

6/2/53

COPY

Mr. President, last week President Eisenhower took what must have been an interesting and enlightening tour of the great Agricultural Research Center operated by the Department of Agriculture out at Beltsville, Maryland.

The New York Times of Wednesday, May 27, carried a particularly interesting account of that visit, written by William M. Blair and headed, "President Eisenhower Becomes a Farm Boy for a Day". I ask unanimous consent that the article be inserted in the record.

Mr. President I would like to call the Senate's attention to a few of President Eisenhower's remarks quoted in that article.

Mr. Blair quotes the President as saying:

"I read in the papers of making a lot of promises that I did not make. But I did make one which shows I'm not as

stupid as I sometimes appear. ~~That~~ was that we needed
more research." End Quote.

Let me quote further from the article:

"He went on to tell a small group of the country's top agricultural scientists and guests gathered at the Department of Agriculture's research center here that more work was needed in this field because it was 'better than direct help'.

"'Keep up the good work' he urged the scientists. And, in a statement directed at Congress, he concluded: 'Anybody who wants to limit the very modest appropriation for research better come out and see Beltsville before they vote.'"

I respectfully suggest to President Eisenhower that he might be better informed about what his own lieutenants are doing contrary to his publicly expressed views, both in the campaign and since.

I find it difficult to reconcile the President's observations with the cold, hard facts that his Administration's revised budget estimates provided for a reduction of \$2,347,900 in funds for agricultural research below the level proposed by the original Democratic budget -- a slash

COPY

that has since been cut even further by the Republican-

controlled House Committee to a total reduction of \$3,636,563

in this important work of which the President says we need

more, rather than less.

I find extremely interesting his inquiry to officials of the Bureau of Animal Industry about cattle research -- and again I quote the President, "When are you going to get one that resists hoof and mouth disease?" -- in view of his Administration's recommendation that funds for animal research be slashed four percent, and funds for animal disease control and eradication by slashes 6 percent below the Truman budget. I cannot help but observe that the Republican-controlled House appropriations committee cut funds for animal research still further, to 10% below the original estimates. I'm glad the Committee increased very

slightly ~~the amounts for animal~~ **COPY** disease control and eradication above what the Eisenhower Administration requested, until it is now only 5% below the Democratic budget -- but still below the actual amount allocated for this important work in 1953.

I'm sure many farmers who have been trying to get rid of brucellosis will sympathize with the President's comment that, and again I quote: "I had a heifer I paid \$3,500 for and she died when she gave birth to a calf". I do not think they will be so sympathetic, however, over Secretary of Agriculture Benson's recommendation for reduction in indemnity payments for brucellosis control.

I was interested in the concern the President is evidently feeling about butter, in view of his remarks in the article. I cannot help but wonder if he has been fully apprised of the fact that his budget includes a sharp slash from original estimates for research on dairy products,

COPY

work which would have included finding out about the chemical composition of milk, improving evaporated milk, developing usefulness of milk solids, and other steps which would keep butter from glutting the market by enabling farmers to sell it more cheaply without loss to themselves.

Mr. President, perhaps I should go on right down the line on the Department of Agriculture's new budget estimates for research. But instead I'll just quote very briefly from the statement of Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson before the subcommittee on agricultural appropriations in the House, on March 26, saying:

"Recognizing the very important part research has played in the development of agriculture, and the contribution it can make in solving many of the immediate and long-range

COPY

problems facing agriculture today, an attempt has been made to avoid any substantial reductions in this essential work".

Now that is quite an example of lip service to research in the same breath as an announcement of reductions ahead.

In view of the many public addresses and utterances of the Secretary of Agriculture about the importance of research, and the need for greater dependence upon research, I must say he has a rather unusual way of exemplifying his beliefs, if this is any example.

I hope the President will not have the joy taken out of his recent Beltsville visit, when he learns his Administration is proposing to hold down much needed research work, rather than expand it as most of us apparently including the President, desire.

COPY

I can understand the need of the President to have lieutenants prepare his agricultural campaign speeches, and I can understand his need now to have lieutenants carry out his agricultural policies. My only suggestion is that there might be less conflict and more uniformity of objectives if the same lieutenants were used for both.



Minnesota Historical Society

Copyright in this digital version belongs to the Minnesota Historical Society and its content may not be copied without the copyright holder's express written permission. Users may print, download, link to, or email content, however, for individual use.

To request permission for commercial or educational use, please contact the Minnesota Historical Society.



www.mnhs.org