 F Street NW., room 314, Washington, D. C.
B. Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the United States Government, 900 F Street NW., room 314, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Retention and improvement of the Civil Service Retirement and United States Employees' Compensation Acts.
D. (6) $1,162.25.
E. (7) $29; (9) $29; (11) $29.

A. John E. Dougherty, 211 Southern Building, 15th and H Streets NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 1740 Suburban Station Building, Philadelphia, Pa.
C. (See attached statement).[1]

A. Robert E. Dougherty, 1319 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Lumber Manufacturers Association, 1319 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation affecting the interest of the lumber manufacturing industry.
D. (6) $2,200.
E. (7) $122; (9) $122; (11) $122.

A. Mrs. Francis P. Douglas, 1026 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. League of Women Voters of the United States, 1026 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) (See program attached).[1]
D. (6) $550.02.
E. (7) $19.75; (9) $19.75; (11) $19.75.

A. James W. Douthat, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers.

A. Fayette B. Dow, attorney, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Committee for Pipe Line Companies, Tulsa, Okla.
C. (2) Any legislation which if enacted would divorce pipelines that are subject to the Interstate Commerce Act from their existing owning companies.
D. and E. (See statement attached).[1]

A. M. J. Dowd.
B. Imperial Irrigation District, El Centro, Calif.

A. Adin M. Downer, Wire Building, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.
C. (2) Legislation affecting all veterans and their dependents in relation to employ-

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

ment, hospitalization, rehabilitation, pensions, disability compensation, and housing; welfare of servicemen of the Armed Forces and their dependents; matters relating to the national security, immigration and naturalization, the combating of subversive activities; and the furtherance of a sound foreign policy; other matters included in the resolutions adopted by the national encampment and the national council of administration. (3) Foreign Service.
D. (6) $1,625.
E. (7) $36.50; (9) $36.50; (11) $36.50.

A. Richard S. Doyle, 404 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Fletcher Trust Co. and Jessie Reed Millis, executors of estate of Fred Millis, deceased, Indianapolis, Ind.
C. (2) Federal estate taxes. (a) Section 8111 (c), Internal Revenue Code, as amended. (b) H. R. 3783, introduced March 9, 1953. (c) 63d Statutes 895; 65th Statutes 567. (d) For amendment of section 811 (c), Internal Revenue Code.

A. W. A. Dozier, Jr., 17 Molton Street, Montgomery, Ala.
B. Medical Association of the State of Alabama, 537 Dexter Avenue, Montgomery, Ala.
C. (2) All health matters covered by legislative action. (3) (a) Postal Reserve Notes.
D. (6) $1,650.
E. (4) $225; (9) $225; (11) $225.

A. Robert M. Drysdale, Jr., Federation for Railway Progress, Railway Progress Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Federation for Railway Progress, Railway Progress Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Transportation legislation: S. 281, S. 908, S. 1360.
D. (6) $1,000.
E. (2) $187.50; (4) $100; (5) $617.58; (6) $161.73; (7) $44.65; (9) $1,111.46; (11) $1,111.46.

A. Stephen M. DuBrul, 5–141 General Motors Building, Detroit, Mich.
B. General Motors Corp., 3044 West Grand Boulevard, Detroit, Mich.
C. (2) (See statement (5) of quarterly report dated April 11, 1949.)
D and E (See attached statement).[1]

A. Read Dunn, Jr., 1832 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Cotton Council of America, P. O. Box 18, Memphis, Tenn.
C. (2) The National Cotton Council of America favors such action on any legislation affecting the raw cotton industry as will promote the purposes for which the council is organized.
D. (6) $217.50.
E. (7) $5.62; (9) $5.62; (11) $5.62.

A. Wm. M. Dunn, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Communications Workers of America-CIO, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislative matters affecting the interests of the membership of the union.

A. Henry I. Dworshak, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Measures affecting mining, such as income taxation, social security, public lands, stockpiling, monetary policy, etc.
D. (6) $900.
E. (7) $7.25; (9) $7.25; (11) $7.25.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Joseph L. Dwyer, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 50 West 50th Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the petroleum industry.
D. (6) $3,150.
E. (7) $628.94.

A. Eastern Meat Packers Association, Inc., Hotel Statler, New York, N. Y., and 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Matters affecting meat packers.
E. (2) $45.33; (4) 34 cents; (6) 44 cents; (7) $4.88; (9) $50.99; (11) $50.99; (15) (see attached).[1]

A. George S. Eaton, 907 Public Square Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
B. National Tool and Die Manufacturers Association, 907 Public Square Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
C. (2) Bills especially affecting the interests of contract tool and die shops which are small businesses.
D. (6) $100.

A. Joseph H. Ehlers, 1026 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Society of Civil Engineers, 33 West 39th Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislative interests relative to matters affecting the engineering profession.
D. (5) $2,000.
E. (5) $13.50; (9) $13.50; (11) $13.50.

A. Bernard H. Ehrlich, 1367 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association and Council of Business Schools, 418 Homer Building, 13th and F Streets NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislative interest on all bills relating to education and training of World War II veterans and Korean veterans.
D. (6) $1,050.
E. (6) $51.83; (8) $67.88; (9) $119.71; (11) $119.71.

A. Rev. D. Howard Elliott, 207 Darlington Road, Beaver Falls, Pa.
B. The Reformed Presbyterian Church of North America, 209 Ninth Street, Pittsburgh, Pa.
C. (2) We seek for the introduction of a bill into Congress calling for a constitutional amendment acknowledging divine authority.
E. (7) $165; (9) $165; (11) $165.

A. John Doyle Elliott, 305 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D. C.
B. The Townsend Plan, Inc., 6875 Broadway Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio.
C. (2) Promotion to passage of H. R. 2446, 83d Congress, 1st session.
D. (6) $910.

A. Otis H. Ellis, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.
B. National Oil Jobbers Council, suite 708 Ferguson Building, Springfield, Ill.
C. (2) Legislation which might affect the business interests of independent oil jobbers.
D. (6) $4,500.

A. John H. Else, legislative counsel, 302 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Retail Lumber Dealers Association, 302 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting retail lumber dealers, including housing and price and wage controls.
D. (6) $3,050.
E. (7) $358.50; (9) $358.50; (11) $358.50.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Law Offices of Northcutt Ely, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Public Power Association, 1757 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting public power projects generally.

A. Law Offices of Northcutt Ely, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Department of Water and Power of the City of Los Angeles, 207 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.
C. (2) Conference and reports to clients on legislation affecting the city's rights in the Colorado River and related matters, and legislation affecting public power projects.
D. (6) $1,800.

A. Law Offices of Northcutt Ely, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. East Bay Municipal Utility District, 512 16th Street, Oakland, Calif.
C. (2) Interior Department appropriations bill, 1954, and legislation affecting social security coverage for municipal employees.
D. (6) $2,173.82.
E. (4) $47.23; (6) $15.32; (8) $11.27; (9) $73.82; (11) $73.82.

A. Law Offices of Northcutt Ely, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Imperial Irrigation District, El Centro, Calif.
C. (2) Conferences and reports to clients on legislation affecting the district's rights in the Colorado River and related matters.
D. (6) $2,100.

A. Law Offices of Northcutt Ely, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Six Agency Committee and Colorado River Board of California, 315 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.
C. (2) Legislation affecting California's interest in the Colorado River including S. 1438, Bridge Canyon bill, H. R. 4443, H. R. 4449, H. R. 4463, and S. 1555, Colorado River storage project, and legislation relating to reclamation and water resources policies.
D. (6) $6,673.51.
E. (6) $50.74; (7) $7.12; (8) $30.65; (9) $88.51; (11) $88.51.

A. Law Offices of Northcutt Ely, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Sun-Pacific, Inc., 520 Ash Street, San Diego, Calif.
C. (2) Conferences and reports to client on legislation affecting Sun-Pacific's interests; i. e., tuna tariff legislation (H. R. 5693) and related Federal Tariff Commission hearings.
D. (6) $4,500.
E. (6) $27.32; (8) $730.58; (9) $757.90; (11) $757.90.

A. Law Offices of Northcutt Ely, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Water Project Authority of the State of California, Sacramento, Calif.
C. (2) Interior Department Appropriations bill, 1954; H. R. 4213, Waterfowl Management, Central Valley project; and legislation affecting the Central Valley project and Federal reclamation and power policies generally.
D. (6) $2,400.95.
E. (7) $150.95; (9) $150.95; (11) $150.95.

A. Law Offices of Northcutt Ely, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Water Resources Board of the State of California, Sacramento, Calif.
C. (2) Army civil functions appropriations bill, 1954, and legislation affecting flood-control projects generally.

A. Emergency Committee of Small and Medium Size Magazine Publishers, room 301, 305 East 46th Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Postal legislation.
D. (6) $3,777.70.
E. (2) $1,183.34; (4) $387.88; (6) $30.88; (7) $4.05; (8) $11; (9) $1,617.15; (11) $1,617.15 (see attached).[1]

A. K. Blyth Emmons, National Small Business Men's Association, Inc., 925 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation pertaining to small business, either directly or indirectly. (3) Pulling Together.
D. (6) $2,325.
E. (7) $344.75; (9) $344.75; (11) $344.75; (14) $344.75.

A. Walter M. Evans, 512 Travelers Building, Richmond, Va.
B. Virginia Associated Businessmen, 512 Travelers Building, Richmond, Va.
C. (2) H. R. 1559 and similar tax equality legislation.
D.[1]
E. (6) $69.17; (7) $72.84; (10) $142.01; (15).[1]

A. Herman Fakler, National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Millers' National Federation, 309 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.

A. Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union of America, 1555 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo. (home office); 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislative interests, all matters affecting the interests of farmers.
D and E (see attached statement).[1]

A. Charles J. Farrington, National Automobile Dealers Association, Washington, D. C.
B. National Automobile Dealers Association.
C. (2) All small-business legislation; tax revision; Federal aid to highways.
D. (6) $5,769.24.
E. (7) $1,479.60; (9) $1,479.60; (11) $1,479.60.

A. Joseph G. Feeney, 17 Battery Place, New York, N. Y.
B. National St. Lawrence Project Conference, 843 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation with reference to the St. Lawrence Waterway and power project; opposed.
D. (6) $300.
E. (7) $245.50; (9) $245.50; (11) $245.50.

A. Abner N. Ferguson, 1100 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Legislation affecting savings and loan associations and general mortgage lending.
D. (6) $900.

A. John A. Ferguson, 918 16th Street NW., suite 501, Washington, D. C.
B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., suite 501, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation pertaining to natural gas.
D. (6) $3,750.

A. Estate of Karrie J. Ferguson, deceased, care of John A. Ferguson, Jr., executor, Post Office Box 5150, Terminal Annex, Denver, Colo.
C. (2) For amendment to section 811 (c) (1) (B), Internal Revenue Code, to prevent its application to trusts created prior to March 4, 1931, H. R. 3783 (Representative Simpson, Pennsylvania), introduced March 9, 1953.
E. (6) $22.35; (7) $240.03; (9) $262.38; (11) $262.38; (15).[1]

A. Irving Ferman, Century Building, 412 Fifth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Civil Liberties Union, 170 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) H. R. 3575; S. J. Res. 1; H. R. 408, H. R. 477, S. 832; S. J. Res. 49; S. 655–659, S. 3, S. 10, S. 11, S. 16.
D. (6) $1,000.
E. (2) $207.04; (4) $32.85; (5) $149.16; (6) $90.24; (7) $71.30; (8) $32.17; (9) $582.76; (11) $582.76.

A. Josiah Ferris, 510 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. United States Sugar Corp., Clewiston, Fla.; Wellsmere Sugar Producers Association, Fellsmere, Fla.; American Sugar Cane League, New Orleans, La.

A. Harold E. Fellows, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) General legislative interests: Those relating directly or indirectly to the radio and television broadcasting industry.

A. James Finucane, 1013 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Council for Prevention of War, 1013 18th Street, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Bill affecting world peace, such as: Foreign economic assistance programs, military appropriations, universal military training and other manpower legislation, peace treaties, disarmament, immigration, and educational exchange.
D. (6) $1,225.
E. (7) $40.50; (9) $40.50; (11) $40.50.

A. Bernard M. Fitzgerald, Washington Loan & Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, Ring Building, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation that might affect the members of the NAEC.
D. (6) $675.

A. Stephen Fitzgerald & Co., 502 Park Avenue, New York.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) General legislative questions which affect the interests of the public and of electric light and power companies.
D. (6) $18,000.
E. (4) $612.34; (6) $234.86; (7) $2,395.24; (8) $290.20; (9) $3,532.64; (11) $3,532.64.

A. F. Stuart Fitzpatrick, Chamber of Commerce of the United States, Washington, D. C.
B. Chamber of Commerce of the United States, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Rent control: Letter sent to Chairman WOLCOTT and members of the House Banking and Currency Committee on March 9, 1953, by Clarence R. Miles, manager, legislative department, advising that the Chamber of Commerce of the United States recommends that Rent Control Act be allowed to lapse on April 30, 1953.
D. (5) $875.

A. Roger Fleming, 261 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) (See attached.)[1]
D. (6) $1,277.78.

A. Donald G. Fletcher, 745 McKnight Building, Minneapolis, Minn.
B. Rust Prevention Association, 745 McKnight Building, Minneapolis, Minn.
C. (2) Legislation affecting funds for research on plant-disease control and crop improvement.
D. (6) $2,025.
E. (2) $331.27; (5) $140.68; (6) $45; (7) $155.83; (9) $672.78; (10) $672.78.

A. Fletcher Trust Co. and Jessie Reed Millis, executors, estate of Fred Millis, deceased, Indianapolis, Ind.
C. (2) Federal estate taxes: Section 811 (c), Internal Revenue Code, as amended; H. R. 3783, introduced March 9, 1953; 63 Stat. 895, 65 Stat. 567; for amendment of section 811 (c), Internal Revenue Code.

A. Florida Citrus Mutual, Lakeland, Fla.
C. (2) In any legislation that affects the citrus industry.
D. (6) $2,000.
E. (2) $1,133.33; (6) $20.49; (7) $78.52; (9) $1,232.34; (11) $1,232.34.

A. Florida Inland Navigation District, Citizens Bank Building, Bunnell, Fla.
C. (2) Potentially interested in all legislation affecting river and harbor works, flood control, and other water use and conservation and related subjects.
E. (2) $1,350; (8) $34.69; (9) $1,384.69; (10) $1,384.69; (15).[1]

A. Florida Railroad Association, 404 Midyette-Moor Building, Tallahasee, Fla.
B. (See B attached.)[1]
C. (2) Proposed legislation of interest to members of Florida Railroad Association set forth under B.
D. (6) $2,424.56.
E. (2) $1,320; (9) $1,320; (11) $1,320.

A. E. F. Forbes, 604 Mission Street, Suite 1002–3 San Francisco, Calif.
B. Western States Meat Packers Association, Inc., 604 Mission Street, suite 1002–3, San Francisco, Calif.
C. (2) Interested in legislation affecting livestock and meat packing industry.
D. (6) $5,416.70.

A. Mrs. J. A. Ford, 305 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D. C.
B. Townsend Plan Inc., 6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio.
C.[1]

A. Forest Farmers Association Cooperative, box 692, Valdosta, Ga.
C. (2) Agricultural appropriations bill for 1954 (forestry items). S. 1348, to amend the Bankhead-Jones Farmer Tenant Act so as to improve credit services available to farmers seeking to adopt certain conservation measures. (3) The Forest Farmer.

A. J. Carter Fort, 929 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) (See rider C–2).[1]
D. (6) $6,934.59.
E. (7) $149.19; (9) $149.19; (11) $149.19; (15).[1]

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. John Fossum, Keshena, Wis.
B. Menominee Tribe of Indians, Menominee Indian Agency, Keshena, Wis.
C. (2) Favor enactment of S. 1014 and H. R. 2828.

A. Charles E. Foster, Disabled American Veterans, 1701 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Disabled American Veterans, National Headquarters, 1423 East McMillan Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
C. (2) Legislation affecting war veterans, their dependents, and survivors of deceased veterans.
D. (6) $2,160.

A. Robert Franklin, 327 North Van Ness, Fresno, Calif.
B. Allied Wool Industry Committee, 327 North Van Ness, Fresno, Calif., and 414 Pacific National Life Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.
C. (2) H. R. 1427, parity protection amendment to the Agricultural Act of 1949.
D. (6) $1,000.
E. (7) $1,000; (9) $1,000; (11) $1,000.

A. George H. Frates, 1163 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. NARD.
C. (2) To oppose legislation detrimental to independent retail druggists and to further legislation favorable to the profession. Protection of the Robinson-Patman Act which means opposition to H. R. 3501, H. R. 635, S. 540. (3) NARD Journal.
D. (6) $2,800.
E. (2) $675; (5) $399; (6) $105; (9) $1,179; (10) $2,396; (11) $3,575.

A. Dr. John H. Frederick, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Transportation Association of America, 130 North Wells Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) All legislation having anything to do with transportation including pending bills before the House and Senate.

A. Fred J. Fredrickson, 1215 16th Street NW., suite 7, Washington, D. C. (home address: 247 Third Street SW., Valley City, N. Dak.).
B. North Dakota Resources Board, 311 Broadway, Fargo, N. Dak.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the development and utilization of the land, water, mineral, and other natural resources of North Dakota, including authorizations and appropriations.

A. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 104 C Street NE., Washington, D. C.
C. (See p. 3 attached.) [1]
D. (6) $15,610.57.
E. (2) $7,907.26; (3) $100; (4) $2,465.37; (5) $1,512.79; (6) $280.91; (7) $639.13; (8) $1,039.88; (9) $13,945.34; (11) $13,945.34; (12) $150; (14) $640; (15).[1]

A. George M. Fuller, 1319 18 Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Lumber Manufacturers Association, 1319 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation inimical to the interests of the lumber industry, American industry and free enterprise.
D. (6) $4,299.98.
E. (7) $1,030.51; (9) $1,030.51; (11) $1,030.51.

A. Wallace H. Fulton, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc.
D. (6) $625.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. M. J. Galvin, attorney, 207 Union Depot Building, St. Paul, Minn.
B. Minnesota railroads.[1]
C. (2) Interested in all matters affecting railroads, and particularly any matters relating to Railroad Retirement Act and proposed amendments; Interstate Commerce Act and proposed amendments; and Federal Employer's Liability Act and proposed amendments. Generally favor legislation favorable to railroads and oppose unfavorable legislation.
D. (6) $500.

A. Earl H. Gammons, 801 Warner Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Columbia Broadcasting System, Inc., 485 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation applicable to or affecting the radio and/or television industry.
E. (7) $65; (9) $65; (15) Recipients of expenditures of $10 or more. (See attached page 3.) [1]

A. Gardner, Morrison, and Rogers, 1126 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Lehigh Valley Railroad Co., 143 Liberty Street, New York, N. Y.; agency of Canadian Car & Foundry Co., Ltd., 30 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.; and other holders of awards of Mixed Claims Commission, United States and Germany, World War I.
C. (2) Legislation relating to World War I awards of the Mixed Claims Commission, United States and Germany, such as H. R. 6074, 81st Congress, H. R. 4702 and H. R. 5802, 82d Congress. (3) Memorandum in support of H. R. 6074, 81st Congress, dated March 1, 1950.
E. (6) $1.83; (7) $65.93; (9) $67.76; (11) $67.76.

A. Marion R. Garstang, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation that may affect milk producers or the cooperatives through which they act together to process and market their milk.
D. (6) $2,438.
E. (8) $0.50; (9) $0.50; (11) $0.50.

A. Francis J. Garvey, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Dental Association, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $3,000.
E. (7) $346.53; (9) $346.53; (11) $346.53; (15) (See attached).[1]

A. Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association, Inc., 60 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) In general, legislation which concerns or affects members of the Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association, Inc.

A. Gus F. Geissler.
B. Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union of America (National Farmers Union), 1555 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo. (home office); 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (legislative office).

A. General Electric Co., 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.
E. (4) $6,235.18; (9) $6,235.18; (11) $6,235.18.

A. J. M. George, 165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
B. The Inter-State Manufacturers Association, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
C. (2) H. R. 2685, S. 586, Senate Resolution 49, S. 471; H. R. 999, and H. R. 3599.
D. (6) $1,500.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. J. M. George, H. K. Brehmer, and C. S. McMahon, 165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
B. National Association of Direct Selling Companies, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
C. (2) H. R. 2685, S. 586, Senate Resolution 49, S. 471, H. R. 999, H. R. 3599.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. Leo E. George, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Federation of Post Office Clerks, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation pertaining to the postal service and the welfare of postal and Federal employees.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. Ernest Giddings, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Legislation-Federal relations division of the National Education Association of the United States, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Bills pending before the 83d Congress relating to public education.
D. (6) $1,400.
E. (7) $54.92; (9) $54.92; (11) $54.92.

A. Leif Gilstad, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Transportation Association of America, 130 North Wells Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) All legislation having anything to do with transportation.
D and E. (See report of T. A. A.)[1]

A. Hugh V. Gittinger, Jr., 312 Wire Building, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Washington Real Estate Board, Inc., 312 Wire Building, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All measures affecting the District of Columbia.

A. Lawrence L. Gourley, 1757 K Street NW., suite 603, Washington, D. C.
B. American Osteopathic Association, 212 East Ohio Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Bills affecting the public health.
D. (6) $375.

A. Government Employees' Council, American Federation of Labor, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., room 509, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation that affects Government employees is of interest to this council.
D. (6) $3,999.02.
E. (2) $3,490.71; (4) $252.96; (5) $451.15; (6) $126.53; (8) $767.31; (9) $5,088.66; (11) $5,088.66; (15).[1]

A. Grand Lodge of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen & Enginemen, 318–418 Keith Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
C. (2) To promote general interests of locomotive firemen and enginemen.
D. (6) $28,035.
E. (2) $3,754.41; (5) $485.63; (6) $93.74; (7) $749.78; (8) $36.45; (9) $5,120.01; (11) $5,120.01; (15).[1]

A. Cassius B. Gravitt, Jr., 1110 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National League of District Postmasters, 1110 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation which affects the interests of postmasters. (3) The Postmasters' Advocate.
D. (6) $1,500.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. David G. Gray, Humble Oil & Refining Co., Houston, Tex.
B. Humble Oil & Refining Co., Post Office Box 2180, Houston, Tex.
C. (2) Legislation affecting business in general, which includes practically every important measure before Congress.
D. (5) $1,500.
E. (6) $84; (7) $3,039.10; (9) $3,123.10.

A. Ernest W. Greene, Hawaiian Sugar Planters' Association, 731 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Hawaiian Sugar Planters' Association, Post Office Box 2450, Honolulu, T. H.

A. Jerry N. Griffin, 544 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Coal Association, 15th and H Streets NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation which affects the coal industry.
D. (6) $1,200.

A. Weston B. Grimes, 436 Bowen Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Cargill, Inc., 200 Grain Exchange, Minneapolis, Minn.
C. (2) Agriculture and the processing and transportation of the products thereof; tax legislation; legislation pertaining to imports and exports; H. R. 536, maintenance of 9-foot channel in the Minnesota River; S. 1064, CCC grain storage; S. 1369, CCC, surplus commodities, foreign disposal.
D. (6) $6,874.98.
E. (7) $9.50; (9) $9.50; (11) $9.50.

A. Mrs. Enid H. Griswold, 7501 Empire State Building, New York, N. Y.
B. National Economic Council, Inc., Empire State Building, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Interests are in favoring any legislation that tends to support private enterprise and maintain American independence, and to oppose measures that work contrariwise.
D. (6) $300.
E. (7) $45.45; (9) $45.45; (11) $45.45.

A. John J. Gunther, 1341 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Americans for Democratic Action, 1341 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation covered by convention-adopted program of organization. (3) Column in monthly organization paper, ADA World.
D. (6) $1,350.
E. (7) $273.59; (9) $273.59; (11) $273.59.

A. Violet M. Gunther, 1341 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Americans for Democratic Action, 1241 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All bills covered by convention-adopted program.
D. $1,470.
E. (7) $129.50; (9) $129.50; (11) $129.50.

A. Frank E. Haas, 280 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.
B. The Association of Western Railways, 474 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Interested in any and all Federal legislative proposals which may or do affect western railroads.

A. Hugh F. Hall, 261 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Government credit policies; prohibition of trip leasing; agricultural appropriations; ACP payments; REA; taxation; appropriation, Agricultural Extension Service; Department of Agriculture reorganization; farm program; appropriations for defense.
D. (6) $950.
E. (7) $46.15; (9) $46.15; (11) $46.15.

A. Radford Hall, 515 Cooper Building, Denver, Colo.
B. American National Cattlemen's Association, 515 Cooper Building, Denver, Colo.
C. (2) Support prices, standby controls, freeze order, reciprocal trade, buy-American, reorganization of Department of Agriculture, public land legislation, etc.
D. (6) $2,400.
E. (6) $42.10; (7) $308.43; (8) $860.39; (9) $1,210.92; (11) $1,210.92.

A. E. C. Hallbeck, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Federation of Post Office Clerks, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation pertaining to the postal service and the welfare of postal and Federal employees. (3) Federation News Service Bulletin.
D. (6) $3,354.12.
E. (7) $300.49; (9) $300.49; (11) $300.49.

A. Harry G. Hamlet, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Retired Officers Association, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any and all legislation pertinent to the rights, benefits, privileges, and obligations of retired officers, male and female, regular and reserve, and their dependents and survivors, of whatever nature, dealing with personnel matters, pay and retirement benefits and pensions, studying and analyzing bills, preparing statements for presentation to the cognizant committees, and principally the Committees on Armed Services, the Committees on Veterans' Affairs, and the committees dealing with various privileges, opportunities and obligations of the personnel involved. (3) The Retired Officer.
D. (6) $750.

A. Joseph J. Hammer, 26 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
B. Socony-Vacuum Oil Co., Inc., 26 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation of interest to the petroleum industry.
D. (6) $1,426.59.
E. (6) $18.20; (7) $283.39; (9) $301.59; (11) $301.59.

A. Ralph M. Hanneman, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the real-estate industry.
D. (6) $771.37.
E. (7) $1.10; (8) $4.27; (9) $5.37; (11) $5.37.

A. William A. Hanscom, 1700 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Oil Workers International Union, CIO, 1840 California Street, Denver, Colo.
C. (2) Support all legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare—oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.
D. (6) $2,055.
E. (7) $180; (9) $180; (11) $180.

A. Murray Hanson, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Investment Bankers Association of America, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C., also 33 South Clark Street, Chicago.
C. (2) Tax and other legislation affecting the securities business.
D. (6) $600.
E. (2) $97.50; (5) $145.97; (6) $66.72; (7) $97.83; (9) $408.02; (11) $408.02.

A. Eugene Hardy, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers.

A. Ralph W. Hardy, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Registrant is interested in any legislation—local, State, Federal, or international—which affects the broadcasting industry.

A. Robert E. Harper, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Business Publications, Inc., 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) That which affects postal rates of periodicals published by members of the above-named association.

A. Winder R. Harris, 441 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Shipbuilders Council of America, 21 West Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Maritime matters.

A. Merwin K. Hart, 7501 Empire State Building, New York, N. Y.
B. National Economic Council, Inc., Empire State Building, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Interests are in favoring any legislation that tends to support private enterprise and maintain American independence, and to oppose any measures that work contrariwise.
D. (6) $500.
E. (7) $174.19; $174.19; (11) $174.19; (15).[1]

A. Stephen H. Hart, 350 Equitable Building, Denver, Colo.
B. National Live Stock Tax Committee, 515 Cooper Building, Denver, Colo.
C. (2) Interested in general livestock tax matters, including specifically proposed amendments to the Internal Revenue Code concerning capital gains on sale of breeding livestock and deduction of soil conservation, brush control, and other ranching expenditures, and livestock accounting methods.

A. Dow W. Harter, 412–414 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The B. F. Goodrich Co., Akron, Ohio.
C. (2) Legislation authorizing the sale to private industry of facilities for the production of man-made rubber in the United States, also the repeal or reduction of present excise taxes on tires and tubes, and in certain other changes in our tax structure which would relieve burdens upon business and industry, and generally in all legislative proposals in Congress relating to tires and other manufactured rubber products.
D. (6) $2,125.

A. Paul M. Hawkins, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Retail Federation, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (See p. 3.)[1]
D. (6) $3,375.
E. (7) $51; (9) $51; (11) $51.

A. Joseph H. Hays, 280 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.
B. The Association of Western Railways, 474 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.

A. John C. Hazen, suite 808, Sheraton Building, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Retail Dry Goods Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Senate Resolution 38, S. 1081, S. 753, House Resolution 1, H. R. 3851, H. R. 4159, H. R. 1533.
E. (7) $108.45; (8) $1.25; (9) $109.70; (11) $109.70.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Felix Hebert,[2] 602 Turks Head Building, Providence, R. I.
B. Associated Factory Mutual Fire Insurance Cos., 1500 Turks Head Building, Providence, R. I.
C. (2) Amendment to Internal Revenue Code, section 207.
E. (7) $256.39; (8) $6.75; (9) $263.14; (11) $263.14.

A. K. W. Heberton, room 101, 1405 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Western Union Telegraph Co., 60 Hudson Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislative proposals affecting the interests of the telegraph company.
E. (7) $112.40; (9) $112.40; (11) $112.40.

A. George J. Hecht, 52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York, N. Y., and 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.
B. American Parents' Committee, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Support of Federal aid for school construction. Support of legislative providing national school-health services. Appropriations to establish program of education for children of migratory workers. Bills to safeguard health and welfare of children of migratory workers. Appropriations for the Children's Bureau. Appropriations for the national school-lunch program. Emergency maternal and infant care, S. 2337.

A. C. B. Heinemann, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Eastern Meat Packers Association, Inc., Hotel Statler, New York, N. Y., and 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Matters affecting meat packers.
D. (6) $875.01.
E. (7) $242.94; (9) $242.94; (11) $242.94.

A. C. B. Heinemann, 740 11th St. NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The National Independent Meat Packers Association, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Matters affecting meat packers.
D. (6) $1,608.06.
E. (7) $909.38; (9) $909.38; (11) $909.38.

A. Robert B. Heiney, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Defense controls and all measures directly affecting the food-canning industry.
D. (6) $2,350.99.
E. (7) $85.10; (9) $85.10; (11) $85.10.

A. Joseph D. Henderson, 431 Balter Building, New Orleans, La.
B. American Association of Small Business, 431 Balter Building, New Orleans, La.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. Maurice G. Herndon, 1002 Washington Loan & Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Insurance Agents, 96 Fulton Street, New York, N. Y., and 1002 Washington Loan & Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation which affects directly or indirectly the interests of local property agents.
D. (6) $126.94.
E. (7) $128.94; (9) $128.94; (11) 128.94.

A. Ewart A. Hester, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Offices of Clinton M. Hester, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the Brewing Industry.
D. (6) $2,500.

[2] Filed with the Secretary only.

A. M. F. Hicklin, Iowa Railway Committee, 507 Bankers Trust Building, Des Moines, Iowa.
B. Iowa Railway Committee,[1] 507 Bankers Trust Building, Des Moines, Iowa.

A. Ray C. Hinman, 26 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
B. Socony-Vacuum Oil Co., Inc., 26 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation of interest to the petroleum industry.
D. (6) $1,250.

A. Mr. L. S. Hitchner, 528 Barr Building, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Agricultural Chemicals Association, 528 Barr Building, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) I have an interest in the current investigation on the use of chemicals on foods being conducted by the select committee under Chairman JAMES J. DELANEY, Democrat, New York, as authorized by the passage of H. R. 323, Sabath resolution.

A. John L. Hoen, 1741 De Sales Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American-Hawaiian Steamship Co., 90 Broad Street, New York, N. Y., and Eastern Steamship Lines, Inc., 40 Centre Street, Boston, Mass.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the interest of the American Merchant Marine.
D. (6) $3,750.

A. Frank N. Hoffmann, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United Steelworkers of America, CIO, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
C. (2) Support all legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare.
D. (6) $4,000.
E. (7) $3,200; (9) $3,200; (11) $3,200.

A. Robert L. Hogg, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill. (See exhibit 1, attached to first quarter, 1950, report.)
C. (2) All prospective and existing legislation which may affect the life-insurance business.
D. (6) $2,916.67.
E. (6) 88 cents; (7) $299.17; (9) $300.05; (11) $300.05; (15).[1]

A. Charles W. Holman, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation that may affect milk producers or the cooperatives through which they act together to process and market their milk.
D. (6) $4,127.20.
E. (8) $2.20; (9) $2.20; (11) $2.20.

A. Home Rule Headquarters, 1608 20th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) S. 999, District of Columbia Charter Act.
D. (6) $2,265.
E. (1) $795.96; (2) $868.44; (4) $312.11; (5) $350.93; (6) $138.65; (8) $362.67; (9) $2,828.76; (11) $2,828.76; (15).[1]

A. J. M. Hood, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

C. (2) (See "legislative policies" attached to employer's report).
D. (6) $300.

A. Victor Hood, 4310 Queensbury Road, Riverdale, Md.
B. The Journeymen Barbers, Hairdressers, Cosmetologists, and Proprietors International Union of America, 12th and Delaware, Indianapolis, Ind.
C. (2) Interest in general legislation affecting labor, the National Defense Act, veterans' educational legislation, the District Barber Act, and any amendments thereto.
D. (6) $2,077.82.
E. (7) $727.82; (9) $727.82; (11) $727.82.

A. Housewives United, 2915 Foxhall Road NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Interested in economic legislation affecting material welfare of family life.
D. (6) $69.36.
E. (7) $63.65; (9) $63.65; (11) $63.65.

A. S. H. Howard, 1414 Evergreen Avenue, Millvale, Pittsburgh, Pa.
B. Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen of America, 503 Wellington Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) H. R. 3999 and S. 281 and all other legislation of interest to railway employees and labor in general.
D. (6) $500.

A. Harold K. Howe, Suite C, 2480 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Institute of Laundering, Box 1187, Joliet, Ill.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the Laundry Industry and the members thereof.
D. (6) $2,649.99.
E. (2) $1,079; (7) $574.22; (9) $1,653.22; (11) $1,653.22.

A. Harold K. Howe, 205 Mills Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Lawn Mower Institute, Inc., 205 Mills Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All matters of interest to the lawn mower industry.
D. (6) $500.

A. Hudson, Creyke, Lipscomb & Gray, 400 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) To obtain relief for applicants for leases on submerged lands and for those persons whose activities led the Government to assert title to submerged lands.
D. (6) $1,000.
E. (6) $10.69; (9) $10.69; (11) $10.69.

A. William T. Huff, 806 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Trans-World Airlines, Inc., 10 Richards Road, Kansas City, Mo.
C. (2) Any legislation which might effect civil aviation.
D. (6) $2,350.
E. (7) $231.85.

A. C. E. Huntley, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) (See "legislative policy" attached to employer's return).
D. (6) $225.

A. William C. Hushing, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of Labor, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All bills affecting the welfare of the country generally, and specifically bills affecting workers.
D. (6) $2,616.
E. (6) $26.40; (7) $72.60; (8) $189; (9) $288; (11) $288.

A. Sam C. Hyatt, Hyattville, Wyo.
B. American National Cattlemen's Association, 515 Cooper Building, Denver, Colo.
C. (2) Support prices, standby controls, freeze order, reciprocal trade, buy American, reorganization of Department of Agriculture, public land legislation, etc.

A. Illinois Railroad Association, room 1526, 33 South Clark Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Legislation affecting railroads.
E. (2) $825; (9) $825; (11) $825.

A. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., suite 501, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation pertaining to natural gas.
D. (6) $49,072.16.
E. (2) $5,750; (5) $300; (9) $6,050; (11) $6,050.

A. Indiana State Medical Association, 1021 Hume Mansur Building, Indianapolis, Ind.
C. (2) All bills pending before Congress which would create national health insurance.

A. The Indiana Tax Equality Committee, Inc., Board of Trade Building, Indianapolis, Ind.
C. (2) Bills affecting equality of taxation—examples: revenue bills, the Mason bill (H. R. 1559) in the present Congress (for).
D. (6) $75.
E. (8) $51; (9) $51; (11) $51; (15).[1]

A. William Ingles, 1624 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Self-employed. Employee in sense of note (a) (i) above of list of employers attached hereto.[1]
C. (2) Legislation affecting industry.
D. (6) $8,656.
E. (2) $900; (5) $632.09; (6) $268.51; (7) $680.96; (8) $360; (9) $2,841.56; (11) $2,841.56.

A. Ingoldsby & Coles, 813 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Committee for the Promotion of Tramp Shipping (now incorporated under the name of American Tramp Shipowners' Association, Inc.), 80 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) The committee is interested in amending existing shipping legislation in order to extend operating and construction differential subsidies to American-flag vessels engaged in so-called tramp trades.
D. (6) $10,000.
E. (5) $272.58; (6) $72.63; (7) $103.46; (9) $448.67; (11) $448.67; (15).[1]

A. Kenneth W. Ingwalson, 261 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Inflation control (Defense Production Act of 1950); Government credit policies; education; mutual security program; agricultural appropriations; ACP payments; REA: appropriation Agricultural Extension Service; Department of Agriculture reorganization; farm program.
D. (6) $1,125.
E. (7) $27.10; (9) $27.10; (11) $27.10.

A. International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen, and Helpers of America, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) General interest is in Federal and State legislation affecting the interest and welfare of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters of America, including its affiliate local unions and members.
D. (6) $3,750.
E. (2) $3,750; (9) $3,750; (11) $3,750.

A. The Inter-State Manufacturers Association, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
C. (2) H. R. 2685; S. 586; H. R. 49; S. 471; H. R. 999; H. R. 3599.
D. (6) $3,000.
E. (4) $15.35; (9) $15.35; (11) $15.35.

A. Iron Ore Lessors Association, Inc., W–1481 First National Bank Building, St. Paul, Minn.
C. (2) Amendments of Internal Revenue Code: (b) H. R. 604, 2691; (d) in favor of bills. (3).[1]
D. (6) $59,562,37.
E. (2) $8,000; (4) $53.40; (5) $411.40; (6) $177.82; (7) $3,818.71; (9) $12,461.33; (11) $12,461.33; (15).[1]

A. Robert L. Irvin, 502 Jergins Trust Building, Long Beach, Calif.
B. Long Beach Harbor Commission, 1333 El Embarcadero, Long Beach, Calif.
C. (2) Tidelands legislation; supporting State ownership.
D. (6) $2,400.
E. (2) $540; (3) $20; (5) $715.29; (6) $82.43; (7) $765.11; (9) $2,122.83; (11) $2,122.83.

A. Mr. Boyd J. Jackson, Klamath Agency, Oreg.
B. Klamath Tribe of Indians, Klamath Agency, Oreg.
C. (2) Legislation relating to Indians; interested in enactment of S. 1033, S. 1034, S. 1035, S. 1036, S. 1037; H. R. 3402, H. R. 3403, H. R. 3404, H. R. 3405, and H. R. 3406.

A. Robert C. Jackson, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 203–A Liberty Life Building, Charlotte, N. C.
C. (2) Customs Simplification Act; Trade Agreements Act; cotton products identification proposals; amending and extending Defense Production Act, 1950; S. 800, Export-Import Bank policies; amending and extending the National Labor Relations Act.
D. (6) $650.
E. (6) $9.60; (7) $89; (9) $96.60; (11) $96.60.

A. Seward H. Jacobi.
B. Wisconsin State Chamber of Commerce, 119 Monona Avenue, Madison, Wis.
C. (2) All legislation affecting business and industry.
(6) $2,750.

A. Japanese American Citizens League Anti-Discrimination Committee, Inc., 406 Beason Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.
C. (2) Legislation affecting persons of Japanese ancestry in the United States and Hawaii.
D. (6) $3,295.50.
E. (2) $600; (9) $600; (11) $600; (15).[1]

A. Robert G. Jeter, Dresden, Tenn.
B. H. C. Spinks Clay Co., Paris, Tenn.
C. (2) Interested in retaining our present percentage depletion allowance for Ball and Sagger Clays as shown in title 26, section 114, Internal Revenue Code.

A. William T. Jobe, 1706 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Ice Industries, 1706 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) General interest in matters affecting ice industry.

A. Peter Dierks Joers, Mountain Pine, Ark.
B. Dierks Lumber & Coal Co., 1006 Grand Avenue, Kansas City, Mo.
C. (2) Flood-Control Act of 1945—Millwood Dam. Legislation affecting lumber industry.

A. Johns-Manville Corp., 22 East 40th Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Tax legislation, housing legislation, tariff legislation.
E. (2) $1,250; (8) $861.88; (9) $2,111.88; (11) $2,111.88.

A. Gilbert R. Johnson, 1208 Terminal Tower, Cleveland, Ohio.
B. Lake Carriers' Association, 305 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
C. (2) Legislation relating to Great Lakes shipping.
D. (6) $2,916.

A. Vernon A. Johnson, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Lockheed Aircraft Corp., Burbank, Calif.
C (2) All legislation affecting aviation.
D. (6) $4,320.
E. (7) $696.36; (9) $696.36; (11) $696.36.

A. W. D. Johnson, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
B. Order of Railway Conductors, O. R. C. Building, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.
C. (2) St. Lawrence seaway project and all legislation directly and indirectly affecting the interests of labor generally and employees of carriers under the Railway Labor Act, in particular.

A. Walter R. Johnson, 917 District National Building, 1406 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Attorneys General, 917 District National Building, 1406 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) To confirm and establish title in the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries. Senate Joint Resolution 13 and similar bills.
D. (6) $5,100.
E. (7) $243; (8) $20; (9) $263; (11) $263.

A. Lillian Cohen for Willard Johnson, general secretary, United States Committee for a United Nations Genocide Convention.

A. Bascom F. Jones, Tennessee Railroad Association, 930 Broadway, Nashville, Tenn.
B. Class I railroads operating in Tennessee.
C. (2) Legislative bills affecting the industry.
D. (See attached schedule.) [1]

A. Charles W. Jones, 1832 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 18, Memphis, Tenn.
C. (2) The National Cotton Council of America favors such action on any legislation affecting the raw cotton industry as will promote the purposes for which the council is organized.
D. (6) $450.
E. (7) $28.23; (9) $28.23; (11) $28.23.

A. Jones, Day, Cockley & Reavis, 1759 Union Commerce Building, Cleveland, Ohio, and 1135 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The M. A. Hanna Co., Leader Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

C. (2) S. 589 and House Joint Resolution 104, to authorize the St. Lawrence seaway and power project.
D. (6) $15,725.
E. (6) $121.07; (7) $77.42; (9) $198.49; (11) $198.49; (15).[1]

A. J. M. Jones, 414 Pacific National Life Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.
B. National Wool Growers Association, 414 Pacific National Life Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.
C. (2) H. R. 4023, land bill; H. R. 1427, parity protection amendment to the Agricultural Act of 1949.
D. (6) $2,500.03.
E. (6) $85.52; (7) $809.67; (8) $434.61; (9) $1,329.80; (11) $1,329.80.

A. L. Dan Jones, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Independent Petroleum Association of America, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation that might affect the petroleum industry.
E. (8) $20.20; (9) $20.20; (10) $20.20.

A. Rowland Jones, Jr., 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Retail Federation, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) (See p. 3.)[1]
D. (6) $3,000.
E. (7) $308.09; (9) $308.09; (11) $308.09.

A. The Journeymen Barbers, Hairdressers, Cosmetologists, and Proprietors International Union of America, 12th and Delaware, Indianapolis, Ind.
C. (2) Interest in general legislation affecting labor, the National Defense Act, veterans' educational legislation, the District Barber Act, and any amendments thereto.

A. The Kansas Independent Businessmen's Association, 205 Orpheum Building, Wichita, Kans.
C. (2) Tax equality and other legislation affecting independent business.
E. (5) $196.74; (7) $76.75; (9) $273.49; (11) $273.49.

A. Thomas J. Keefe, 1319 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Road Builders' Association, 1319 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the road-building industry.
D. (6) $2,750.
E. (6) $41.50; (7) $1,187.55; (8) $334.75; (9) $1,563.80; (11) $1,563.80.

A. Francis V. Keesling, Jr., 315 Montgomery Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. City and County of San Francisco, City Hall, San Francisco, Calif.
C. (2) Legislation of interest to the city and county of San Francisco, including civil functions appropriations, civil defense, ship construction, payments in lieu of taxes, airports and aviation, merchant marine development, national defense appropriations, housing and urban development, taxation and Government controls, and veterans' educational benefits.
D. (6) $3,000.
E. (5) $1,075; (6) $562.73; (7) $2,787.78; (8) $87.38; (15).[1]

A. Miss Elizabeth A. Kendall, 5415 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation related directly or indirectly to the development of the antarctic continent, such as that regarding geopolitical decisions, inventions, transportation, communcations, equipment, long-range planning, exploitation of natural resources, etc., in the interests of all United States taxpayers and world peace and prosperity.
E. (4) $5; (9) $5; (11) $5.

A. I. L. Kenen, 3636 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Zionist Council, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. American aid to Israel and the Middle East.
D. (6) $3,36..
E. (1) $39; (4) $501.45; (6) $218.86; (7) $1,947.33; (9) $2,706.64; (11) $2,706.64; (15).[1]

A. Earle R. Kennedy, 162 Madison Avenue, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 18, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $207.36.
E. (7) $243.92; (9) $243.82; (11) $243.82.

A. Mr. Harold L. Kennedy, 203 Commonwealth Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Ohio Oil Co., Findlay, Ohio.
C. (2) Generally interested in all legislative matters that would affect the oil and gas industry.
D. (6) $500.
E. (2) $125; (5) $75; (6) $50; (7) $25; (8) $15; (9) $290; (11) $290.

A. Miles D. Kennedy, care of the American Legion, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
C. (2) and (3) (See statement attached).[1]
D. (6) $3,100.
E. (7) $33; (9) $33; (11) $33.

A. Ronald M. Ketcham, 1757 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, 1151 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (5) $3,050.
E. (2) $3,050; (9) $3,050; (11) $3,050.

A. Omar B. Ketchum, Wire Building, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.
C. (1) Legislative interests to continue indefinitely, because of yearly program. (2) Legislation affecting all veterans and their dependents in relation to employment, hospitalization, rehabilitation, pensions, disability compensation and housing; welfare of servicemen of the Armed Forces and their dependents; matters relating to the national security, immigration and naturalization, the combating of subversive activities; and the furtherance of a sound foreign policy. (3) VFW magazine; VFW Legislative Newsletter.
D. (6) $3,000.
E. (7) $247.85; (9) $247.85; (11) $247.85.

A. Jeff Kibre, 930 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. International Longshoremen's & Warehousemen's Union, 150 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, Calif., and National Union of Marine Cooks & Stewards, 86 Commercial Street, San Francisco, Calif.
C. (2) General interest in legislation affecting trade unions and their members and the maritime industry as well.
D. (6) $498.34.
E. (2) $303.33; (4) $24.98; (5) $117.71; (6) $92.30; (8) $32.94; (9) $571.26; (11) $571.26; (15).[1]

A. Clifton Kirkpatrick, 162 Madison Avenue, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Council of America, post-office box 18, Memphis, Tenn.
C. (2) The National Cotton Council of America favors such action on any legislation affecting the raw cotton industry as will promote the purposes for which the council is organized.
D. (6) $330.
E. (7) $45.34; (9) $45.34; (11) $45.34.

A. C. W. Kitchen, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United Fresh Fruit & Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Interested in any legislation affecting the marketing and distribution of fresh fruits and vegetables, directly or indirectly.

A. Allan B. Kline, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation.
C. (2) Those matters affecting directly American agriculture.
D. (6) $1,250.

A. Robert E. Kline, Jr., 322 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Palmer-Bee Co., Detroit, Mich.
C. (2) S. 477 and H. R. 2042.
E. (6) $4; (7) $4; (9) $8; (10) $85; (11) $93.

A. Burt L. Knowles, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Associated General Contractors of America, Inc., Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Robert A. Koch, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Chambers of Commerce of Venezuela, care of Caracas Chamber of Commerce, Sur 2, No. 30, Altos, Caracas, Venezuela.
C. (2) Legislation designed to increase tariffs or impose quota on imports of petroleum products.

A. Robert A. Koch, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Employed by Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly & Ball, a law firm of which a client is Comite Franc Dollar, 31, Avenue Pierre Ier de Serbie, Paris 8e, France (a branch of the Conseil National du Patronat Francais).
C. (2) Legislation affecting imports into the United States; tariffs, quotas, etc.

A. Robert M. Koch, 619 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Agricultural Limestone Institute, Inc., 619 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation which directly or indirectly affects the interests of agricultural limestone producers.
E. (7) $30.20; (9) $30.20; (11) $30.20.

A. John Kolanda, Room 413, Railway Labor Building, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
B. Railway Employees' Department, 220 South State Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) All legislation of interest to railroad employees and labor in general.
D. (6) $2,700.

A. Alfred U. Krebs, 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) H. R. 66, S. 719, and H. R. 983.
D. (6) $500.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Oscar R. Kreutz, 907 Ring Building, 18th and M Streets NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Savings and Loan League, 907 Ring Building, 18th and M Streets NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Support of bills to improve facilities of savings and loan associations for encouragement of thrift and home financing. Oppose legislation adverse to savings and loan associations. Opposing S. 975 and H. R. 1559. Supporting in the main H. R. 316. Supporting H. R. 1280.
D. (6) $2,500.

A. Lake Carriers' Association, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. James W. Lamberton, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Chambers of Commerce of Venezuela, care of Caracas Chamber of Commerce, Sur 2, No. 30, Altos, Caracas, Venezuela.
C. (2) General interest in obtaining information on and opposing any legislation designed to increase tariffs or impose quotas on imports of petroleum products.

A. James W. Lamberton, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Comite Franc Dollar, 31, Avenue Pierre 1er de Serbie, Paris 8e, France (a branch of the Conseil National du Patronat Francais).
C. (2) General interest in obtaining information on legislation affecting imports into the United States; tariffs, quotas, etc., and communicating such information individually to other interested persons in the United States.

A. Alfons Landa, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Director of Trucking Industry National Defense Committee, Inc.

A. Fritz G. Lanham, 2737 Devonshire Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Fair Trade Council, Inc., 1434 West 11th Avenue, Gary, Ind.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Fritz G. Lanham, 2737 Devonshire Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Patent Council, 1434 West 11th Avenue, Gary, Ind.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. Fritz G. Lanham, 2737 Devonshire Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. State Tax Association, Post Office Box 2559, Houston, Tex.

A. Fritz G. Lanham, 2737 Devonshire Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Trinity Improvement Association, Inc., 1308 Commercial Standard Building, Fort Worth, Tex.
D. (6) $975.

A. La Roe, Brown & Winn, 743 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Eastern Meat Packers Association, Inc., Statler Hotel, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Defense Production Act. Vesicular exanthema in hogs. Taft-Hartley law.
D. (6) $1,500.
E. (5) $2,678.19; (7) $263.58; (9) $2,941.77; (11) $2,941.77.

A. La Roe, Brown & Winn, 743 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The National Independent Meat Packers Association, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Defense Production Act. Vesicular exanthema in hogs. Taft-Hartley law.
D. (6) $4,500.
E. (4) $9.51; (5) $2,678.19; (6) $42.50; (9) $2,730.20; (11) $2,730.20.

A. William V. Lavelle, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington D. C.
B. Congress of Industrial Organizations, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C., and United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
C. (2) Support all legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare; oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.
D. (6) $2,625.
E. (7) $6.80; (9) $6.80.

A. John V. Lawrence, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $6,874.98.
E. (7) $6.90; (9) $6.80.

A. John G. Laylin, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Kennecott Copper Corp., 161 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislative interests, mining, smelting, and refining, and to foreign or international investment, trade, or commerce.

A. Clarence F. Lea., 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Transportation Association of America, 130 North Wells Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) All legislation having anything to do with transportation.
D. and E.[1]

A. League of Women Voters of the United States, 1026 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) (See program attached).[1] (3) The United States and underdeveloped countries, Report from the Hill No. 1, Report from the Hill No. 2, International Trade and International Economic Development, the National Voter.
D. (6) $3,505.72.
E. (2) $550.02; (4) $1,710.44; (6) $8.94; (9) $2,269.40; (11) $2,269.40.

A. Ivan Lebedeff, 8888 Appian Way, Hollywood, Calif.
B. National Economic Council, Inc., 7501 Empire State Building, New York, N. Y.
C. (Mr. Ivan Lebedeff, former employee, is now deceased. Please drop his name from registration).

A. Ivy Lee and T. J. Ross, 405 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. United States Cuban Sugar Council, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the importation by the United States of sugar produced in Cuba. Sugar Act of 1948 and Public Law 140, 82d Congress, amending the Sugar Act of 1948. Trade Agreements Act. Tariff acts. (3) (See attached sheet).[1]
D. (6) $3,086.83.
E. (4) $1,367.02; (6) $51.96; (8) $167.85; (9) $1,586.83; (11) $1,586.83; (15).[1]

A. James R. Lee, 604 Albee Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association, 60 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) In general, legislation which concerns or affects members of the Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association.

A. Legislative Committee of Office Equipment Manufacturers Institute (OEMI), 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Legislation-Federal Relations Division of the National Education Association of the United States (J. L. McCaskill, Director), 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Bills pending before the 83d Congress relating to public education. (3) Legislative news.
E. (2) $1,625.63; (4) $1,326.49; (5) $116.52; (6) $45.08; (7) $259.04; (9) $3,372.76; (11) $3,372.76; (15).[1]

A. G. E. Leighty, Railway Labor Executives' Association, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation of interest to railroad employees.

A. Mrs. Newton P. Leonard, 341 Sharon Street, Providence, R. I.
C. (2) The general legislative interests of the National Congress are concerned with measures which affect the welfare of children and youth in the field of education; social and economic well-being; child labor and environmental situations; Federal research agencies in education, health, juvenile protection and homemaking; world understanding and peace among nations. (3) National Parent-Teacher.

A. Wilbur R. Lester, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Kennecott Copper Corp., 161 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislative interests, relating to mining, smelting and refining and to foreign or international investment, trade or commerce.
D. (6) (See p. 3).[1]

A. Arnold Levy, 829 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Anthracite Operators Wage Agreement Committee, 237 Old River Road, Wilkes Barre, Pa.
C. (c) All legislation affecting the anthracite industry.
D. (6) $4,521.75.
E. (6) $4.75; (7) $7; (8) $10; (9) $21.75; (11) $21.75.

A. George J. Lewis, Union Station Building, Lexington, Ky.
B. Kentucky Railroad Association, Union Station Building, Lexington, Ky.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the railroad industry.
D. (5) (Note p. 3).[1]

A. The Liaison Committee of the Mechanical Specialty Contracting Industries, 610 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) S. 848, H. R. 515, 1051, 1066, 1520, 1825.
D. (6) $7,533.71.
E. (2) $6,000; (4) $950; (7) $470.50; (8) $113.21; (9) $7,533.71; (11) $7,533.71; (15).[1]

A. Frederick J. Libby, 1013 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Council for Prevention of War, 1013 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Bills affecting world peace, such as: Mutual assistance program, appropriations and supplementary appropriations, particularly where they bear on military matters or on the government of occupied areas; manpower legislation, including universal military training and service, economic assistance (point 4), disarmament, expellees and

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

displaced persons, educational exchange, and immigration legislation.
D. (6) $1,380.81.
E. (7) $155.82; (9) $155.82; (11) $155.82.

A. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y. (Washington address: 1000 Vermont Avenue).
C. (2) General: Legislation which might affect the welfare of policyholders and annuitants. Specific: (See p. 3).[1]
D. (6) $5,025.30.
E. (2) $3,478.78; (5) $1,410.38; (6) $106.82; (7) $29.32; (9) $5,025.30; (11) $5,025.30.

A. Life Insurance Policyholders Protective Assn., 116 Nassau Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) General education concerning the effect of inflation on the purchasing power of life insurance proceeds as it relates to Federal policies or measures which are deemed to be inflationary, or inflationary-retarding, in character. (3) (See attached).[1]
D. (6) $12,422.04.
E. (2) $2,871.38; (4) $1,427.53; (5) $822.26; (6) $122.27; (7) $3,011.30; (8) $479.42; (9) $8,734.16; (11) $8,734.16; (15).[1]

A. L. Blaine Liljenquist, 917 15th Street, Washington, D. C.
B. E. F. Forbes, Western States Meat Packers Association, Inc., 604 Mission Street, San Francisco, Calif.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the livestock and meat industry.
D. (6) $2,500.02.
E. (4) $23.69; (7) $135.06; (9) $158.75; (11) $158.95; (15).[1]

A. John W. Lindsey, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc.
D. (6) $375.

A. Leon Lipson, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Chambers of Commerce of Venezuela, care of Caracas Chamber of Commerce, Sur 2, No. 30, Altos, Caracas, Venezuela.
C. (2) General interest in obtaining information on and opposing any legislation designed to increase tariffs or impose quotas on imports of petroleum products.

A. Leon Lipson, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Comite Franc Dollar, 31 Avenue Pierre 1er de Serbie, Paris 8e, France (a branch of the Conseil National du Patronat Francais).
C. (2) General interest in obtaining information on legislation affecting imports into the United States; tariffs, quotas, etc.

A. Robert G. Litschert, 1200 18th Street, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) (See appended statement, p. 5).[1]
D. (6) $3,350.
E. (6) $17.10; (7) $506.22; (8) $88.10; (9) $611.42; (11) $611.42; (15).[1]

A. Norman M. Littell, 1422 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The Navaho Tribe of Indians residing in Arizona, Utah, New Mexico, and Colorado. (Address of superintendent, Window Rock, Ariz.)
C. (2) S. 108 and H. R. 433 re stock reduction on Navaho Reservation. S. 528 and H. R. 130 re helium on Navaho Reservation. S. 3013 re Colorado River storage project.
D. (6) $1,875.

A. Walter J. Little, 510 West Sixth Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
B. Major Steam Railroads of California.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. John M. Littlepage, 840 Investment Building, 15th and K Streets NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The American Tobacco Co., Inc., 111 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting a company engaged in the manufacture and sale of tobacco products.

A. Gordon C. Locke, 643 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Committee for Pipe Line Companies, 35 East Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Legislation favorable to the pipeline industry.
D. (6) $5,000.

A. Charles E. Lofgren, 522 Rhode Island Avenue NE., Washington, D. C.
B. Fleet Reserve Association, 522 Rhode Island Avenue NE., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Armed Forces personnel legislation. H. R. 1433, to prevent retroactive checkage. (For.)
D. (6) $1,716.

A. Benjamin H. Long, 2746 Penobscot Building, Detroit, Mich. Lawyer.
B. Blue Cross Commission, 425 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) General interest in legislation for payroll deductions, war damage, economic controls, and hospital and health matters.
D. (6) $650.
E. (6) $15.01; (7) $181.95; (8) $19.40; (9) $216.36; (11) $216.36.

A. Lord, Day & Lord, 25 Broadway, New York, N. Y.; and 500 Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Agency of Canadian Car and Foundry Co., Ltd., 30 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation having relation to World War I claims.
D. (6) $2,814.88.

A. Otto Lowe, 820 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting canning of food products.
D. (6) $1,500.
E. (7) $500; (9) $500; (11) $500.

A. Mrs. Frances B. Lucas, 1776 D Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Defense Committee, National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, 1776 D Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) In general, all legislation concerning defense and freedom; all bills relating to socialized medicine. (3) Press Digest and DAR magazine.
D. (6) $100.
E. (6) $7.40; (7) $6.50; (9) $13.90.

A. James C. Lucas, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Retail Federation, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (See p. 3).[1]
D. (6) $750.

A. Lucas and Thomas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Acacia Mutual Life Insurance Co., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Interested in aiding company as consultant counsel in connection with Federal tax matters affecting life insurance companies.
D. (6) $750.

A. Lucas and Thomas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Finance Conference, 176 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

C. (2) Legislation which may deal with credit controls.
D. (6) $1,250.

A. Lucas and Thomas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Adolph Von Zedlitz, care of 100 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) S 155 and H. R. 3594, to amend section 32 of the Trading With the Enemy Act.

A. Dr. Carl E. Lunn, 2315 East Yale, Phoenix, Ariz.
B. Townsend Plan for National Insurance, 6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio.
C. (2) The Townsend plan, H. R. 2446 and H. R. 2447.
E. (4) $23.20; (5) $1; (9) $24.20; (11) $24.20.

A. Gerald J. Lynch, Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Ford Motor Co., Dearborn, Mich.

A. John C. Lynn, 261 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (See attached).[1]
D. (6) $2,218.76.
E. (7) $93.19; (9) $93.19; (11) $93.19.

A. A. E. Lyon, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting labor, especially railroad labor.
D. (6) $750.

A. Avery McBee, 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Aircraft Industries Association.
C. (2) Legislation affecting aviation.
D.[1]

A. Jonas A. McBride, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, 318 Keith Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
C. (2) All legislation affecting the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen in particular, and railroad employees in general; particularly proposed amendments to the Railroad Retirement Act.
D. (6) $2,499.99.

A. Robert J. McBride, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Regular Common Carrier Conference of American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislative interest in protection and fostering of the interest of federally regulated motor common carriers of general commodities. Specific interest: S. 925 and H. R. 3203, leasing of motor vehicles; H. R. 2524, a bill to repeal certain miscellaneous excise taxes.
D. (6) $2,000.

A. Edward A. McCabe, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Hotel Association, 221 West 57th Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Any and all bills and statutes of interest to the hotel industry.
D. (6) $750.
E. (7) $82.65; (9) $82.65; (11) $82.65.

A. John A. McCart, Room 716, 900 F. Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of Government Employees, Room 716, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All bills of interest to Federal Government employees and District of Columbia government employees.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

D. (6) $1,750.
E. (7) $12.90; (9) $12.90; (11) $12.90.

A. Frank J. McCarthy, 211 Southern Building, 15th and H Streets NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 1740 Suburban Station Building, Philadelphia, Pa.
C. (See attached statement).[1]

A. J. L. McCaskill, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Division of Legislation and Federal Relations of the National Education Association of the United States, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Bills pending before the 83d Congress relating to public education.
D. (6) $225.63.

A. McClure & Updike, 626 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Iron Ore Lessors Association, Inc., W-1481 First National Bank Building, St. Paul, Minn.
C. (2) Amendments of Internal Revenue Code. H. R. 604; H. R. 2691.
D. (6) $5,000.
E. (4) $24.23; (6) $48.12; (7) $1,055.90; (8) $49; (9) $1,177.25; (11) $1,177.25; (15).[1]

A. Warren C. McClure, Mississippi Valley Association, Box 207, Camden, Ark.
B. Mississippi Valley Association, 511 Locust Street, St. Louis, Mo.
C.(2) Legislative matters relating to soil conservation and flood control.
D. (6) $1,417.50.

A. Angus McDonald.
B. Farmers Educational & Cooperative Union of America (National Farmers Union), 1555 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo. (home office); 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. A. J. McFarland, field secretary, 126 North 8th Street, Sterling, Kans.
B. The Christian Amendment Movement.
C. (3) The Christian Patriot.
D. (6) $810.
E. (7) $200; (9) $200; (11) $200.

A. Ernest W. McFarland, LaSalle Building, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Cable and Radio Corp., New York City; RCA Communications, Inc., New York City; Western Union Telegraph Co., New York City.
D. (6) $7,500.

A. Thomas Edward McGrath, 4012 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Taxpayers, U. S. A., 4012 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. [1]
D. (6) $180.
E. (2) $180; (9) $180; (10) $180; (11) $180.

A. Joseph V. McLaughlin, 923 Chestnut Street, Chattanooga, Tenn.
B. Railway Express Agency, Inc., 230 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Opposition to H. R. 2685.
D. (6) $3,813.32.
E. (7) $1,657.81; (9) $1,657.81; (11) $1,657.81.

A. M. C. McKercher, 3860 Lindell Boulevard, St. Louis, Mo.
B. The Order of Railroad Telegraphers, O. R. T. Building, St. Louis, Mo.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the welfare of railroad employes.
D. (5) $682.50.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. W. H. McMains, 1135 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Distilled Spirits Institute, 1135 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the domestic distilling industry.

A. Ralph J. McNair, 1000 Vermont Avenue, Washington, D. C.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) General: Legislation which might affect the welfare of policyholders and annuitants. Specific: (See p. 3).[1]
D. (6) $337.50.

A. Wm. P. MacCracken, Jr., 1152 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) S. 632, H. R. 3921, H. R. 116, H. R. 2980, H. R. 2224, H. R. 2332, H. R. 257, H. R. 1818, H. R. 1862 on behalf of the American Optometric Association, Inc., care of Dr. Leo G. Miller, 420 Sharp Building, Lincoln, Nebr.
D. (6) $1,800.
E. (6) $6.61; (7) $28.25; (9) $34.86; (11) $34.86.

A. W. Bruce Macnamee, National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) H. R. 66, transportation tax on persons. H. J. Res. 2, 3, 4, 104, and S. 589, Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway. H. R. 3080, dunnage. H. R. 3800, seamen's 30-day penalty wage. H. R. 640, lighting system on Delaware Canal.
D. (6) $1,050.
E. (7) $28.41; (9) $28.41; (11) $28.41.

A. Leslie T. Mahurin, 5001 Battery Lane, Bethesda, Md.
B. Organization of Professional Employees of the United States Department of Agriculture, Post Office Box 381, Washington 4, D. C.
C. (2) The general legislative interests are of Public General Bills issued by the Library of Congress under the captions, Public Officers and Employees, Retirement, and Taxation, exemptions to Annuitants.
D. (6) $49.18.
E. (7) $1.95; (9) $1.95; (11) $1.95.

A. Carter Manasco, 4201 Chesterbrook Road, Falls Church, Va.
B. National Business Publications, Inc., 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation affecting the members of the above-named trade association.
D. (6) $600.
E. (6) $16.55; (7) $171.87; (9) $188.47; (11) $188.47.

A. Carter Manasco, 4201 Chesterbrook Road, Falls Church, Va.
B. National Coal Association, Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation affecting the members of the above-named trade association.
D. (6) $2,600.
E. (6) $16.55; (7) $171.77; (9) $188.47; (11) $188.47.

A. Manufacturing Chemists' Association, Inc., 246 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the chemical industry.
D. (6) $2,375.
E. (1) $1,000; (8) $1,375; (11) $2,375.

A. Olya Margolin (Mrs.), 1637 Massachusetts Avenue, NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Council of Jewish Women, 1 West 47th Street, New York, N. Y.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

D. (6) $1,567.02.
E. (8) $61; (9) $61.

A. Winston W. Marsh, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The National Association of Independent Tire Dealers, Inc., 777 14th Street, NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (See attached p. 3 for answer to items 1-3).[1]
D. (6) $161.88.
E. (7) $12.75; (9) $12.75; (11) $12.75.

A. Robert F. Martin, Vitrified China Association, Inc., 517 Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Vitrified China Association, Inc., 517 Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Maryland and Virginia Milk Producers Association, Inc., 1756 K Street, NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Maryland and Virginia Milk Producers Association, Inc.

A. Mike M. Masaoka, 1737 H Street, NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Japanese American Citizens League Anti-Discrimination Committee, 406 Beason Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.
C. (2) Legislation affecting persons of Japanese ancestry in the United States and Hawaii.
D. (6) $600.
E. (8) $12; (9) $12.

A. Will Maslow, 15 East 84th Street, New York, N. Y.
B. American Jewish Congress, Inc.
C. (2) To oppose anti-Semitism and racism in all its forms and in connection therewith to defend incidental civil rights.
D. (6) $112.50.
E. (7) $150; (9) $150, (11) $150.

A. Walter J. Mason, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of Labor, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All bills affecting the welfare of the country generally, and specifically bills affecting workers.
D. (6) $2,256.
E. (6) $28.20; (7) $69.60; (8) $177.20; (9) $275; (11) $275.

A. P. H. Mathews, Association of American Railroads, 929 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) (See Rider C-2).[1]
D. (6) $4,746.99.
E. (7) $445.20; (9) $445.20; (11) $445.20; (15).[1]

A. Cyrus H. Maxwell, M. D., 1523 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) All bills (Senate and House) relating to health and welfare.
D. (6) $2,874.99.
E. (7) $314.96; (9) $314.96; (11) $314.96.

A. Medical Association of the State of Alabama, 537 Dexter Avenue, Montgomery, Ala.
C. (2) All health matters covered by legislative action. (3) P R NOTES.
E. (2) $1,650; (4) $225; (9) $1,875; (11) $1,875.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. E. A. Meeks, National League of District Postmasters, 1110 F. Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National League of District Postmasters, 1110 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation which affects the interests of postmasters. (3) The Postmasters' Advocate.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. James Messer, Jr., 404 Midyette-Moor Building, Tallahassee, Fla.
B. Florida Railroad Association, 404 Midyette-Moor Building, Tallahassee, Fla.
C. (2) Proposed legislation of interest to members of Florida Railroad Association.
D. (6) $1,320.

A. Ross A. Messer, Post Office Box 1611, Washington, D. C. (Room 512 Victor Building, 724 Ninth Street NW., Washington, D. C.)
B. National Association of Post Office and General Services Maintenance Employees, Post Office Box 1611, Washington, D. C. (Room 512, Victor Building, 724 Ninth Street NW., Washington, D. C.)
C. (2) All beneficial legislation affecting custodial employees of the Post Office and G. S. A. (3) The Post Office and General Services Maintenance News.
D. (6) $500.
E. (7) $26.40; (8) $11.15; (9) $37.55; (11) $37.55.

A. Clarence R. Miles, 1615 H. Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Chamber of Commerce of the United States, 1615 H. Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) (See attachment A.)[1]
D. (6) $1,312.
E. (6) $48.46; (7) $74.70; (9) $123.16; (11) $123.16.

A. Milk Industry Foundation, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (See attached statement, page 3.)[1]
D. (6) $1,500.
E. (3) $1,500; (9) $1,500; (11) $1,500; (15).[1]

A. Dale Miller, Mayflower Hotel 372, Washington, D. C.
B. Dallas (Tex.) Chamber of Commerce.
C. (2) General legislation affecting Dallas and Texas, such as appropriations and revenue bills.
D. (6) $1,500.
E. (2) $225; (5) $55.18; (6) $24.68; (7) $524,82; (8) $70.32; (9) $900; (11) $900.

A. Dale Miller, Mayflower Hotel 372, Washington, D. C.
B. Intracoastal Canal Association of Louisiana and Texas, Second National Bank Building, Houston, Tex.
C. (2) For adequate river and harbor authorizations and appropriations.
D. (6) $2,250.
E. (5) $16.20; (6) $24.33; (7) $122; (9) $162.53; (11) $162.53.

A. Dale Miller, Mayflower Hotel 372, Washington, D. C.
B. Texas Gulf Sulphur Co., Newgulf, Tex., and New York, N. Y.
C. (2) For retention of existing depletion allowances in tax laws.
D. (6) $1,500.
E. (5) $847.77; (6) $79.93; (7) $421.69; (8) $38.25; (9) $1,387.64; (11) $1,387.64.

A. Justin Miller, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) General legislative interests: Those relating directly or indirectly to the radio and television broadcasting industry.

A. Millers' National Federation, 309 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.

A. Mississippi Associated Businessmen, 605–607 Plaza Building, Post Office Box 1329, Jackson, Miss.
C. (2) Legislation relating to Government economy, Government regulations of business, and taxation such as Mason and Davis bill.
D. (6) $315.
E. (4) $15.03; (9) $15.03; (11) $15.03.

A. Missouri-Kansas Businessmen's Association, Inc., 1210 Waltower Building, Kansas City, Mo.
C. (2) Association is interested in legislation relating to taxation of independent business, labor legislation, and encroachment of Government into private industry.
E. (4) $30.06; (5) $1.63; (7) $10.22; (9) $41.91; (11) $41.91; (16).[1]

A. Henry B. Mitchell, II, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Chambers of Commerce of Venezuela, care of Caracas Chamber of Commerce, Sur 2, No. 30, Altos, Caracas, Venezuela.
C. (2) General interest in obtaining information on, and opposing, any legislation designed to increase tariffs or impose quotas on imports of petroleum products.

A. Henry B. Mitchell, II, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Comite Franc-Dollar, 31 Avenue Pierre Ier de Serbie, Paris, 8e, France.
C. (2) General interest in obtaining information on legislation affecting imports into the United States; tariffs, quotas, etc.

A. Harry L. Moffett, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Measures affecting mining, such as income taxation, social security, public lands, stockpiling, monetary policy, etc.
D. (6) $1,250.
E. (6) 0.55; (7) $44.66; (9) $45.21; (11) $45.21.

A. F. E. Mollin, 515 Cooper Building, Denver, Colo.
B. American National Cattlemen's Association, 515 Cooper Building, Denver, Colo.
C. (2) Proposed legislation supported or opposed: Support prices, standby controls, freeze order, reciprocal trade, buy American, reorganization of Department of Agriculture, public land legislation, etc.
D. (6) $4,400.
E. (6) $33.78; (7) $394.66; (8) $191.36; (9) $619.80; (11) $619.80.

A. George W. Morgan, 90 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Association of American Ship Owners, 90 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Merchant Marine Act, 1936.

A. The Morris Plan Corporation of America, 103 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Bank holding company bills and similar legislation.

A. Giles Morrow, 1220 Dupont Circle Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Freight Forwarders Institute.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting freight forwarders.
D. (6) $3,750.
E. (5) $32.55; (6) $3.82; (7) $22.50; (9) $58.87; (11) $58.87.

A. Harold G. Mosier, 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation of interest to the aircraft manufacturing industry.
D. (6) $3,750.
E. (7) $726.87; (9) $726.87; (15).[1]

A. William J. Mougey, 802 Cafritz Building, Washington, D. C.
B. General Motors Corporation, 3044 West Grand Boulevard, Detroit, Mich.

A. T. H. Mullen, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Paper and Pulp Association, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $200.
E. (6) $20; (7) $10; (9) $30; (11) $30.

A. Howard E. Munro, room 607, A. F. of L. Building, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Central Labor Union and Metal Trades Council of the Panama Canal Zone, Post Office Box 471, Balboa Heights, C. Z.
C. (2) All legislation affecting A. F. of L. union members employed on the Canal Zone.
D. (6) $1,800.
E. (3) $167.43; (5) $157.14; (6) $65.63; (7) $956.99; (9) $1,347.19; (11) $1,347.19; (15).[1]

A. Walter J. Munroe, Hotel Washington, Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.

A. Dr. Emmett J. Murphy, 5737 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Chiropractic Insurance Co., Webster City, Iowa.
C. (2) H. R. 54; S. J. Res. 41.
D. (6) $300.
E. (8) $300; (9) $300; (11) $300.

A. Ray Murphy, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Association of Casualty and Surety Companies, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation affecting casualty and surety companies.
D. (6) $99.

A. J. Walter Myers, Jr., Post Office Box 692, Valdosta, Ga.
B. Forest Farmers Association Cooperative, Post Office Box 692, Valdosta, Ga.
C. (2) Agricultural appropriations bill for 1954 (Forestry Items). S. 1348—To amend the Bankhead-Jones Farmer Tenant Act so as to improve credit services available to farmers seeking to adopt certain conservation measures. (3) The Forest Farmer.

A. National Agricultural Limestone Institute, Inc., 619 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation which directly or indirectly affects the interests of agricultural limestone producers.
D. (6) $873.30.
E. (2) $600; (4) $121.56; (5) $121.54; (7) $30.20; (9) $873.30; (11) $837.30; (15).[1]

A. National Association of Attorneys General, 917 District National Building, 1406 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) To confirm and establish title in the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries. S. J. Res. 13, and similar bills.
D. (6) $8,000.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

E. (2) $5,756.41; (4) $635.97; (5) $712.50; (6) $343.37; (7) $533; (8) $544; (9) $8,525.25; (11) $8,525.25; (15).[1]

A. National Association and Council of Business Schools, 418–419 Homer Building, 601 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation concerning education of all kinds, particularly bills relative to GI education for Korean veterans, Public Law 550. (3) Business School News.
D. (6) $10,804.11.
E. (2) $5,340.08; (4) $1,696.39; (5) $1,282.99; (6) $115.36; (7) $247.95; (8) $120.10; (9) $8,802.87; (11) $8,802.87; (15).[1]

A. National Association of Direct Selling Companies, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
C. (2) H. R. 2685, S. 586, S. 49, S. 471, H. R. 999, H. R. 3599.
D. (6) $14,050.
E. (4) $56.04; (5) $1.96; (6) $19.32; (8) $2.38; (9) $79.70; (11) $79.70.

A. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th St. NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (See appended statement, p. 5.)[1]
D. (6) $378,446.97.
E. (1) $21,702; (2) $87,263.31; (4) $14,812.49; (5) $7,336.82; (6) $1,756.95; (7) $6,819.75; (8) $3,390.42; (9) $145,081.80; (11) $143,081.60; (15).[1]

A. The National Association of Independent Tire Dealers, Inc., 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Statutes or bills which affect the interests of independent tire dealers. (3) Dealer News.
D. (6) $223.17.
E. (2) $161.88; (4) $47.06; (6) $1.48; (7) $12.75; (9) $223.17; (11) $223.17; (15).[1]

A. National Association of Insurance Agents, 96 Fulton Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Any legislation which affects, directly or indirectly, local property insurance agents. (3) American Agency Bulletin.
D. (6) $2,802.63.
E. (2) $3,378.48; (5) $414.63; (6) $324.92; (7) $128.94; (9) $4,246.97; (11) $4,246.97; (15).[1]

A. National Association of Margarine Manufacturers, 1028 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Interested in any legislation that may relate to margarine.
D. (6) $90.45.
E. (2) $70; (7) $20.45; (9) $90.45; (11) $90.45; (15).[1]

A. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 60 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

A. National Association of Post Office and General Services Maintenance Employees, Post Office Box 1611, Washington, D. C., and Room 512 Victor Building, 724 Ninth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Beneficial legislation affecting Postal employees and General Services employees, and Post Office custodial employees and GSA in PBS employees, in particular. (3) The Post Office and General Services Maintenance News.
D. (6) $14,814.21.
E. (2) $630.20; (4) $258.60; (5) $155; (6) $24.35; (7) $26.40; (8) $11.15; (9) $1,105.70; (11) $1,105.70; (15).[1]

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill.—1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the real estate industry.
D. (6) $63,654.07.
E. (1) $469.34; (2) $18,669.96; (4) 729.87; (5) $3,611.01; (6) $789.24; (7) $3,727.79; (8) $306.55; (9) $28,303.76; (11) $28,303.76; (15).[1]

A. National Association of Storekeeper-Gaugers, 4742 North Carlisle Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
C. (2) All legislation affecting Federal classified employees, and that in particular which would affect our position—United States storekeeper-gaugers.
D. (6) $439.80.
E. (2) $500; (9) $500; (11) $500; (15).[1]

A. National Association of Travel Organizations, 1424 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $10,168.31.
E. (2) $333.99; (4) $18.50; (5) $78; (6) $12; (9) $442.49; (11) $442.49.

A. National Business Publications, Inc., 1001 15th Street NW., Suite 55, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) That which affects postal rates of periodicals published by members of the above-named association.

A. National Canners Association, 1123 20th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Defense controls and all measures directly affecting the food canning industry.
D. (6) $283,112.46.
E. (2) $3,850.99; (4) $145.21; (7) $3,106.70; (8) $36.60; (9) $7,139.50; (11) $7,139.50; (15).[1]

A. National Coal Association, 802 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All measures affecting bituminous coal industry.
D and E.[1]

A. National Committee for Strengthening Congress, 1135 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation dealing with the organization of Congress.

A. National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 600 South Michigan Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) The general legislative interests of the National Congress are concerned with measures which affect the welfare of children and youth in the field of education; social and economic well-being; child labor and environmental situations; Federal research agencies in education, health, juvenile protection and homemaking; world understanding and peace among nations. (3) National Parent-Teacher.
D and E.[1]

A. National Cotton Compress and Cotton Warehouse Association, 586 Shrine Building, Memphis, Tenn., and 1008 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any matters substantially affecting the cotton compress and cotton warehouse industry.
D. (6) $81.45.
E. (2) $71.50; (5) $6.95; (7) $3; (9) $81.45; (11) $81.45.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 18, Memphis, Tenn.
C. (2) The National Cotton Council of America favors such action on any legislation affecting the raw cotton industry as will promote the purposes for which the council is organized.
D. (6) $2,341.24.
E. (2) $1,665.86; (5) $199.80; (6) $14.82; (7) $460.76; (9) $2,341.24; (11) $2,341.24.

A. National Council on Business Mail, Inc., 105 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) All legislation relating to the postal service, particularly S. 586, Senate Resolution 49, and H. R. 2685.
D. (6) $1,347.87.
E. (1) $900; (4) $37.30; (5) $9.35; (6) $17.31; (7) $317.91; (8) $66; (9) $1,347.87; (11) $1,347.87; (15).[1]

A. National Council, Junior Order United American Mechanism, 3027 North Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
C. (2) S. 694, to prohibit international organization flag display, equal or superior to United States. S. 3 and S. 4 employment. H. R. 1 to reduce income tax 11 percent. S. 339, H. R. 1854 to exempt pensions and annuitants retired civil-service employees. H. R. 2076 nonquota visas. (3) The Junior American.
E. (2) $249.99; (4) $176.95; (8) $55.50; (9) $481.94; (11) $481.94.

A. National Council for Prevention of War, 1013 Eighteenth Street, NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Bills affecting world peace, such as: Mutual assistance program, appropriations and supplementary appropriations particularly where they bear on military matters or on the government of occupied areas, manpower legislation including universal military training and service, economic assistance (point 4), disarmament, expellees and displaced persons, educational exchange, and immigration legislation. (3) Peace action.
D. (6) $10,713.02.
E. (2) $5,342.68; (3) $71.07; (4) $1,182.73; (5) $1,504.01; (6) $111.60; (7) $235.22; (8) $1,453.29; (9) $9,900.60; (11) $9,900.60; (15).[1]

A. National Economic Council, Inc., 7501 Empire State Building, New York, N. Y.
C. (See sheet attached).[1]
D. (6) $29,934.09.
E. (2) $15,229.78; (4) $4,668.12; (5) $4,886.56; (6) $664.04; (7) $1,843.16; (8) $513.22; (9) $27,804.88; (11) $27,804.88; (15).[1]

A. National Electrical Contractors Association, Inc., 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) S. 848 and companion House bills H. R. 515, H. R. 1051, H. R. 1066, H. R. 1520, H. R. 1825. (3) News Letter, Qualified Contractor.
D. and E.[1]

A. National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Pacific American Steamship Association, 16 California Street, San Francisco, Calif. American Merchant Marine Institute, 11 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) (See attachment 1.[1]
E. (2) $5,143.75; (5) $1,350; (6) $183.76; (7) $85.96; (9) $6,763.47; (11) $6,763.47.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. The National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., 1819 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) (See attached statement).[1]
D. (6) $24,890.50.
E. (2) $900; (4) $452.10; (5) $220; (6) $173.04; (8) $24.57; (9) $1,769.71; (11) $1,769.71.

A. National Federation of Post Office Clerks, Suite 502, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation pertaining to postal service and the welfare of postal and Federal employees. (3) The Union Postal Clerk.
D. (6) $162,427.75.
E. (2) $7,413; (4) $5,197.21; (5) $380; (8) $5,189.97; (9) $18,180.18; (11) $18,180.18; (15).[1]

A. National Food Brokers Association, 527 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) (See attached sheet).[1]
D. (6) $1,675.34.
E. (2) $1,000; (4) $645.34; (5) $30; (9) $1,675.34; (10) None; (11) $1,675.34; (15).[1]

A. National Housing Conference, Inc., 1129 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (2) $5,517.54; (3) $30; (4) $996.98; (5) $1,391.06; (6) $478.71; (7) $980.83; (8) $2,731.03; (9) $12,126.15; (11) $12,126.15; (15).[1]

A. The National Independent Meat Packers Association, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Matters affecting meat packers.
D. (6) $192.26.
E. (1) $3.44; (2) $120.11; (4) $35.01; (5) $17.16; (6) $4.04; (7) $19.08; (8) $11.06; (9) $209.90; (11) $209.90; (15).[1]

A. The National Labor-Management Council on Foreign Trade Policy, 424 Bowen Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) H. R. 4294, Trade Agreements bill. (3) Radio address, "Trade, Not Aid"; article, Import Quota.
D. (6) $270.86.
E. (1) $194.88; (2) $2,713.10; (4) $272.89; (5) $572.71; (6) $172.47; (7) $393.54; (8) $42.40; (9) $4,361.99; (11) $4,361.99; (15).[1]

A. National Live Stock Tax Committee, 515 Cooper Building, Denver, Colo.
C. (See p. 3 attached).[1]
D. (6) $1,308.

A. National Lumber Manufacturers Association, 1319 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation affecting the interests of the lumber manufacturing industry. (3) Lumber Letter, National Defense Development Letter.
D (6) $29,093.73.
E. (1) $2,448.90; (2) $3,962.03; (4) $525.15; (5) $200.01; (6) $17; (7) $2,305.78; (8) $1,973.71; (9) $11,432.58; (11) $11,432.58; (15).[1]

A. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation that may affect milk producers or the Cooperatives. (3) News for Dairy Co-ops, Legislative Letter.
D. (6) $53,794.10.
E. (1) $904.76; (2) $27,991.93; (4 and 5) $3,938.16; (6) $984.10; $2,203.30;[1] (7) $4,734.42; (8) $1,711.82; (9) $42,468.49; (11) $42,468.49; (15).[1]

A. National Multiple Sclerosis Society, 270 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Appropriations for public health.
E. (1) $600; (7) $155.79; (9) $755.79; (11) $755.79.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. National Reclamation Association, 1119 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) H. R. 200, H. R. 236, H. R. 495, H. R. 555, H. R. 559, H. R. 993, H. R. 1038, H. R. 1716, H. R. 2229, H. R. 2267, H. R. 2337, H. R. 2971, H. R. 4463, H. R. 4406, S. 87, S. 118, S. 158, S. 446, S. 621, S. 624, S. 646, S. 887, S. 1197, S. 1572, S. 1555, S. 1603, and all other bills concerning reclamation, flood control as related to reclamation, and water and land conservation.
D. (6) $5,942.60.
E. (2) $5,381.96; (4) $2,174.38; (5) $1,534.13; (6) $337.52; (7) $572.04; (8) $500.25; (9) $10,500.28; (11) $10,500.28; (15).[1]

A. National Retail Dry Goods Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (See p. 3).[1]
D. (6) $4,125.
E. (2) $3,375; (4) $2,703.07; (5) $517.60; (7) $108.45; (8) $2.50; (9) $6,706.62; (11) $6,706.62; (15).[1]

A. National Retail Furniture Association, 666 Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Legislation affecting retail distribution of home goods.
E. (2) $300; (4) $100; (5) $100; (6) $100; (9) $600; (11) $600; (15).[1]

A. National Rivers & Harbors Congress, 1720 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All matters pertaining to river and harbor improvement, flood control, navigation, irrigation/reclamation, soil and water conservation, and related subjects.
D. (6) $11,291.99.
E. (2) $2,416.95; (3) $20; (4) $378.95; (5) $152.77; (6) $57.05; (7) $1,689.36; (8) $904.37; (9) $5,619.45; (11) $5,619.45; (15).[1]

A. National St. Lawrence Project Conference, 843 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation with reference to the St. Lawrence waterway and power project (opposed).
D. (6) $16,500.
E. (1) $1,125; (2) $5,447.04; (4) $2,546.36; (5) $287.91; (6) $334.38; (7) $792.47; (8) $116.36; (9) $10,649.52; (11) $10,649.52; (15).[1]

A. National Savings and Loan League, 907 Ring Bldg., 18th and M Streets NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Opposing S. 975 and H. R. 1559; supporting, in the main, H. R. 316; supporting H. R. 1280.
D. (6) $216,223.10.
E. (2) $2,500; (4) $690.16; (9) $3,190.16; (11) $3,190.16; (15).[1]

A. National Small Businessmen's Association, 2834 Central Street, Evanston, Ill.
C. (3) Monthly bulletin to membership.
E. (2) $4.372.92; (5) $1,242.32; (6) $141.27; (9) $5,756.51; (11) $5,756.51; (15).[1]

A. National Society of Professional Engineers, 1121 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation affecting the interests of professional engineers, including: Taft-Hartley Act, Fair Labor Standards Act, Walsh-Healey Act, Davis-Bacon Act, UMT, Selective Service, Armed Forces Reserve legislation, Defense Production Act, Hoover Commission bills, income retirement legislation. (3) Legislative Bulletin.
D. (6) $84,358.10.
E. (2) $1,183; (4) $278.77; (9) $1,461.77; (15).[1]

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. National Tax Equality Association, 231 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) General legislative interests relate to corporate income-tax legislation such as H. R. 1559 cited as the Tax Equalization Act of 1953 and H. R. 1988. National Tax Equality Association is for H. R. 1559.
D. (6) $14,261.64.
E. (1) $2,115.59; (2) $3,620.49; (4) $2,330.96; (5) $555.61; (6) $1,436; (7) $2,687.27; (9) $12,745.92; (11) $12,745.92; (15).[1]

A. National Tax Relief Coalition, Box 401, Greensboro, N. C.
C. (2) Favor tax limitations.
D. (6) $2,640.
E. (2) $375; (5) $500; (7) $1,200; (9) $2,075; (11) $2,075.

A. National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, 1730 Chicago Avenue, Evanston, Ill.
B. The National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, 1730 Chicago Avenue, Evanston, Ill.
D. (6) $3,059.65.
E. (2) $1,250; (5) $467.05; (8) $50; (9) $1,767.05; (11) $1,767.05; (15).[1]

A. National Wool Growers Association, 414 Pacific National Life Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.
C. (2) H. R. 4023, land bill; H. R. 1427, parity protection amendment to the Agricultural Act of 1949 (identical bill in Senate not yet introduced).
E. (2) $2,500.03; (6) $85.52; (7) $809.67; (8) $434.61; (9) $3,829.83; (11) $3,829.83; (15).[1]

A. William S. Neal, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers.

A. Samuel E. Neel, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Mortgage Bankers Association of America, 111 West Washington Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the mortgage banking industry.
D. (6) $6,214.35.
E. (2) $229.61; (4) $28.80; (5) $1,351.67; (6) $444.59; (7) $534.72; (9) $2,589.39; (11) $2,589.39.

A. Mr. G. W. Nelson, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.
C. (2) Advocating legislation favorable to labor and opposing unfavorable legislation.

A. Herbert U. Nelson, 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill., and 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill., and 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the real-estate industry.
D. (6) $1,250.
E. (2) $291.83; (6) $18.91; (7) $1,472.64; (8) $632.50; (9) $2,415.88; (11) $2,415.88; (15).[1]

A. Harold F. Neumann, 112 Bowers Street, Jersey City, N. J.
B. New Jersey Associated Businessmen, Inc., 112 Bowers Street, Jersey City, N. J.
C. (2) Any laws or proposals adversely affecting business.
E. (4) $60; (5) $10; (6) $18.40; (9) $88.40; (11) $88.40.

A. New Jersey Associated Businessmen, Inc., 112 Bowers Street, Jersey City, N. J.
C. (2) Any laws or proposals adversely affecting business.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

D. (6) $100.
E. (5) $10; (6) $18.40; (7) $61.24; (8) $332.50; (9) $422.14; (11) $422.14; (15).[1]

A. New York Stock Exchange, 11 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Proposed Federal tax legislation affecting the interests of the New York Stock Exchange and its members. (3) Taxes—Equity Capital—and Our Economic Challenges.
E. (2) $3,162.50; (4) $284.64; (7) $204.54; (8) $48.64; (9) $3,700.32; (11) $3,700.32; (15).[1]

A. Russ Nixon, 930 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America (UE), 11 East 51st Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Support all legislation favorable to national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and the general welfare. Oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives. Support Taft-Hartley repeal; repeal of Smith, McCarran, and Walter-McCarran Acts; social security extension, civil rights, lower taxes. Oppose wage controls and antilabor legislation.
D. (6) $1,217.50.
E. (7) $195; (9) $195; (11) $195.

A. W. R. Noble, Suite 509, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Retail Farm Equipment Association, 207 Hotel DeSoto Building, St. Louis, Mo., and National Retail Hardware Association, 964 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
C. (2) Special attention given to all labor legislation, tax bills, the Defense Production Act, and all legislation affecting the retail farm equipment and hardware trade.
D. (6) $3,375.
E. (4) $111.35; (6) $197.27; (7) $876.66; (8) $110.13; (9) $1,295.41; (11) $1,295.41.

A. Christian P. Norgord, 1617 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Humane Association, Albany, N. Y.
C. (2) To promote the enactment of legislation within the field of work and conforming to the standards of the association and its federated societies. To discourage the legislation in that field below such standards.
D. (6) $660.83.
E. (5) $3; (6) $46.14; (9) $49.14; (11) $49.14.

A. O. L. Norman, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Electric Cos., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) (See appended statement, p. 5.) [1]
D. (6) $4,812.52.
E. (7) $454.85; (8) $45.10; (9) $499.95; (11) $499.95; (15).[1]

A. Harry E. Northam, 360 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
B. Association of American Physicians and Surgeons, Inc., 360 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
C. (See attached.) [1]

A. North Dakota Resources Board, 311 Broadway, Fargo, N. Dak.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the development and utilization of the land, water, mineral, and other natural resources of North Dakota, including authorizations and appropriations.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Northern Hemlock and Hardwood Manufacturers Association, Washington Building, Oshkosh, Wis.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the timber industries of Wisconsin and Michigan taxation, forestry, and labor-management relations.

A. Charles E. Noyes, 270 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. American Institute of Accountants, 270 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation affecting certified public accountants.
D. (6) $937.50.
E. (6) $50; (7) $282.98; (9) $332.98; (11) $332.98.

A. Peter Q. Nyce, 1266 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation pertaining to land of the United States.

A. Donald W. Nyrop, Room 710, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Conference of Local Airlines, Room 710, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Support legislation which is in the interest of a sound national air transportation policy and oppose legislation contrary to such interests.
D. (6) $313.
E. (2) $300; (4) $8; 7) $5; (9) $313; (11) $313.

A. Edward H. O'Connor, 176 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Insurance Economics Society of America, 176 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) All bids proposing to amend the Social Security Act.
D. (6) $30,620.47.

A. Eugene O'Dunne, Jr., Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Wool Manufacturers, 386 Fourth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) General interest in proposed legislation having direct or specific impact on the wool textile industry.
E. (6) $86.59; (8) $15; (9) $101.59; (11) $101.59; (15).[1]

A. Eugene O'Dunne, Jr., Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Wilbur-Ellis Co., Inc., 320 California Street, San Francisco, Calif.
C. (2) General interest in any proposed legislation having direct or specific impact on any food products produced or handled by this company. H. R. 5693, 82d Congress, an amendmeint to the Tariff Act of 1930; opposed. H. R. 93, 83d Congress.
D. (6) $9,500.

A. W. Raymond Ogg, 261 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Inflation Control (Defense Production Act of 1950); Lending Authority for Export-Import Bank; Mutual Security Program (Foreign Aid); Customs Simplification Act; Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act; Special Insurance for cotton stocks stored abroad, Congressional Bipartisan Commission to study foreign trade problems, Sec. 104 of Defense Production Act.
D. (6) $971.58.

A. The Ohio Railroad Association, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.
C. (2) Legislation affecting railroad interests.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Fred N. Oliver, 110 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y., and Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 60 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Clarence H. Olson, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
C. (2) (See attached statement).[1]
D. (6) $1,929.24.
E. (7) $15.30; (9) $15.30; (11) $15.30.

A. Sam O'Neal, Public Relations Counsel, 211 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Council on Business Mail, Inc., 105 West Monroe Stree, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) All legislation pertaining to postal rates and postal legislation.
D. (6) $900.
E. (7) $100; (8) $60; (9) $160.

A. Sam O'Neal, 211 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Power Distributors Information Committee of Tennesee Valley Public Power Association, Sixth and Cherry Streets, Chattanooga, Tenn.
C. (2) All legislation pertaining to public power.
D. (6) $1,875.
E. (7) $100; (8) $60; (9) $160; (11) $160.

A. Order of Railway Conductors of America, O. R. C. Building, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.
E. (2) $2,125; (5) $1,072.16; (6) $58.47; (9) $3,255.63; (11) $3,255.63.

A. Organization of Professional Employees of the United States Department of Agriculture, Post Office Box 381, Washington, D. C.
C. (3) (See p. 3).[1]
D. (6) $125.57.
E. (2) $54.23; (4) $99.06; (7) $1.95; (9) $155.24; (10) $155.24; (11) $155.24; (15).[1]

A. Mrs. Theodor Oxholm, 654 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. Volunteer worker for Spokesmen for Children, Inc., 654 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $47.52.
E. (7) $47.52; (9) $47.52; (11) $47.52; (15).[1]

A. Pacific American Tankship Association, 25 California Street, San Francisco, Calif.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the merchant marine, particularly the tanker division thereof, including without limitation, amendments relating to titles 14, 33, and 46 of the United States Code Annotated, the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, Transportation Act of 1940, appropriations relating to agencies charged with the duty of administering laws affecting transportation, etc.
D. (6) $200.
E. (2) $900; (9) $900; (11) $900.

A. Lovell H. Parker, 614 Colorado Building, Washington, D. C.
B. None. (Engaged as a consultant by National Coal Association; National Council of Coal Lessors; and Television Broadcasters Tax Committee; all of Washington, D. C., and Iron Ore Lessors Association, St. Paul, Minn.)
C. (2) Tax legislation affecting the bituminous coal industry, the iron ore industry and the television broadcasting industry.
D. (6) $3,000.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. George F. Parrish, Charleston, W. Va.
B. West Virginia Railroad Association, Post Office Box 7, Charleston, W. Va.
D. (6) $3,249.99.

A. James G. Patton.
B. Farmers Educational & Cooperative Union of America (National Farmers Union), 1555 Sherman St. Denver, Colo. (Home office) 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation on matters of interest to the National Farmers Union.

A. Albert A. Payne, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Relators' Washington Committee of the National Association of Real Estate Boards, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the real estate industry.
D. (6) $2,500.
E. (6) $1.15; (7) $87.81; (8) $5.30; (9) $94.26; (11) $94.26.

A. Endicott Peabody, 50 State Street, Boston, Mass.
B. Charles D. Cook, M. D., Boston Lying-in Hospital, 221 Longwood Avenue, Boston, Mass.
C. (2) S. 1531 and H. R. 3706, doctors' draft law, amendment of same. (3) Typewritten memorandum in support of amendment.
D. (5) $500.
E. (5) $25; (6) $25.25; (8) $25; (9) $75.25; (11) $75.25.

A. D. Michael Perry, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Mining Congress, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Measures affecting mining, such as income taxation, social security, public lands, stockpiling, monetary policy, etc.
D. (6) $900.
E. (7) $89.77; (9) $89.77; (11) $89.77.

A. Pershing, Bosworth, Dick & Dawson, 320 Equitable Building, Denver, Colo.
B. Estate of Karrie J. Ferguson, deceased, care of John A. Ferguson, Jr., executor, post-office box 5150 Terminal Annex, Denver, Colo.
C. (2) For amendment of section 811 (c) (1) (B), Internal Revenue Code, to prevent its application to trusts created prior to March 4, 1931. H. R. 3783 (Representative SIMPSON, of Pennsylvania) introduced March 9, 1953.
E. (6) $22.35; (7) $240.03; (9) $262.38; (11) $263.38; (15).[1]

A. J. Hardin Peterson, post-office box 2097, Dixieland Station, Lakeland, Fla.
B. Government of Guam, an unincorporated Territory of the United States.
C. (2) Legislation affecting Guam. For omnibus bill making certain legislation applicable to Guam. Against legislation that would adversely affect Guam and for legislation that would be of assistance to Guam. For an act making National Guard Act applicable to Guam.
D. (6) $2,500.
E. (5) $40.88; (6) $1.54; (7) $27.19; (9) $69.61; (11) $69.61; (15).[1]

A. J. Hardin Peterson, post-office box 2097, Dixieland Station, Lakeland, Fla.
B. Florida Citrus Mutual, Lakeland, Fla.
C. (2) In any legislation that affects the citrus industry.
D. (6) $1,133.33.
E. (6) $20.49; (7) $78.52; (8) $2.33; (9) $101.34; (11) $101.34.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Albert Pike, Jr., 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) General: Legislation which might affect the welfare of policyholders and annuitants.
D. (6) $55.

A. Frank M. Porter, 50 West 50th Street, New York, N. Y.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 50 West 50th Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (See explanatory statement).[1]

A. William I. Powell, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Measures affecting mining, such as income taxation, social security, public lands, stockpiling, monetary policy, etc.
D. (6) $1,125.

A. Kenneth L. Pray, 1632 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Schenley Distillers, Inc., and affiliated companies.

A. William H. Press, 204 Evening Star Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Washington Board of Trade, 204 Evening Star Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the District of Columbia, of interest to the Washington Board of Trade.
D. (6) $4,500.

A. Murray Preston, 901 Hibbs Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Association, 821 Cafritz Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Support of certain bills now in committee to authorize construction and operation of a St. Lawrence seaway.
D. (6) $2,475.
E. (7) $79.78; (9) $79.78; (11) $79.78.

A. Allen Pretzman, Scioto-Sandusky Conservancy District, 2540 Leveque Lincoln Tower, 50 West Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.

A. Harry E. Proctor, 1110 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 60 East 42d Street, New York City.

A. The Proprietary Association, 810 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Measures affecting the proprietary medicines industry.
E. (4) $136.80; (7) $125; (9) $261.80; (11) $261.80; (15).[1]

A. The Prudential Insurance Company of America, 763 Broad Street, Newark, N. J.
C. (2) General interest in all legislation affecting the business of the company.
E. (2) $10,500; (6) $245.16; (7) $2,648.92; (8) $1,362.83; (9) $14,756.91; (11) $14,756.91; (15).[1]

A. Ganson Purcell, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Insular Lumber Co., 1406 Locust Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
C. (2) General legislative interests are those affecting foreign commerce of the United States, including tax and tariff legislation.
E. (6) $3.75; (8) $1.12; (9) $4.87; (11) $4.87.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Alexander Purdon, 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation as may affect the development of an adequate American merchant marine.
D. (6) $468.75.
E. (7) $57.55; (9) $57.55; (11) $57.55.

A. C. J. Putt, 920 Jackson Street, Topeka, Kans.
B. The Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railway Co., 920 Jackson Street, Topeka, Kans.
C. (2) General legislative interest in matters affecting railroads.

A. Luke C. Quinn, Jr., 412 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Cancer Society, 47 Beaver Street, New York City; United Cerebral Palsy Association, 50 West 57th Street, New York City; Arthritis and Rheumatism Foundation, 537 Fifth Avenue, New York City; National Multiple Sclerosis Society, 270 Park Avenue, New York City.
C. Public health. The specific interest is to present the need for adequate appropriations by the Federal legislature for research in the fields of diseases which kill and disable people.
D. (6) $7,916.64.
E. (2) $844.98; (5) $1,017.08; (6) $179.38; (7) $1,372.34; (8) $137.40; (9) $3,551.18; (11) $3,551.18.

A. F. Miles Radigan, 1200 18th Street NW., Room 510, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) (See appended statement, pages 5 and 6).[1]
D. (6) $1,825.
E. (7) $121.75; (9) $121.75; (11) $121.75; (15).[1]

A. Alex Radin, 1757 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Public Power Association, 1757 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the generation, transmission and distribution of electrical energy by local publicly owned electric systems, and the management and operation of such systems.
D. (6) $2,500.

A. Radio-Television Manufacturers Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) General legislative interests are: Those relating directly or indirectly to the radio and television manufacturing industry.
E. (2) $6,260; (8) $154.70; (9) $6,414.70; (11) $6,414.70.

A. Railroad Pension Conference, Post Office Box 798, New Haven, Conn.
C. (2) For enactment of 30-year, half-pay railroad retirement legislation, maximum annuity $200 per month—H. R. 122.
D. (6) $485.
E. (4) $10; (5) $232.78; (6) $17.21; (7) $72.50; (8) $9.66; (9) $342.10; (11) $342.10.

A. Railway Labor Executive Association, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting railroad labor.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Alan T. Rains, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Interested in any legislation affecting the marketing and distribution of fresh fruits and vegetables, directly or indirectly.

A. DeWitt C. Ramsey, 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the aviation industry.

A. Donald J. Ramsey, 1612 Eye Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Silver Users Association, 1612 Eye Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation involving silver. H. R. 2518. To repeal certain legislation relating to the purchase of silver, and for other purposes.
D. (6) $16,575.
E. (2) $797.69; (5) $928.59; (6) $487.17; (7) $799.47; (8) $1,103.76; (9) $12,116.68; (11) $12,116.68; (12) $12,116.68.

A. Record Industry Association of America, Inc., 270 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the record industry.

A. Regular Common Carriers Conference of the American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) The general legislative interest is protection and fostering of the interest of federally regulated motor common carrier of general commodities. Specific interest: S. 925 and H. R. 3203, leasing of motor vehicles; H. R. 2524, a bill to repeal certain miscellaneous excise taxes. (3) (See page 3 attached.)[1]
D. (6) $4,101.65.
E. (2) $3,284.50; (4) $767.15; (5) $50; (9) $4,101.65; (11) $4,101.65; (15).[1]

A. Gerard D. Reilly, 1120 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Foremanship Foundation, 512-20 Harries Building, Dayton, Ohio.
C. (2) Supporting provisions relating to supervisors in the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, and opposing bills contemplating modification or repeal.

A. Reserve Officers Association of the United States, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation for development of a military policy for the United States which will guarantee adequate national security. (3) The Reserve Officer.

A. Retired Officers Association, Inc., 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any and all legislation pertinent to the rights, benefits, privileges, and obligations of retired officers, male and female, Regular and Reserve, and their dependents and survivors, of whatever nature, dealing with personnel matters, pay and retirement benefits and pensions. (3) The Retired Officer.
D. (6) $26,790.78.

A. Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the United States Government, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) General legislative interests are: Retention and improvement of the Civil Service Retirement and United States Employees Compensation Acts.
D. (6) $5,548.08.
E. (2) $2,932.27; (4) $717.88; (5) $580.16; (6) $55.18; (7) $114.50; (8) $717.18; (9) $5,117.17; (11) $5,117.17; (15).[1]

A. Roland Rice, 537 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Regular Common Carrier Conference of the American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislative interest, protection and fostering of the interests of federally regulated motor common carriers of general commodities.
D. (6) $295.

A. William M. Rice, 631 Tower Building, 14th and K Streets NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Central Public Utility Corp., 1017 Olive Street, St. Louis, Mo.

A. Charles R. Richey, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Hotel Association, 221 West 57th Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) All bills of interest to the hotel industry.
D. (5) $1,875.
E. (7) $157.95; (9) $157.95; (11) $157.95; (15).[1]

A. Siert F. Riepma, 1028 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Margarine Manufacturers, 1028 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Interested in any legislation which may relate to margarine.
D. (6) $70.
E. (7) $20.45; (9) $20.45; (11) $20.45.

A. George D. Riley, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of Labor, 901 Massachusetts Avenue, NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All bills affecting the welfare of the country generally, and specifically bills affecting workers.
D. (6) $2,256.
E. (6) $28.60; (7) $72.60; (8) $184.80; (9) $286; (11) $286.

A. E. W. Rising, 1215 16th Street NW., Suite No. 3, Washington, D. C.
B. National Water Conservation Conference, 341 Broad Street Station Building, Philadelphia, Pa.
C. (2) All legislation relative to development, utilization and conservation of natural resources, including bills to authorize projects, and appropriations for construction of projects.
E. (2) $'04; (4) $137.51; (5) $167.86; (6) $14.50; (7) $133.87; (9) $857.74; (11) $857.74; (15).[1]

A. E. W. Rising, 1215 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Western Beet Growers Association, Post Office Box 742, Great Falls, Mont.
C. (2) Legislation that may affect or limit the right of American farmer to grow and market sugar beets.
D. (6) $265.
E. (2) $60.06; (4) $100.80; (5) $47; (6) $11.83; (7) $62.97; (9) $282.66; (11) $282.66; (15).[1]

A. George Mackay Robb, 2507 South Salina Street, Syracuse, N. Y.
B. Christian Amendment Movement, 804 Pennsylvania Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $475.
E. (5) $5.03; (6) $6.92; (7) $183.71; (9) $195.66; (11) $195.66.

A. Paul H. Robbins, 1121 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Society of Professional Engineers, 1121 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation affecting the interests of professional engineers. (3) Legislative Bulletin.
D. (6) $250.

A. Edward O. Rodgers, 1107 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Air Transport Association of America, 1107 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) General legislative interests for the proper advancement of the airline industry. (See attached sheets for specific bill numbers.)[1]
D. (6) $1,250.
E. (7) $22.50; (9) $22.50; (10) $22.50; (11) $22.50.

A. Frank W. Rogers, 911 Commonwealth Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Western Oil and Gas Association, 510 West 6th Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
C. (2) Federal legislation affecting the petroleum industry in Washington, Oregon, California, Arizona, and Nevada.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. Watson Rogers, 527 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Food Brokers Association, 527 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) (See attached sheet).[1]
D. (6) $1,000.

A. George B. Roscoe, 610 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Electrical Contractors Association, Inc., 610 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) The National Electrical Contractors Association has an interest in the enactment of S. 848, H. R. 515, H. R. 1051, H. R. 1066, H. R. 1520, and H. R. 1825. (3) News Letter, Qualified Contractor.

A. Carlton H. Rose, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Lead Co., 111 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the operation of National Lead Co., including the manufacture and sale of its products. H. R. 234, H. R. 606, H. R. 2535, H. R. 2740, H. R. 2823, S. 753, S. 869, S. 1539.

A. Roland H. Rowe, 400 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. United States Wholesale Grocers' Association, 400 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting interest of wholesale grocers. (a) Amending the Robinson-Patman Act and the Federal Trade Commission Act. (b) S. 1357, H. R. 3501, S. 1377, S. 540, H. R. 635. (c) Robinson-Patman Act, Federal Trade Commission Act. (d) For S. 1357. Against H. R. 3501, S. 1377, S. 540, and H. R. 635.
D. (5) $18.15. (See p. 3).[1]

A. Albert R. Russell, 162 Madison Avenue, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 18, Memphis, Tenn.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the raw cotton industry as will promote the purposes for which the Council is organized.
D. (6) $165.
E. (7) $43.12; (9) $43.12; (11) $43.12.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Francis M. Russell, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Broadcasting Co., Inc., 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting National Broadcasting Co., Inc., and/or affiliated companies.
E. (7) $297.25; (9) $297.25.

A. Horace Russell, 7 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Legislation directly or indirectly affecting the savings and loan business.
D. (6) $3,750.
E. (7) $109.29; (9) $109.29; (11) $109.29; (15).[1]

A. M. O. Ryan, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Hotel Association, 221 West 57th Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) All bills of interest to the hotel industry.
D. (6) $3,750.
E. (7) $261.85; (9) $261.85; (11) $261.85; (15).[1]

A. Robert A. Saltzstein, 511 Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Emergency Committee of Small and Medium-Size Magazine Publishers, 305 East 46th Street (Room 301), New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Interested in matters affecting second-class postal rates.
D. (6) $1,250.01.
E. (2) $27.75; (6) $36.63; (7) $1.05; (9) $65.43; (11) $65.43; (15).[1]

A. Charles E. Sands, 4211 Second Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Hotel and Restaurant Employees and Bartenders International Union, A. F. of L., 525 Walnut Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
C. (2) Labor and social legislation.
D. (6) $1,800.
E. (5) $102; (9) $102; (11) $102.

A. L. R. Sanford, 21 West Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Shipbuilders Council of America, 21 West Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Satterlee, Warfield & Stephens, 49 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.
B. American Nurses' Association, 2 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) General legislative interests are in legislation relating to nurses, nursing, or health. (3) The American Journal of Nursing.
D. (6) $1,600.
E. (7) $241.04; (9) $241.04; (11) $241.04; (15).[1]

A. Stuart T. Saunders, 108 North Jefferson Street, Roanoke, Va.
B. Norfolk & Western Railway Co., 108 North Jefferson Street, Roanoke, Va.

A. Schoene & Kramer, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Railway Labor Executives' Association, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D C.
C. (2) Railroad retirement and unemployment insurance matters.
D. (6) $500.
E. (7) $2; (9) $2; (11) $2.

A. John W. Scott, 317 Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Harvey B. Jacobson, 1406 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C.[1]
D. (16) $300.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Mildred Scott, 1370 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of the Physically Handicapped, 1370 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) H. R. 1725, 2701; S. 898; H. R. 2096, 2147, 2149, 2300, 2342, 2346, 2463, 2519, 3177, 3188, 3291, 3473.
D. (6) $300.
E. (7) $10; (9) $10; (11) $10.

A. Hollis M. Seavey, 532 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Clear Channel Broadcasting Service, 532 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) CCBS is opposed to any proposed legislation (such as S. 491 and H. R. 4004, 81st Congress) calling for the duplication of Class I–A Clear Channel frequencies or the limitation of the power of Class I–A Standard Broadcast Stations. CCBS opposes ratification of the so-called NARBA Agreement signed November 15, 1950.
E. (7) $19.75; (9) $19.75; (11) $19.75; (15).[1]

A. James D. Secrest, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Radio-Television Manufacturers Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) General legislative interests are: Those relating directly or indirectly to the radio and television manufacturing industry. Special legislative interests are: Defense Production Act; excise taxes; excess profits taxes. (3) RTMA Industry Report.

A. Mr. Harry See, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.
C. (2) Advocating favorable labor legislation and opposing unfavorable labor legislation.
E. (7) $147.18; (9) $147.18; (11) $147.18.

A. Manning Shaw, Washington Loan & Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, Ring Building, 1200 18th Street, NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation that might affect the members of the N. A. E. C.
D. (6) $5,096.65.

A. Mark R. Shaw, 114 Trenton Street, Melrose, Mass.
B. National Council for Prevention of War, 1013 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Favor economic aid to Europe and Asia, point IV, etc. Favor plans for universal disarmament. Favor full cooperation in the U. N. for economic and social welfare. UNICEF. Favor modification of the McCarran-Walter immigration law, liberalizing it. Oppse UMT, UMS, and Military Aid Program. Oppose rearming Germany and Japan. Other measures related to peace and war. (3) Peace Action.
D. (6) $600.
E. (7) $38.90; (9) $38.90; (11) $38.90.

A. Leander I. Shelley, 30 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.
B. The Port of New York Authority, New York, N. Y. (Bi-State Agency); American Association of Port Authorities, Washington, D. C. (Port Association); Airport Operators Council, Washington, D. C. (Airport Association).
C. (2) For bills (1) to return tidelands to States, (2) to provide compensation for persons prejudiced by Rome Convention, (3) to amend Surplus Airports Act, and (4) to continue Federal-airport aid.
D. (6) $4,250.
E. (6) $1.38; (7) $249.62; (9) $251; (11) $251; (15).[1]

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Bruce E. Shepherd, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) General: Legislation which might affect the welfare of policyholders and annuitants.
D. (6) $117.50.

A. Robert H. Shields, 1001 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. United States Beet Sugar Association, 1001 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Interested in any legislation affecting sugar, particularly the Sugar Act of 1948 and related legislation.
D. (6) $10,000.

A. Earl C. Shively, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.
B. The Ohio Railroad Association, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.
C. (2) Legislation affecting railroad interests.

A. Silver Users Association, 1612 I Street, NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation regarding silver.
D. (6) $4,250.06.
E. (7) $799.47; (9) $799.47; (11) $799.47.

A. Six Agency Committee, 315 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.
C. (2) Legislation affecting California's interest in the Colorado River, including S. 1438, Bridge Canyon bill, H. R. 4443, H. R. 4449, H. R. 4463, and S. 1555, Colorado River storage project, and legislation relating to reclamation and water resources policies.
D. (6) $10,000.
E.[1]

A. Stephen Slipher, 711 14th Street, NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United States Savings & Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (See attached page).[1]
D. (6) $1,300.
E. (7) $15.40; (9) $15.40; (11) $15.40.

A. Miss Elizabeth A. Smart, 138 Constitution Avenue NE., Washington, D. C.
B. National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, 1730 Chicago Avenue, Evanston, Ill.
C. (2) S. 10, S. 11, S. 1080, H. R. 3094, H. R. 1227.
D. (6) $724.98.
E. (5) $159.56; (6) $44.75; (9) $204.31; (11) $204.31.

A. Anthony W. Smith, 718 Jackson Place, NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Congress of Industrial Organizations, 718 Jackson Place, NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) General: Forestry; regional development; resource conservation; labor relations.

A. George C. Smith, Jr., 1615 H Street, NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Chamber of Commerce of the United States, 1615 H Street, NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,562.50.
E. (6) $23.25; (7) $557.30; (9) $580.55; (11) $580.55.

A. Harold O. Smith, Jr., 400 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. United States Wholesale Grocers' Association, Inc., 400 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Lloyd W. Smith, 425 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Co., 547 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago,

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

Ill.; Great Northern Railway, 175 East Fourth Street, St. Paul, Minn.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting directly or indirectly the Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Co. and the Great Northern Railway.
D. (6) $2,556.66.

A. Robert E. Smith, 116 Nassau Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Life Insurance Policyholders Protective Association, 116 Nassau Street, New York, N. Y.
C.[1]
D. (6) $900.
E. (7) $1,227.55; (9) $1,227.55; (11) $1,227.55; (12) $9,801.89; (13) $2,000; (14) $435.29; (15).[1]

A. Sylvester C. Smith, Jr., Prudential Insurance Co. of America, 763 Broad Street, Newark, N. J.
B. Prudential Ins. Co. of America, 763 Broad Street, Newark, N. J.

A. Purcell L. Smith, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) (See appended statement, pp. 5 and 6).[1]
D. (6) $16,250.01.
E. (6) $59.50; (7) $937.06; (8) $109.60; (9) $1,106.16; (11) $1,106.16; (15).[1]

A. Spokesmen for Children, Inc., 654 Madison, Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Appropriations for grants-in-aid for the States for maternal and child health, child welfare and services to crippled children. Public Law 874 and Public Law 815 for aid to schools in defense areas. S 1153 for extending local public health units.
D. (6) $430.75.
E. (1) $63; (4) $17.58; (5) $75.05; (6) $1.48; (7) $47.52; (9) $204.63; (11) $204.63; (15).[1]

A. Calvin K. Snyder, National Association of Real Estate Boards, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Realtors' Washington Committee of the National Association of Real Estate Boards, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the real-estate industry.
D. (6) $4,125.
E. (6) $3.35; (7) $524.22; (8) $15; (9) $545.57; (11) $545.57; (15).[1]

A. J. D. Snyder, 1040 La Salle Hotel, Chicago, Ill.
B. Illinois Railroad Association, Room 1526, 33 South Clark Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Legislation affecting railroads.
D. (6) $825.

A. Southern States Industrial Council, Nashville, Tenn.
C. (2) Support of legislation favorable to free enterprise system and opposition to legislation unfavorable to that system. (3) Southern States Industrial Council Bulletin.
D. (6) $50,188.
E. (2) $15,896.30; (4) $4,055.86; (5) $1,992.04; (6) $193.28; (7) $139.23; (8) $503.33; (9) $22,780.04; (11) $22,780.04; (15).[1]

A. Spence, Hotchkiss, Parker & Duryee, 40 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation to establish a national air policy.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Lyndon Spencer, 305 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
B. Lake Carriers' Association, 305 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Thomas G. Stack, 1104 West 104th Place, Chicago, Ill.
B. National Railroad Pension Forum, Inc., 1104 West 104th Place, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Interested in all bills pertaining to the Railroad Retirement Act. (3) Rail Pension News.
D. (6) $1,320.
E. (1) $214.50; (2) $1,320; (4) $1,400; (6) $32; (9) $2,966.50; (11) $2,966.50.

A. Howard M. Starling, 837 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Association of Casualty and Surety Companies, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation affecting casualty and surety companies.
D. (6) $150.
E. (7) $7.50; (9) $7.50; (11) $7.50.

A. Charles I. Stengle, AFGE, Room 716, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of Government Employees, Room 716, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All bills of interest to Federal Government employees and District of Columbia government employees.
D. (6) $1,750.
E. (7) $27.20; (9) $27.20; (11) $27.20.

A. Mrs. Nell F. Stephens, Post Office Box 6261, Northwest Station, Washington, D. C.

A. Mrs. Alexander Stewart (Annalee), 1734 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, 1734 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (3) Four Lights, Washington Newsletter.
D. (6) $10,875.69.
E. (2) $5,802.68; (4) $993.24; (5) $2,978.55; (6) $427; (7) $624.97; (9) $10,826.44; (11) $10,826.44.

A. Charles T. Stewart, National Association of Real Estate Boards, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the real-estate industry.
D. (6) $3,768.58.
E. (7) $226.13; (8) $42.45; (9) $268.58; (11) $268.58; (15).[1]

A. Erskine Stewart, Suite 808, Sheraton Building, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Retail Dry Goods Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N. Y.
C. S. Res. 38, S. 1081, S. 753; H. Res. 1, H. R. 3851, H. R. 4159, H. R. 1533, H. R. 235, H. R. 2685, H. R. 632.
D. (5) $375.
E. (8) $1.25; (9) $1.25; (11) $1.25.

A. Wilson E. Still, 162 Madison Avenue, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 18, Memphis Tenn.

A. Edwin L. Stoll, assistant director of public relations, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the real estate industry.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

D. (6) $2,566.76.
E. (7) $23.76; (8) $43; (9) $66.76; (11) $66.76; (15).[1]

A. Sterling F. Stoudenmire, Jr., 61 St. Joseph Street, Mobile, Ala.
B. Waterman Steamship Corp., 61 St. Joseph Street, Mobile, Ala.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the American merchant marine and transportation generally.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Paul A. Strachan, 1370 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of the Physically Handicapped, 1370 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) H. R. 2096, 2147, 2149, 2300, 2342, 2346, 2463, 2519, 3177, 3188, 3291, 3473, 1725, 2701. S. 898.
D. (6) $600.
E. (7) $30; (9) $30; (11) $30.

A. O. R. Strackbein, 424 Bowen Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) H. R. 4294, trade agreements bill.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. O. R. Strackbein, 424 Bowen Building, Washington, D. C.
B. International Allied Printing Trades Association, Box 728, Indianapolis, Ind.
C. (2) H. R. 4317 (Amendment of section 308 of the Tariff Act of 1930).
D. (6) $625.

A. O. R. Strackbein, 424 Bowen Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) H. R. 4294, trade agreement bill.
D. (6) $1,625.

A. Arthur D. Strong, 1034 Midland Bank Building, Minneapolis, Minn.
B. Upper Mississippi Waterway Association, 1034 Midland Bank Building, Minneapolis, Minn.
C. (2) All legislation relating to the improvement and development of navigable waterways in the upper Mississippi River, together with legislation relating to flood control, conservation, pollution, recreation, fish and wild life, including all legislation that has to do with the development of water resources of the upper Mississippi River and its tributaries as this legislation relates to all types of public benefits.
D. (6) $1,351.80.

A. Arthur Sturgis, Jr., 1625 Eye Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Retail Federation, 1625 Eye Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (See page 3).[1]

A. J. E. Sturrock, P. O. Box 2084, Capitol Station, Austin, Tex.
B. Texas Water Conservation Association, P. O. Box 2084, Capitol Station, Austin, Tex.
C. (2) Interested in all legislation concerning the development, conservation, protection and utilization of Texas' land and water resources through existing State and Federal agencies. Opposed to all legislation creating Federal Valley Authorities and all legislation seeking to superimpose Federal Control over State control in the distribution of the State's water resources. Opposed to approving agreement between United States and Canada relating to the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin. For legislation to prohibit establishment of valley authority in any State without vote of people of the State. For bill quitclaiming title to tidelands to the several States. (3) Texas water.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

D. (6) $1,500.
E. (2) $63.50; (5) $16.32; (6) $20.89; (7) $757.57; (8) $115.58; (9) $973.86; (11) $973.86; (15).[1]

A. Francis M. Sullivan, 1701 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Disabled American Veterans, National Headquarters, 1423 East McMillan Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
C. (2) Legislation affecting war veterans, their dependents, and survivors of deceased veterans. (3) DAV Semi-Monthly.
D. (6) $2,906.60.

A. A. D. Sutherland, 104 South Main Street, Fond du Lac, Wis.
B. Louis Cary, successor trustee of Bankers Farm Mortgage Co., Fond du Lac, Wis., in behalf of former bondholders of Bankers Joint Stock Land Bank of Milwaukee, Wis., and F. A. Carlton, 135 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (6) $8.37; (7) $141.87; (9) $149.87; (11) $149.87; (12) $8.37.

A. Tax Equality Committee of Kentucky, 310 Commerce Building, Louisville, Ky.
C. (2) Advocating revision of section 101 IRC.
D. (6) $599.50.
E. (1) $1,250; (2) $146.25; (4) $104.31; (5) $135; (6) $1.53; (7) $1.79; (8) $8.10; (9) $1,646.98; (11) $1,646.98; (15).[1]

A. Edward D. Taylor, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Office Equipment Manufacturers Institute (OEMI), 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Margaret K. Taylor, 1731 Eye Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 Eye Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation that may affect milk producers or the cooperatives through which they act together to process and market their milk. (3) News for Dairy Co-ops; Legislative Letter.
D. (6) $2,442.40.
E. (8) $4.90; (10) $4.90; (15).[1]

A. Randolph S. Taylor, 1507 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Burley & Dark Leaf Tobacco Export Association, Inc., 620 South Broadway, Lexington, Ky.
C. (2) Mutual Security Agency; United States Department of Agriculture; H. R. 1417, in opposition.
D. (6) $2,500.
E. (7) $44.45; (8) $33.55; (9) $78; (11) $78.

A. Tyre Taylor, 1112 Dupont Circle Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Southern States Industrial Council, Stahlman Building, Nashville, Tenn.
D. (6) $2,462.37.
E. (5) $471.20; (6) $36.50; (9) $507.70; (11) $507.70; (15).[1]

A. Marjorie L. Temple, 1917 Eye Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., 1819 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
C. (See attached statement).[1]
D. (6) $24,890.50.
E. (2) $900; (4) $452.10; (5) $220; (6) $173.04; (8) $24.57; (9) $1,769.71; (11) $1,769.71; (15).[1]

A. John U. Terrell, 424 Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Colorado River Association, 306 West Third Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
C. (2) S. 1555.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. J. E. Sturrock, Post Office Box 2084, Capitol Station, Austin, Tex.
B. Texas Water Conservation Association, Post Office Box 2084, Capitol Station, Austin, Tex.
C. (2) Interest in all legislation concerning the development, conservation, protection, and utilization of Texas' land and water resources through existing State and Federal agencies. Opposed to all legislation creating Federal Valley Authorities and all legislation seeking to superimpose Federal control over State control in the distribution of the State's water resources. Opposed to approving agreement between United States and Canada relating to the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence basin. For legislation to prohibit establishment of Valley authority in any State without vote of people of the State. For bill quitclaiming title to tidelands to the several States. (3) Texas Water.
D. (6) $3,425.
E. (1) $400; (2) $1,800.96; (4) $827; (5) $294.68; (6) $299.98; (7) $578.56; (8) $1,319.34; (9) $5,520.52 (11) $5,520.52; (15).[1]

A. Oliver A. Thomas, 43 Sierra Street, Reno, Nev.
B. Nevada Railroad Association, 43 Sierra Street, Reno, Nev.; The Union Pacific Railroad Co.; The Western Pacific Railroad Co.; Southern Pacific Co.
C. (2) All Senate and House bills and resolutions affecting the interests of Nevada railroads. The St. Lawrence waterway; H. R. 2685 which proposes to repeal Public Law 199.
D. (6) $675.

A. Chester C. Thompson, 1319 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The American Waterways Operators, Inc., 1319 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All matters affecting barge and towing vessel industry and water transportation. H. R. 294; H. R. 553; H. R. 618; H. R. 1776; H. R. 1997; H. R. 2078; H. R. 3300, and similar bills; H R. 3495; H. R. 3580; H. R. 3705; H. R. 3799; H. R. 4083; H. Res. 102; and H. J. Res. 104; S. 291; S. 413; S. 589, S. 639; S. 655; S. 656; S. 657; S. 658; S. 659; S. 753; S. 796; S. 905; S. 906; S. 1461; S. Res. 22; and S. J. Res. 45.
D. (6) $6,166.66.
E. (7) $134.20; (9) $134.20; (11) $134.20.

A. Julia C. Thompson, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Nurses Association, Inc., 2 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C.[1]
D. (6) $1,400.

A. Eugene M. Thoré, 1000 Vermont Avenue, Washington, D. C.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) General: Legislation which might affect the welfare of policyholders and annuitants. Specific: (See page 3).[1]
D. (6) $1,175.

A. G. D. Tilghman, 1604 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Disabled Emergency Officers of the World Wars, 1604 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) General legislation pertaining to the pay of military personnel.
D. (6) $2,750.
E. (7) $60; (9) $60; (11) $60.

A. E. W. Tinker, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
B. American Paper & Pulp Association, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

A. William H. Tinney, 211 Southern Building, 15th and H Streets NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 1740 Suburban Station Building, Philadelphia, Pa.
C. (See attached statement.)[1]
D and E. (See attached.)[1]

A. Fred A. Tobin, 438 Bowen Building, 821 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen, and Helpers of America, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,750.

A. H. Willis Tobler, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation that may affect milk producers or the cooperatives through which they act together to process and market their milk. (3) News for Dairy Co-ops; Legislative Letter.
D. (6) $2,264.21.
E. (8) $35.45; (9) $35.45; (11) $35.45; (15).[1]

A. John H. Todd, 1008 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Cotton Compress and Cotton Warehouse Association, 586 Shrine Building, Memphis, Tenn.
C. (2) Any matters affecting the cotton compress and cotton warehouse industry.
D. (6) $62.50.
E. (2) $9; (5) $5; (7) $3; (9) $17; (11) $17.

A. Matt Triggs, 261 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,862.49.
E. (7) $77.27; (9) $77.27; (11) $77.27.

A. Paul T. Truitt, 817 Barr Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Plant Food Council, Inc., 817 Barr Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Generally interested in legislation affecting the fertilizer industry.

A. Harold J. Turner, Henry Building, Portland, Oreg.
B. Spokane, Portland, and Seattle Railway Co., Southern Pacific Co., Union Pacific Railroad Co., Henry Building, Portland, Oreg.
C. (2) All bills which directly affect railroads of Oregon.

A. Unemployed Service Association, 623 Third Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) No specific bill but various proposals for unemployed people.

A. United Cerebral Palsy Associations, Inc. 50 West 57th Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Appropriations for Public Health.
E. (1) $999.99; (7) $259.63; (9) $1,259.62; (11) $1,259.62.

A. United States Cane Sugar Refiners Association, 115 Pearl Street, New York, N. Y.; and 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. United States Cuban Sugar Council, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) (see appended statement).[1]
E. (1) $1,886.72; (4) $17,397.30; (9) $19,284.02; (11) $19,284.02; (15).[1]

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) (Schedule attached).[1]
E. (2) $5,108.45; (4) $5,984.90; (5) $810.89; (6) $116.75; (7) $133.69; (8) $501.98; (9) $12,656.66; (11) $12,656.66; (15).[1]

A. A. L. Viles, 444 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. The Rubber Manufacturers Association, Inc., 444 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.

A. Virginia Associated Businessmen, 512 Travelers Building, Richmond, Va.
C. (2) H. R. 1559 and similar tax-equality legislation.
E. (2) $1,551.75; (4) $858.59; (5) $464.08; (6) $69.15; (7) $128.17; (8) $149.03; (11) $3,220.77; (15).[1]

A. Vitrified China Association, Inc., 517 Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Tracy S. Voorhees, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Mutual security; military manpower.

A. The Vulcan Detinning Co., Sewaren, N. J.

A. James A. Waggener, 1021 Hume Mansur Building, Indianapolis, Ind.
B. Indiana State Medical Association, 1021 Hume Mansur Building, Indianapolis, Ind.
C. (2) All bills pending before Congress which would create national health insurance.

A. John E. Walker, 631 Tower Building, 14th and K Streets NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Central Public Utility Corp., 1017 Olive Street, St. Louis, Mo.
C. (2) Amendment of the Internal Revenue Code to provide for the inclusion, in subsection 458 (d) (2), of the principle now set forth in subsection 441 (g) (2).

A. Stephen M. Walter, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Electric Cos., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) (See appended statement, p. 5.)[1]
D. (6) $7,000.02.
E. (7) $362.38; (8) $48.20; (9) $410.58; (11) $410.58.

A. Thomas G. Walters, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Room 509, Washington, D. C.
B. Government Employees' Council A. F. of L., 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Room 509, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,625.

A. Milo J. Warner, 904 Nicholas Building, Toledo, Ohio.
B. The Prudential Insurance Company of America, Newark, N. J.
C. (2) Legislation which may affect the the interests of the mutual policyholders of The Prudential Insurance Company of America.
D. (6) $3,500.

A. Washington Board of Trade, 204 Evening Star Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the District of Columbia, of interest to the Washington Board of Trade.

A. Washington Home Rule Committee, 616–623 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) S. 999, District of Columbia Charter Act.
D. (6) $,2855.50.
E. (1) $254.93; (4) $18.36; (7) $843.76; (9) $1,117.05; (11) $1,117.05; (15).[1]

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Washington Real Estate Board, Inc., 312 Wire Building, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All local measures affecting the District of Columbia are of interest.
E. (3) $500; (9) $500; (11) $500.

A. Vincent T. Wasliewski, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Communications Act of 1934, as amended, 47 U. S. C. 151; Administrative Procedure Act, 5 U. S. C. 1001; bill to amend section 315 of Communications Act (H. R. 539); bill to establish daylight-saving time (H. R. 1722); bill to amend Communications Act re station licenses and revocations (H. R. 3977); bill to amend section 311 of Communications Act (S. 538); bills to provide standby economic controls (S. 753, 1081); bill to adopt rules re broadcasting of baseball (S. 1396); study of juvenile delinquency (S. Res. 88).

A. J. R. Watson, Room 1, I. C. R. R., Passenger Station, Jackson, Miss.
B. Mississippi Railroad Association, Room 1, I. C. R. R. Passenger Station, Jackson, Miss.
C. (2) Legislation affecting railroads in Mississippi. None.

A. William H. Webb, 1720 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Rivers & Harbors Congress, 1720 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All matters pertaining to river and harbor improvement, flood control, navigation, irrigation, reclamation, soil and water conservation, and related subjects.
D. (6) $3,150.57.
E. (5) $5.14; (7) $335.49; (8) $296.85; (9) $637.48; (11) $637.48; (12) $10; (15).[1]

A. Wayne M. Weishaar, 1115 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Aeronautical Training Society, 1115 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Airmen's training bills H. R. 1925 and S. 1253.
D. (6) $3,300.
E. (4) $4.75; (7) $13.10; (9) $17.85; (11) $17.85.

A. William E. Welsh, secretary-manager, 1119 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Reclamation Association, 1119 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) (a) Reclamation Act, 1902 (53 Stat. 1187, 43 U. S. C. 485) and all amendatory and supplementary acts thereto. H. R. 200, H. R. 236, H. R. 495, H. R. 555, H. R. 559, H. R. 993, H. R. 1038, H. R. 1716, H. R. 2229, H. R. 2267, H. R. 2337, H. R. 2971, H. R. 4463, H. R. 4406; S. 87, S. 118, S. 158, S. 446, S. 621, S. 624, S. 646, S. 887, S. 1197, S. 1572, S. 1555, S. 1603, and all other bills concerning reclamation, flood control as related to reclamation, and water and land conservation.
D. (6) $3,249.99.
E. (7) $303.62; (9) $303.62; (11) $303.62.

A. Richard P. White, 635 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Association of Nurserymen, Inc., 635 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the nursery industry directly.
D. (6) $3,124.98.
E. (2) $31.25; (4) $23.36; (5) $22.15; (6) $3.66; (7) $6.34; (9) $86.76; (11) $86.76.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. John C. White, Fulbright, Crooker, Freeman & White, 838 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Cotton Association, Cotton Exchange Building, Memphis, Tenn.; National Association of Cotton Shippers and Exporters; affiliated associations: Texas Cotton Association, Southern Cotton Shippers Association, Oklahoma State Cotton Exchange, California-Arizona Cotton Association, Atlantic Cotton Association, Arkansas Cotton Trade Association.
C. (2) Legislation affecting cotton and foreign trade, such as MSA, CCC, Commodity Futures Exchanges, and Price control. Specifically for S. 1413, H. R. 4465.
D. (5) $250.
E. (5) $1.20.

A. Wheeler & Wheeler, 704 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Missouri Pacific Railroad Co., 25 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.
E. (7) $117.30; (8) $13.72; (9) $130.02; (11) $130.02.

A. Wheeler & Wheeler, 704 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Contract Carrier Conference, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any proposed legislation pertaining to the investigation of domestic land and water transportation under the Motor Carrier Act.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. George Y. Wheeler, II, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Broadcasting Co., Inc., 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting National Broadcasting Co., Inc., and/or its affiliated companies.

A. Edward K. Wheeler, Wheeler & Wheeler, 704 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Shoreline Oil Co., Las Vegas, Nev.; Cray Co., Las Vegas, Nev.
C. (2) Any proposed legislation which affects the rights of the companies represented.

A. Western States Meat Packers Association, Inc., 604 Mission Street, suite 1002–3, San Francisco, Calif.
C. (2) Interested in legislation affecting livestock and meat packing industry.
D. (6) $70,627.27
E. (4) $23.69; (7) $135.06; (9) $158.75; (11) $158.75; (15).[1]

A. H. Leigh Whitelaw, 60 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association, Inc., 60 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Any and all legislation particularly affecting the interests of manufacturers of gas appliances and equipment.

A. Louis E. Whyte, 918 16th Street, NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., suite No. 501, Washington, D. C.
C. Matters of interest to the natural gas industry.
D. (6) $750.

A. Wilkinson, Boyden, Cragun & Barker, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Confederated Bands of Ute Indians, Fort Duchesne, Utah, and Ignacio, Colo.
C. (2) Supporting H. R. 4228 and S. 785.
E. (2) $3.23; (7) $6.65; (9) $9.78; (11) $9.78.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Wilkinson, Boyden, Cragun & Barker, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Menominee Tribe of Indians, Menominee Indian Agency, Neopit, Wis.

C. (2) The Menominee Tribe is interested in all legislation relating to Indian Affairs. The Menominee Tribe is currently favoring enactment of S. 1014 and H. R. 2828.

E. (2) $4.30; (6) $9.76; (7) $11.85; (9) $25.91; (11) $25.91.

A. Wilkinson, Boyden, Cragun & Barker, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Nicholas B. Perry, 1841 Columbia Road NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Relief for losses sustained at the hands of Hungarian and Rumanian Governments.

A. Franz O. Willenbucher, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Retired Officers Association, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Any and all legislation pertinent to the rights, benefits, privileges, and obligations of retired officers, male and female, regular and reserve, and their dependents and survivors, of whatever nature, dealing with personnel matters, pay, and retirement benefits and pensions, studying and analyzing bills, preparing statements for presentation to the cognizant committees, and principally the Committees on Armed Services, the Committees on Veterans' Affairs, and the committees dealing with various privileges, opportunities, and obligations of the personnel involved. (3) The Retired Officer.

D. (6) $1,800.

A. Williams, Myers, and Quiggle, 817 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.

B. National Food Brokers Association, 527 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Opposition to legislation tending to destroy the effectiveness of the antitrust laws to the detriment of free competition. Opposition to H. R. 635, H. R. 3501, H. R. 4170, S. 540, S. 1377. Support of legislation which would strengthen the effectiveness of the antitrust laws. Support of S. 1357. (All of the above bills to amend the Robinson-Patman Act.)

A. James L. Wilmeth, adviser, 3027 North Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

B. The National Council of the Junior Order of United American Mechanics of the United States of America, Inc.

C. (2) S. 339 and H. R. 1854 exempt pensions and annuitants of retired civil-service employees; S. 694 to prohibit display of international organization flags equal or superior to United States; S. 3 and S. 4 prevent citizens of United States of questionable loyalty from accepting employment.

D. (6) $231.95.

E. (4) $176.45; (8) $55.50; (9) $231.95; (11) $231.95.

A. E. Raymond Wilson, 104 C Street NE., Washington, D. C.

B. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 104 C Street NE., Washington, D. C.

C. (See p. 3, attached.) [1]

D. (6) $1,812.50.

E. (6) $2.50; (7) $78.08; (9) $80.58; (10) $80.58.

A. Frank E. Wilson, M. D., 1523 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $3,999.99.

E. (7) $843.73; (9) $843.73; (11) $843.73.

A. Everett T. Winter, 719 Omaha National Bank Building, Omaha, Nebr.

B. Mississippi Valley Association, 511 Locust Street, St. Louis, Mo.

C. Legislation relating to river and harbor maintenance and improvement, the American merchant marine, soil conservation, flood control, and regulation of domestic transportation.

D. (6) $3,500.

E. (7) $954.36; (9) $954.36; (11) $954.36.

A. Walter F. Woodul, Chronicle Building, Houston, Tex.

B. Angelina & Neches River Railroad Co., Keltys, Tex., et al.

C. (2) Generally legislation affecting Texas railroads.

D. (6) $5,086.16.

E. (6) $64.49; (7) $1,257.03; (9) $1,321.52; (11) $1,321.52; (15).[1]

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Frank K. Woolley, 261 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) (See attached.)[1]

D. (6) $2,171.87.

A. Edward W. Wootton, 900 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Wine Institute, 717 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

C. (2) Legislation affecting California wine and brandy industry.

A. Adam Yarmolinsky, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Chambers of Commerce of Venezuela, care of Caracas Chamber of Commerce, Sur 2, No. 30, Altos, Caracas, Venezuela.

C. (2) General interest in obtaining information on, and opposing, any legislation designed to increase tariffs or impose quotas on imports of petroleum products.

A. Adam Yarmolinsky, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Comite Franc-Dollar, 31, Avenue Pierre ler de Serbie, Paris 8e, France (a branch of the Conseil National du Patronat Francais).

C. (2) General interest in obtaining information on legislation affecting imports into the United States; tariffs, quotas, etc., and communicating such information individually to other interested persons in the United States.

A. Mr. Donald A. Young, 1615 H Street, Washington, D. C.

B. Chamber of Commerce of the United States, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) (Attachment A).[1]

D. (6) $1,750.

E. (8) $10.75; (9) $10.75; (11) $10.75.

A. J. Banks Young, 1832 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 18, Memphis, Tenn.

D. (6) $50.

E. (7) $5; (9) $5; (11) $5.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

REGISTRATIONS

The following registrations were submitted for the first calendar quarter 1953:

(NOTE.—The form used for registration is reproduced below. In the interest of economy, questions are not repeated, only the answers are printed, and are indicated by their respective letter and number. Also for economy in the RECORD, lengthy answers are abridged.)

FILE TWO COPIES WITH THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE AND FILE THREE COPIES WITH THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:

This page (page 1) is designed to supply identifying data; and page 2 (on the back of this page) deals with financial data.

PLACE AN "X" BELOW THE APPROPRIATE LETTER OR FIGURE IN THE BOX AT THE RIGHT OF THE "REPORT" HEADING BELOW:

"PRELIMINARY" REPORT ("Registration"): To "register," place an "X" below the letter "P" and fill out page 1 only.

"QUARTERLY" REPORT: To indicate which one of the four calendar quarters is covered by this Report, place an "X" below the appropriate figure. Fill out both page 1 and page 2 and as many additional pages as may be required. The first additional page should be numbered as page "3," and the rest of such pages should be "4," "5," "6," etc. Preparation and filing in accordance with instructions will accomplish compliance with all quarterly reporting requirements of the Act.

Year: 19_____ ←

REPORT

PURSUANT TO FEDERAL REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT

P	QUARTER			
	1st	2d	3d	4th
(Mark one square only)				

NOTE ON ITEM "A".—(a) IN GENERAL. This "Report" form may be used by either an organization or an individual, as follows:

(i) "Employee".—To file as an "employee", state (in Item "B") the name, address, and nature of business of the "employer". (If the "employee" is a firm [such as a law firm or public relations firm], partners and salaried staff members of such firm may join in filing a Report as an "employee".)

(ii) "Employer".—To file as an "employer", write "None" in answer to Item "B".

(b) SEPARATE REPORTS. An agent or employee should not attempt to combine his Report with the employer's Report:

(i) Employers subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their agents or employees.

(ii) Employees subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their employers.

A. ORGANIZATION OR INDIVIDUAL FILING:

1. State name, address, and nature of business.

2. If this Report is for an Employer, list names of agents or employees who will file Reports for this Quarter.

NOTE ON ITEM "B".—*Reports by Agents or Employees.* An employee is to file, each quarter, as many Reports as he has employers; except that: (a) If a particular undertaking is jointly financed by a group of employers, the group is to be considered as one employer, but all members of the group are to be named, and the contribution of each member is to be specified; (b) if the work is done in the interest of one person but payment therefor is made by another, a single Report—naming both persons as "employers"—is to be filed each quarter.

B. EMPLOYER.—State name, address, and nature of business. If there is no employer, write "None."

NOTE ON ITEM "C".—(a) The expression "in connection with legislative interests," as used in this Report, means "in connection with attempting, directly or indirectly, to influence the passage or defeat of legislation." "The term 'legislation' means bills, resolutions, amendments, nominations, and other matters pending or proposed in either House of Congress, and includes any other matter which may be the subject of action by either House"—§ 302 (e).

(b) Before undertaking any activities in connection with legislative interests, organizations and individuals subject to the Lobbying Act are required to file a "Preliminary" Report (Registration).

(c) After beginning such activities, they must file a "Quarterly" Report at the end of each calendar quarter in which they have either received or expended anything of value in connection with legislative interests.

C. LEGISLATIVE INTERESTS, AND PUBLICATIONS in connection therewith:

1. State approximately how long legislative interests are to continue. If receipts and expenditures in connection with legislative interests have terminated, ☐ place an "X" in the box at the left, so that this Office will no longer expect to receive Reports.

2. State the general legislative interests of the person filing and set forth the *specific* legislative interests by reciting: (a) Short titles of statutes and bills; (b) House and Senate numbers of bills, where known; (c) citations of statutes, where known; (d) whether for or against such statutes and bills.

3. In the case of those publications which the person filing has caused to be issued or distributed, in connection with legislative interests, set forth: (a) Description, (b) quantity distributed, (c) date of distribution, (d) name of printer or publisher (if publications were paid for by person filing) or name of donor (if publications were received as a gift).

(Answer items 1, 2, and 3 in the space below. Attach additional pages if more space is needed)

4. If this is a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) rather than a "Quarterly" Report, state below what the nature and amount of anticipated expenses will be; and if for an agent or employee, state also what the daily, monthly, or annual rate of compensation is to be. If this is a "Quarterly" Report, disregard this item "C4" and fill out Item "D" and "E" on the back of this page. Do not attempt to combine a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) with a "Quarterly" Report. ←

AFFIDAVIT

[Omitted in printing]

PAGE 1 ←

A. Thomas H. Alphin, M. D., 1523 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) All bills (Senate and House) relating to health and welfare. 3. (a) Information Bulletins (Bulletin and Capitol Clinic) (now merged into A. M. A. Washington Letter). Weekly news letter and legislative notes published in Journal of AMA.

A. The American Association of Port Authorities, 919 11th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) For Senate Joint Resolution 13 (Holland) and any similar bills with respect to tidelands; legislation increasing appropriation to United States Merchant Marine Academy; legislation involving shipping, Panama Canal tolls, foreign trade zones, river and harbor development. (4) (See attached).[1]

A. John R. Arant, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.

B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Measures affecting mining, such as income taxation, social security, public lands, stockpiling, monetary policy, etc. (4) 1. Ordinary expenses incurred for transportation, travel, and other related expenses. 2. $300 per month.

A. Mrs. R. Gordon Arneson, 5520 North 23rd Street, Arlington, Va.

B. Spokesmen for Children, 654 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Health, welfare, and reducation legislation. (4) I receive no compensation for my work. Am reimbursed for clerical expenses and travel, if any.

A. Richard B. Barker, Robert J. Bird, 306 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Eastman Kodak Co., Rochester, N. Y.

C. (2) Any legislation affecting war losses and excise taxes on photographic equipment. (4) Impossible to estimate the amount of expenses which would include travel, telephone and telegraph expenses. The firm is to be compensated on a quantum meruit basis.

A. Mrs. Louella Miller Berg, 1634 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Association of University Women, 1634 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Federal aid to education; qualified equal-rights amendment; strengthening the United Nations; protection of consumer against inflation and unfair trade practices; improvement of status of women; development of constructive foreign policy; strengthening of existing penal laws for sale of narcotics to minors (see attached legislative program). (3) Mimeographed materials on status of current legislation of interest to the association, sent to State legislative program chairmen. (4) Annual compensation, $5,400.

A. Andrew J. Biemiller, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Federation of Labor, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) All bills affecting the welfare of the country generally, and specifically bills affecting workers.

A. Blue Valley Study Association, Randolph, Kans.

C. (2) H. R. 2730, favoring legislation connected with Tuttle Creek Dam; flood control on Kansas River; soil conservation. (4) $500.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Carl Brown, 1627 Cadillac Tower Building, Detroit, Mich.

B. Foreman's Association of America, 1627 Cadillac Tower, Detroit, Mich.

C. (4) Traveling and living expenses, $150.

A. Thomas H. Burke, 734 Fifteenth St. NW., Washington, D. C.

B. United Automobile Workers of America, CIO, 8000 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

C. (2) Support all legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare.

A. Miss Sally Butler, General Federation of Women's Clubs.

B. General Federation of Women's Clubs, 1734 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislation on citizenship, communications, conservation, education, government and economic policies, international relations, national defense, welfare and legislation regarding women and children. (4) Estimate is $600 per annum or $50 per month devoted to contacts, hearings, etc.

A. Ralph H. Case, 889 National Press building, Washington, D. C.

B. Sioux Tribe of Indians, Cheyenne River Reservation, S. Dak., under attorney's contract approved May 20, 1948, by Commissioner of Indian Affairs; Oahe Dam project. Address: Cheyenne Agency, South Dakota.

C. (2) S. 695, H. R. 2233; Oahe Dam project.

A. Fred L. Crawford, 516 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Richardson Vista Corp., Panoramic View Corp., Hollywood Vista Apartments, Anchorage, Alaska.

C. (2) Appearance before House Committee on Government operations in Alaska housing. (4) $100 per diem.

A. Edward B. Crosland, 195 Broadway, New York, N. Y., and 725 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Telephone and Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Matters affecting communications; (4) Registrant reimbursed for out-of-pocket expenses. Compensation $1,541.67 per month. (See Attachment A.)

A. Robert A. Crichton, 1000 Vermont Avenue, Washington, D. C.

B. American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) All prospective legislation which will or may affect the life insurance business. (4) (See attached.)[1]

A. John A. Danaher, 50 State Street, Hartford, Conn., and 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. The B. F. Goodrich Co., 500 South Main Street, Akron, Ohio.

C. (2) Legislation affecting the manufacture, sale, and distribution of automobile tires. (4) Telephone and stenographic services incident to the general practice of law. Compensation will be determined in due course.

A. John A. Danaher, 50 State Street, Hartford, Conn.; and 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. The Firestone Tire & Rubber Co., Akron, Ohio.

C. (2) Legislation affecting the manufacture, sale, and distribution of automobile tires. (4) Telephone and stenographic services incident to the general practice of law. Compensation will be determined in due course.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Wesley A. Dierberger, Consolidated Building, Indianapolis, Ind.

B. Wabash Realty, Inc., Sycamore Building, Terre Haute, Ind.

C. (2) Amendment of H. R. 1, a bill to reduce the individual income tax. Other tax legislation. (4) Estimated travel and hotel expenses, $2,000, with fee to be based on results accomplished.

A. Richard S. Doyle, 404 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Fletcher Trust Co., and Jessie Reed Millis, executors of estate of Fred Millis, deceased, Indianapolis, Inc.

C. (2) Federal estate taxes. Section 811 (c), Internal Revenue Code, as amended. 63 Statutes 895; 65 Statutes 567. For amendment of section 811 (c), Internal Revenue Code. (4) Anticipated expenses nominal for telephone and travel. Attorney's fees will cover both legislative and nonlegislative services and have not been determined.

A. Henry I. Dworshak, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.

B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Measures affecting mining, such as income taxation, social security, public lands, stockpiling, monetary policy, etc. (4) 1. Ordinary expenses incurred for transportation, travel, and other related expenses; 2. $300 per month.

A. Rev. D. Howard Elliott, 207 Darlington Road, Beaver Falls, Pa.

B. The Reformed Presbyterian Church of North America, 209 Ninth Street, Pittsburgh, Pa.

C. (2) We are working toward a divine acknowledgment in the Constitution. (4) I receive no compensation other than expenses for this work. My travel and living expense will not exceed $200 for the stay in Washington.

A. Robert B. Ely III, 1600 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

B. Insurance Company of North America, 1600 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

C. (2) H. R. 4343. (4) Employee mentioned above is in the legal department of the company and will receive no additional remuneration for his services other than reimbursements of actual expenses incurred for transportation, telephone, hotel, and incidental out-of-pocket expenses.

A. Joseph G. Feeney, 1209 Whitehall Building, New York, N. Y.

B. National St. Lawrence Project Conference, 843 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Any legislation with reference to St. Lawrence Waterway and power project (opposed). (4) Vice president, Republic Coal and Coke Co., serving as chairman of National St. Lawrence Project Conference at the nominal fee of $3,000 per year and for reimbursement of expenses.

A. Estate of Karrie J. Ferguson, deceased, care of John A. Ferguson, Jr., executor, Post Office Box 5150, Terminal Annex, Denver, Colo.

C. (2) For amendment of section 811 (c) (1) (B) Internal Revenue Code to prevent its application to trusts created prior to March 4, 1931. (4) Nature of expenses: telephone, telegraph, and travel expenses, etc. Amount of expenses: cannot presently be determined.

A. Irving Ferman,[3] Century Building, 412 Fifth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Civil Liberties Union, 170 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Supported: (H. R. 28, S. 127, S. 1733); (H. R. 1320, S. 1734); (H. R. 29); (S. 1732); (S. 656); (S. 49, S. 50). (4) Expenses, $1,500 per annum (for legislative purposes). Compensation, $1,400 per annum (for legislative purposes).

A. Fletcher Trust Co. and Jessie Reed Millis, executors, estate of Fred Millis, deceased, Indianapolis, Ind.

C. (2) Federal estate taxes. Section 811 (c), Internal Revenue Code, as amended. Bill to amend section 811 (c), Internal Revenue Code, being drafted. 63 Stat. 895; 65 Stat. 567. For amendment of section 811 (c), Internal Revenue Code. (4) Anticipated expenses nominal for telephone and travel. Attorney's fees will cover both legislative and nonlegislative services and have not been determined.

A. Florida Citrus Mutual, Lakeland, Fla.

C. (2) In any legislation that affects the citrus industry. (4) $10,000 per year plus $100 per day when out of the office, and actual expenses to J. Hardin Peterson.

A. Robert Franklin, 327 North Van Ness, Fresno, Calif.

B. Allied Wool Industry Committee, 327 North Van Ness, Fresno, Calif., 414 Pacific National Life Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.

C. (2) H. R. 1427. (4) Fee $1,000 per month. Anticipated expenses approximately $1,000 per month.

A. Marion R. Garstang, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Any legislation that may affect milk producers or the cooperatives through which they act together to process and market their milk. (4) $9,750 per annum, effective January 1, 1953; reimbursed for all actual expenses.

A. Gus F. Geissler.

B. Farmers Educational & Cooperative Union of America, 1555 Sherman St., Denver, Colo.; and 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (4) My only receipts consist of my salary which is $12,000 per annum. All expenses incurred by me are paid by the National Farmers Union.

A. Leif Gilstad, Transportation Association of America, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Transportation Association of America, 130 North Wells Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) Transportation legislation generally. (4) $21,000 a year salary.

A. Philip P. Gott, National Confectioners' Association of the United States, Inc., 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

B. National Confectioners' Association of the United States, Inc., 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) Agricultural, foreign trade, control, tax, and food and drug legislation. (4) Approximately $3,000 per year, dependent upon activity.

A. Miss Eleanor M. Hadley, 1751 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Consumers League, 1751 N Street NW.

C. (2) Legislation affecting migratory workers in agriculture. (4) Salary: $125 per week.

---

[3] Filed with the Clerk only.

A. Ralph M. Hanneman, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) Any legislation affecting the real-estate industry. (4) $4,600 per year.

A. Edmund Hardesty, Box 371, Marianna, Pa.

B. Foreman's Association of America, 1627 Cadillac Tower, Detroit, Mich.

C. (2) The legislative interest of the Foreman's Association is to procure appropriate amendment of section 2 (11) of the Labor Management Relations Act of 1947 to protect the rights of foremen to self-organization and to bargain collectively. (4) Traveling and living expenses, $150 plus wages for time lost from regular employment, approximately $100.

A. Mrs. Margaret Harper, 15687 East State Fair, Detroit, Mich.

B. Chrysler Chapter No. 3, Foreman's Association of America, 13534 Woodward Avenue, Highland Park, Mich.

C. (2) The legislative interest of the Foreman's Association, Chrysler Chapter No. 3, is to procure appropriate amendment of section 2 (11) of the Labor Management Relations Act of 1947 to protect the rights of foremen to self-organization and to bargain collectively. (4) Traveling and living expenses estimated not to exceed $160.

A. Herbert S. Hirsch, Associate of Cleary, Gotlieb, Friendly & Ball, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) General interest in obtaining information on, and opposing, any legislation designed to increase tariffs or impose quotas on imports of petroleum products.

A. Fuller Holloway, 1000 Shoreham Building, Washington D. C.

B. The Toilet Goods Association, Inc., 9 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N. Y.

C. (For answers to 1, 2, 3, and 4, see attached page marked "Page 3").[1]

A. Mrs. Edna Howe, 61 Buena Vista, Highland Park, Mich.

B. Chrysler Chapter No. 3, Foreman's Association of America, 13534 Woodward Avenue, Highland Park, Mich.

C. (2) The legislative interest of the Foreman's Association, Chrysler Chapter No. 3, is to procure appropriate amendment of section 2 (11) of the Labor Management Relations Act of 1947 to protect the rights of foremen to self-organization and to bargain collectively. (4) Traveling and living expenses estimated not to exceed $160.

A. Harold K. Howe, 205 Mills Building, Washington, D. C.

B. The Lawn Mower Institute, Inc., 205 Mills Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (4) $6,000 per year, including all expenses.

A. Mrs. Ruth Johnson, 716 Cherry Street, Royal Oak, Detroit, Mich.

B. Chrysler Chapter, No. 3, Foreman's Association of America, 13534 Woodward Avenue, Highland Park, Mich.

C. (2) The legislative interest of the Foreman's Association, Chrysler Chapter, No. 3, is to procure appropriate amendment of section 2 (11) of the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947 to protect the rights of foremen to self-organization and to bargain collectively. (4) Traveling and living expenses estimated not to exceed $160.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Norman J. Keehn, 5936 Edgewood Street, Monroe, Mich.

B. Foreman's Association of America, 1627 Cadillac Tower, Detroit, Mich.

C. (2) The legislative interest of the Foreman's Association is to procure appropriate amendment of section 2 (11) of the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947 to protect the rights of foremen to self-organization and to bargain collectively. (4) Traveling and living expenses—$150, plus wages for time lost from regular employment, approximately $100.

A. Jeff Kibre, 930 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. International Longshoremen's & Warehousemen's Union, 150 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.; National Union of Marine Cooks and Stewards, 86 Commercial Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Dan Lacy, 2 West 46th Street, New York, N. Y.

B. American Book Publishers Council, Inc., 2 West 46th Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (4) $17,500 per annum reimbursed for actual expenses.

A. Ivy Lee and T. J. Ross, 405 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.

B. Committee of American Shipping Companies Serving Essential Foreign Trade Routes (office of present chairman at 26 Beaver Street, New York, N. Y.).

C. (2) Legislation affecting the United States merchant marine. Merchant Marine Act of 1936. (4) $500 per month retaining fee only.

A. Robert R. Livingston, Capitol Theater, Lincoln, Nebr.

B. Council of Motion Picture Organizations, Inc., 1501 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Repeal of section 1700 (a), as amended, by section 1650 I. R. C. (20 percent tax on theater admissions). (3) Your Plan for Tax Repeal. (4) Traveling and miscellaneous expenses estimated $500 per month.

A. Lucas & Thomas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Acacia Mutual Life Insurance Co., Washington, D. C.

C. (4) $750 per quarter. Anticipated expenses—not over $300.

A. Lucas & Thomas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Finance Conference, 176 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (4) $1,250 per quarter. Amount of anticipated expenses—not over $500.

A. Lucas & Thomas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Adolph Von Zedlitz, 100 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) S. 155 and H. R. 3594, to amend section 32 of the Trading With the Enemy Act. (4) Registrants are to receive no compensation or expenses for work in behalf of the passage of these bills.

A. Ernest W. McFarland, La Salle Building, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Cable & Radio Corp., New York City; RCA Communications, Inc., New York City; Western Union Telegraph Co., New York City.

C. (4) $2,500 per month salary and $1,000 per month for expenses, including travel, office, stenographic, and miscellaneous expenses.

A. Merle H. Miller, Consolidated Building, Indianapolis, Ind.
B. Wabash Realty, Inc., Sycamore Building, Terre Haute, Ind.
C. (2) Amendment of H. R. 1. (4) Estimated travel and hotel expenses $2,000, with fee to be based on results acomplished.

A. Harry L. Moffett, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Measures affecting mining, such as income taxation, social security, public lands, stockpiling, monetary policy, etc. (4) Ordinary expenses incurred for transportation, travel, and other related expenses, $416.66 per month.

A. Chester Mueller, 830 Broad Street, Newark, N. J.
C. (2) My interest is in having the discriminatory excise tax on domestic floor polishers eliminated from code, section 3406 (a) (3). (4) Combined expenses and compensation estimated not to exceed $5,000.

A. Francis J. Myers, 2026 Land Title Building, Philadelphia, Pa.
B. National Foundation for Consumer Credit, Inc., 1627 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Senate 753, Senate 1081. Quarterly compensation, $937.50.

A. Mrs. Stephen J. Nicholas, 1734 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. General Federation of Women's Clubs, 1734 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) House Joint Resolution 74. (4) Estimate is $300 per annum or $25 per month, devoted to contacts, hearings, etc.

A. Donald W. Nyrop, Room 710, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Conference of Local Airlines, Room 710, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Support legislation which is in the interest of a sound national air transportation policy. (4) Anticipated expenses should ordinarily be not in excess of $400 per quarter; compensation will represent prorating of fees in accordance with time spent.

A. Lovell H. Parker, 614 Colorado Building, Washington, D. C.
B. None: Self-employed (retained as a consultant by Iron Ore Lessors Association, Inc., First National Bank Building, St. Paul, Minn.
C. (2) Tax legislation affecting the lessors of coal lands.

A. Endicott Peabody, Esq., 50 State Street, Boston, Mass.
B. Charles D. Cook, M. D., Boston Lying-in Hospital, 221 Longwood Avenue, Boston, Mass.
C. (2) Senate 1531. (4) $10 an hour for my time, $500 expenses.

A. Pehle, Lessor, Mann, Riemer, & Luxford, 1616 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Mrs. Jean D. Puckle, 56 Avenue Foch, Paris, France. Employer, an American citizen, is not engaged in business. She has engaged the firm of Pehle, Lesser, Mann, Riemer, & Luxford, of Washington, D. C., to represent her generally in respect of her interest as a beneficiary of the estate of her mother, the late Emma G. Donaldson.
C. (2) The only legislative interest is in action affecting section 811 (c) (1) (B) of the Internal Revenue Code, as applicable to transfers made prior to March 4, 1931. (4) The firm of Pehle, Lesser, Mann, Riemer & Luxford is to be compensated generally for its services to Jean D. Puckle, and not specifically for legislative services. It is not expected that any expenses will be incurred in connection with legislative interests.

A. D. Michael Perry, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Measures affecting mining, such as income taxation, social security, public lands, stockpiling, monetary policy, etc. (4) Ordinary expenses incurred for transportation, travel, and other related expenses $300 per month.

A. Pershing, Bosworth, Dick & Dawson, 320 Equitable Building, Denver, Colo.
B. Estate of Karrie J. Ferguson, deceased, care of John A. Ferguson, Jr., executor, Post Office Box 5150 Terminal Annex, Denver, Colo.
C. (2) For amendment of section 811 (c) (1) (B) Internal Revenue Code, to prevent its application to trusts created prior to March 4, 1931. (4) Nature of expenses: telephone, telegraph, and travel expenses, etc. Amount of expenses: cannot presently be determined.

A. J. Hardin Peterson, Postoffice Box 2097, Dixieland Station, Lakeland, Fla.
B. Florida Citrus Mutual, Lakeland, Fla.
C. (2) In any legislation that affects the citrus industry. (4) $10,000 per year plus $100 per day when out of the office, and actual expenses to J. Hardin Peterson. Actual expenses contemplated will be railroad fare, hotel, meals, taxi cabs, telephone and telegraph and postage, estimated $2,500 for a year.

A. George C. Phillips, 9084 Longacre, Detroit, Mich.
B. Foreman's Association of America, 1627 Cadillac Tower, Detroit, Mich.
C. (2) The legislative interest of the Foreman's Association is to procure appropriate amendment of section 2 (11) of the Labor Management Relations Act of 1947 to protect the rights of foremen to self-organization and to bargain collectively. (4) Traveling and living expenses—$150 plus wages for time lost from regular employment, approximately $100.

A. Mrs. Jesse Phillips, 9084 Longacre, Detroit Mich.
B. Chrysler Chapter No. 3, Foreman's Association of America, 13534 Woodward Avenue, Highland Park, Mich.
C. (2) The legislative interest of the Foreman's Association, Chrysler Chapter No. 3, is to procure appropriate amendment of section 2 (11) of the Labor Management Relations Act of 1947 to protect the rights of foremen to self-organization and to bargain collectively. (4) Traveling and living expenses estimated not to exceed $160.

A. Edward R. Place, 1507 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Lace Manufacturers Association, Inc., 212 Turks Head Building, Providence, R. I.
C. (2) General legislative interests are in tariffs. (4) Anticipated expenses, $25 per month; annual rate of compensation, $6,000.

A. Mrs. Jean D. Puckle, 56 Avenue Foch, Paris, France. Employer, an American citizen, is not engaged in business. She has engaged the firm of Pehle, Lesser, Mann, Riemer & Luxford of Washington, D. C., to represent her generally in respect of her interest as a beneficiary of the estate of her mother, the late Emma G. Donaldson.
C. (2) The only legislative interest is in action affecting section 811 (c) (1) (B) of the Internal Revenue Code, as applicable to transfers made prior to March 4, 1931. (4) The firm of Pehle, Lesser, Mann, Riemer & Luxford is to be compensated generally for its services to Jean D. Puckle, and not specifically for legislative services. It is not expected that any expenses will be incurred in connection with legislative interests.

A. Rev. George Mackay Robb, 2507 S. Salina Street, Syracuse, N. Y.
B. Reformed Presbyterian Church of North America, 209 Ninth Street, Pittsburgh, Pa.
C. (2) Working toward a divine acknowledgement in the Constitution. (4) I receive no salary or compensation other than expenses.

A. Mr. John C. Reid, Mr. Robert J. Bird, Ivins, Phillips & Barker, Southern Bld., Washington, D. C.
B. Symington-Gould Corp., Depew, N. Y.
C. (2) Amendatory legislation in respect to the Excess Profits Tax Act. (4) Impossible to estimate the amount of expense for travel, and telephone and telegraph. Firm to be compensated on quantum meruit basis.

A. Mr. John C. Reid, Mr. Robert J. Bird, Ivins, Phillips & Barker, Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Estate of O. P. Woodward, 103 East Main Street, Rochester, N. Y.
C. (2) Amendatory legislation, section 113 (a) (5) Internal Revenue Code. (4) Impossible to estimate the amount of expense for travel and telephone and telegraph. Firm to be compensated on quantum meruit basis.

A. Benjamin H. Saunders, 1000 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Toilet Goods Association, Inc., 9 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N. Y.
C. (For answers to 1, 2, 3, and 4, see attached page marked "Page 3.")[1]

A. Hollis M. Seavey, 532 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Clear Channel Broadcasting Service (CCBS); suite 532, Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) CCBS is opposed to any proposed legislation (such as S. 491 and H. R. 4004, 81st Cong.) calling for the duplication of class I–A clear channel frequencies or the limitation of the power of class I–A standard broadcast stations. CCBS opposes ratification of the so-called NARBA agreement signed November 15, 1950. (4) (See exhibit 1).[1]

A. Irwin W. Silverman, 516 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Richardson Vista Corp., Panoramic View Corp., Hollywood Vista Apartments, Inc., Anchorage, Alaska.
C. (2) Appearance before House Committee on Government Operations on Alaska housing. (4) $100 per diem.

A. Edward L. Sittler, Jr., 1608 20th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Home Rule Headquarters and Home Rule Committee.
C. (2) S. 999. (4) Actual living expenses while in District of Columbia, plus a per diem of $50.

A. R. A. Smith, 1627 Cadillac Tower Building, Detroit, Mich.
B. Foreman's Association of America, 1627 Cadillac Tower, Detroit, Mich.
C. (2) The legislative interest of the Foreman's Association is to procure appropriate amendment of section 2 (11) of the Labor Management Relations Act of 1947 to protect the rights of foremen to self-organization and to bargain collectively. (4) Traveling and living expenses, $150, plus wages for time lost from regular employment, approximately $100.

A. Charles P. Taft, 906 First National Bank Building, Cincinnati, Ohio.
B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly & Ball, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

C. (2) Opposing legislation imposing increased duties or quotas on imports of petroleum and petroleum products.

A. Barrett Godwin Tawresey, 1600 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
B. Insurance Company of North America, 1600 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
C. (2) H. R. 4343.

A. Margaret K. Taylor, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation that may affect milk producers or the cooperatives through which they act together to process and market their milk. (4) To receive a salary of $9,750 per annum.

A. H. Willis Tobler, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation that may affect milk producers or the cooperatives through which they act together to process and market their milk. (4) To receive a salary of $9,915 per annum.

A. Antoine Waupochick, Keshena, Wis.
B. Menominee Tribe of Indians, Menominee Indian Agency, Keshena, Wis.
C. (2) Favor enactment of S. 1014 and H. R. 2828. (4) Registrant receives salary of $4,800 per year as chairman of Menominee Advisory Council and $9 per diem while on actual business in Washington, D. C.

A. Wheeler & Wheeler, 704 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Missouri Pacific Railroad Co., 25 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (4) Compensation: $500 per month and reimbursement for out-of-pocket expenses, which will be incidental in nature and amount.

A. Wilkinson, Boyden, Cragun & Barker, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. C. W. Carlstrom, 4205 Pacific Highway, San Diego, Calif.

A. Walter F. Woodul, 818 Chronicle Building, Houston, Tex.
B. Angelina & Neches River Railroad Co. et al., Keltys, Tex.
C. (2) All legislation affecting Texas railroads. (4) Monthly compensation, $1,458.33, and ordinary out-of-pocket expense away from home, telephone and telegraph, and incidental expense.

A. Jerome Worden, Keshena, Wis.
B. Menominee Tribe of Indians, Menominee Indian Agency, Keshena, Wis.
C. (2) Favor enactment of S. 1014 and H. R. 2828. (4) Registrant receives salary while on actual business in Washington, D. C., of $16 per day and $9 per diem.

SENATE

TUESDAY, JUNE 16, 1953

(Legislative day of Monday, June 8, 1953)

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

Rev. Everett Y. Seale, pastor, First Methodist Church, Beeville, Tex., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, as we come into Thy presence we thank Thee for our many blessings and invoke Thy divine guidance in the deliberations of this Senate. Bless them, their homes, and the States that they represent.

As we realize our heritage that has been left to us by those who have given so much, may we know our own responsibilities to Thee and Thy world, and only as we come to Thee in humility of spirit, with wills surrendered to Thy will, can we fulfill them.

Looking to Thee as the author and finisher of our faith, may we do all in our power to bring about peace on earth and good will among all peoples. We pray in Thy name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. KNOWLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, June 15, 1953, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations 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. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4495) to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, so as to provide for special registration, classification, and induction of certain medical, dental, and allied specialist categories, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 1308. An act to amend the Color of Title Act;

H. R. 2231. An act to authorize the negotiation and ratification of separate settlement contracts with the Sioux Indians of the Lower Brule and the Crow Creek Reservations in South Dakota for Indian lands and rights acquired by the United States for the Fort Randall Dam and Reservoir, Missouri River development, to authorize a transfer of funds from the Secretary of Defense to the Secretary of the Interior and to authorize an appropriation for the removal from the taking area of the Fort Randall Dam and Reservoir, Missouri River development, and the reestablishment of the Indians of the Yankton Indian Reservation in South Dakota; and

H. R. 2824. An act to encourage the discovery, development, and production of tungsten ores, and concentrates in the United States, its Territories and possessions, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

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

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

H. R. 4730. An act to provide for the conveyance by the United States to the city of Cincinnati, Ohio, of certain lands formerly owned by that city.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF POSITION OF SENATOR CAPEHART ON CERTAIN YEA-AND-NAY VOTES ON AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, because of an oversight in connection with the yea-and-nay votes on pages 6494, 6495, and 6496 in the RECORD of June 15, 1953, the voting position of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] was omitted from the announcements. Had he been present and voting the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] would have voted as follows: "Yea" on the amendment of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], page 6494; "yea" on the amended amendment of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], page 6495; and "nay"' on the amendment of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], page 6496.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, Mr. LEHMAN was excused from attendance on the session of the Senate today.

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate beginning Thursday, until next Monday.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Airplane Procurement of the Committee on Armed Services may be authorized to meet tomorrow afternoon if the Senate is then in session.

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

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

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following the quorum call such business as is usual in a morning hour may be transacted under the usual practice of a 2-minute limitation on speeches.

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business for the