

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation providing for a new post office building in the county of Kauai; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Florida, requesting the abolition of certain provisions of the laws of the United States of America invoked by the Social Security Administration as the basis for regulations for withholding information as to the names and other information concerning persons who are recipients of welfare payments; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, with respect to Federal taxes on gasoline and motor fuel; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to oppose any measures to alter the tax status of cooperatives; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BRAY:

H. R. 3890. A bill for the relief of Hormoz Mahmoud; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRNE of New York:

H. R. 3891. A bill for the relief of Paul D. Banning, Chief Disbursing Officer, Treasury Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. R. 3892. A bill for the relief of Milton C. Towner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. R. 3893. A bill for the relief of Eiko Takano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3894. A bill for the relief of Albert M. Goldberg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING:

H. R. 3895. A bill for the relief of Ethel Cristeta Berner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 3896. A bill for the relief of Frank A. Wefel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MANSFIELD (by request):

H. R. 3897. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue to Yellowstone Metals, Inc., patents in fee to certain lands in Meagher County, Mont.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RAMSAY:

H. R. 3898. A bill for the relief of William E. Gillespie, Jr.; 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:

256. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Elmo J. Osborne, manager, Texas Power Reserve Electric Cooperative, Inc., Austin Tex., relative to declaring opposition to the policy of the Administrator of Rural Electrification Administration issued September 21, 1950; to the Committee on Agriculture.

257. Also, petition of Leon K. Sterling, Sr., clerk, office of the city and county clerk, Honolulu, T. H., relative to obtaining grants of Federal funds to the counties of the Territory of Hawaii for antidisaster expenditures; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

258. Also, petition of Jose Ma. Araneta, secretary, Tagbilaran, Philippine Islands, relative to requesting the release of \$100,000,000 appropriation for the payment of war damage claims in the Philippines; to the Committee on Appropriations.

## SENATE

TUESDAY, MAY 1, 1951

(Legislative day of Tuesday, April 17, 1951)

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

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

O Thou God of life and light, our glad hearts thrill at the risen glory of the awakening earth robed in the blooming garb of spring. We are grateful for the mystic wonder of this yearly miracle, as nature climbs to a soul in leaf and flower and the earth showeth Thy handiwork. Together we bow in the hush and joy of Thy presence, pausing in the morning tasks to listen for Thy call sounding in our ears. In the stillness, wilt Thou whisper some word of insight within our souls.

Have mercy upon us for our frantic boasts, our foolish words, and our perverse ways. Save us from small and selfish living in so great a day. In the vision splendid of divine fatherhood and of human brotherhood which knows no frontiers, may we dream our dreams, mold our lives, enact our laws, build our Nation and plan our world, until this shadowed earth which is our home rolls out of the darkness into light, and it is daybreak everywhere. Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, April 30, 1951, was dispensed with.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, Mr. SMITH of North Carolina was excused from attendance on sessions of the Senate today and Wednesday.

#### COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service may meet during the session of the Senate this afternoon, to hear testimony on the postal-rate bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I shall not object to the request, because I know how important it is to have such matters attended to. However, I wish to point out that the bill which is now the unfinished business of the Senate has been dragging on, day after day after day, and our work on the bill has been handicapped because there have been so many meetings of various Senate com-

mittees. One of the principal reasons why the bill which is the unfinished business has not been finally passed upon by the Senate is the handicap caused by the meeting of so many committees and subcommittees of the Senate during the course of the debate on this piece of proposed legislation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me say that if I thought the committee meetings were the real reason why more progress has not been made on the bill which is the unfinished business, I would object to the request which has been made. However, I think the real reason has been the speeches which have been made on other matters.

I think we are going to come to the time when objection will have to be made to having committees, with the possible exception of the Appropriations Committee, meet during the sessions of the Senate, if we expect to end the session at any reasonable time this year. I hope we can do so. I concur in what the distinguished minority leader has said; I certainly hope we can make progress on this bill today.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, in reply to what has been said, I wish to say that I thoroughly agree with what the Senators have stated. However, inasmuch as at this particular time the committee has before it the Deputy Postmaster General, who has been testifying, I have felt obligated to come to the Senate Chamber and make the request, in order that he might be able to continue his testimony. That was the only reason for making the request.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from South Carolina? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

On request of Mr. RUSSELL, and by unanimous consent, the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee considering the Treasury and Post Office appropriation bill, was authorized to meet in the hearing room of the Appropriations Committee during the session of the Senate today.

#### CONFERRING OF POWERS OF STANDING COMMITTEES ON THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS AND THE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES SITTING JOINTLY

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that for the purpose of holding joint meetings in accordance with the order of the Senate of April 25, 1951, the Committees on Armed Services and Foreign Relations be constituted a committee of the Senate with all the powers conferred upon standing committees of the Senate.

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

#### TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators be

permitted to present petitions and memorials, submit reports, introduce bills and joint resolutions, and transact other routine business, without debate and without speeches.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

**RULES OF CIVIL PROCEDURE BY UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT (H. DOC. NO. 121)**

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of amendments to the Rules of Civil Procedure for the United States District Courts, adopted by the Court, together with a supplementary report, containing the original report, of the Court's Advisory Committee on Rules for Civil Procedure, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

**PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS**

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

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution adopted by the Goodfellow Sunday-school class of the First Baptist Church, San Angelo, Tex., pledging anew, as members, their faith in God and their allegiance to His cause, and calling upon Christians throughout the Nation to join in prayer for uplifting the moral standards of the world; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A communication from the family of former Senator Arthur H. Vandenberg, acknowledging with thanks the expression of sympathy from the Senate on the occasion of the death of the former Senator; ordered to lie on the table.

**INCREASED SALARIES FOR POSTAL EMPLOYEES—RESOLUTION OF RHODE ISLAND GENERAL ASSEMBLY**

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague, the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] and myself, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the General Assembly of Rhode Island on April 25, 1951, entitled "Resolution memorializing Congress with relation to the passage of Senate bill 355 and House of Representatives bill 244, providing for the elimination of the six lowest-salary grades for postal clerks and carriers and providing for a 17-percent increase in the annual salary of post office employees receiving less than \$5,000 annually."

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution memorializing Congress with relation to the passage of Senate bill No. 355 and House of Representatives bill No. 244, providing for the elimination of the six lowest salary grades for postal clerks and carriers and providing for a 17-percent increase in the annual salary of post office employees receiving less than \$5,000 annually

Whereas there is now pending before the Congress of the United States Senate bill No. 355 and House of Representatives bill

No. 244, which bills provide for the elimination of the six lowest salary grades for postal clerks and carriers and provide for a 17-percent increase in the annual salary of post office employees receiving less than \$5,000 annually; and

Whereas the wages of postal employees have continually lagged behind the cost of living for a period of at least 10 years; and

Whereas according to a recent report submitted by the Bureau of the Budget and the Civil Service Commission to the Subcommittee on Postal Service of the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, the cost of living advanced 78.1 percent from 1939 to November 1950; and

Whereas according to that same report, the average wage of a post office clerk advanced from \$2,165 per annum to approximately \$3,500 per annum for the same period, reflecting an increase of only some 61.8 percent, or a net loss of 16.3 percent; and

Whereas the cost of living, according to the index, has risen something like 3 or 4 points during the interval between the date of the report and the present time; and

Whereas the newer employees in the postal service, a majority of whom are veterans of World War II, have to work for years at substandard wages to reach a salary level commensurate with the effort and educational standard required for postal duty: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations respectfully requests the Congress of the United States of America to enact Senate bill No. 355 and House of Representatives bill No. 244 into law; and be it further

*Resolved*, That the Secretary of State be and he is hereby respectfully requested to transmit duly certified copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Secretary of the United States Senate, to the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives and to the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

**RESOLUTIONS OF MICHIGAN LEGISLATURE**

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I send to the desk for appropriate reference two resolutions of the Michigan Legislature and a resolution adopted by the State of Michigan House of Representatives.

Senate concurrent resolution of the Michigan Legislature, adopted April 22, reiterates the position of the Michigan Legislature in support of the St. Lawrence seaway project. As such it reflects similar petitions to Congress from the Michigan Legislature over the past 18 years as well as the prevailing opinion in the State of Michigan that the seaway project was never more urgently needed than now, in the light of world conditions. I may add that the self-liquidating nature of the project as presently proposed has the hearty endorsement of the people in our State.

A second resolution supports demands upon the Veterans' Administration that it provide more adequate facilities for tubercular patients in Michigan. The house resolution memorializes Congress to enact legislation amending the Fed-

eral income-tax law with respect to exemptions.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolutions will be received and appropriately referred and, under the rule, printed in the RECORD.

To the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 22

"Concurrent resolution relative to the Great Lakes Tidewater Commission and the St. Lawrence seaway project

"Whereas, in the year 1919, by Public Act 17 and in 1921 by Public Act 138, the legislature created the Great Lakes Tidewater Commission for the purpose of investigating the feasibility of establishing deep-water connections between the Great Lakes and the Atlantic Ocean, so as to permit passage of seagoing vessels from the Great Lakes to said ocean, which project has since come to be known as the St. Lawrence seaway, and in said acts the legislature authorized the Commission to cooperate with similar agencies of other States to coordinate the efforts of all such States in obtaining the building of the project; and

"Whereas in the decade between 1921 and 1931 the legislature appropriated to said Commission approximately \$100,000 to enable it to complete its work and studies and to present its arguments for the approval of this international project, and as a result of the work of the Commission and of similar commissions in other States, the feasibility and value of the project was demonstrated to the Federal Government; and

"Whereas that Commission has repeatedly made reports to the Governor, and the two houses of the legislature have on numerous occasions expressed in sundry concurrent resolutions their desire that the Congress and the members of the Michigan delegation proceed speedily in all steps necessary for the action to be taken by the Federal Government since the project of necessity is international in its nature and its scope, to wit, by Senate Concurrent Resolutions 5 of 1933, 7 of 1933, 1 of 1933, 98 of 1941, 5 of 1947, 13 of 1951, House Concurrent Resolutions 7 of 1935, 5 of 1937, 3 of 1941; and

"Whereas, for 16 of the last 18 years and during the entire period of World War II, the President and the controlling majority of the Congress of the United States have been members of the same political party, and although the project is now entirely within the field of Federal and international relations, the Congress and the President have utterly failed in action and in a realization that the economic and defense needs of this country, even during the period of World War II, and in the present perilous state of international affairs and national emergency, have been jeopardized by the failure to initiate and complete this project; and

"Whereas the present national emergency and the experiences of the last World War have demonstrated beyond a question of doubt, in addition to its basic economic value in the industrial development of the country, the need of the project as an essential in the national defense so that the industrial capacity of this country for defense may be supplied with raw materials; and

"Whereas the legislature of this State, having steadfastly developed and maintained a position of support in relation to this project for the past three decades: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring)*, That the legislature reiterates its position in support of the St. Lawrence seaway project and requests each member of the Michigan delega-

tion in the Congress, in view of the importance of the project, both to the State and to the national economic and defense needs, to take all steps possible to further the adoption of the project by the Federal Government and to complete by way of treaty or agreement its international authorization; and be it further

"Resolved, That suitable copies of this resolution be sent to each member of the Michigan delegation and to the majority leaders of Congress.

"Adopted by the senate March 6, 1951.

"FRED I. CHASE,

"Secretary of the Senate.

"Adopted by the house April 12, 1951.

"NORMAN E. PHILLEO,

"Clerk of the House of Representatives."

To the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 20

"Concurrent resolution supporting the resolutions of and demands of the Michigan Veterans' Hospital Committee and the various State veterans' conventions, that the Veterans' Administration build a 500-bed tuberculosis hospital in Michigan or provide other adequate facilities to provide proper care to tubercular veteran patients

"Whereas the Michigan Veterans' Hospital Committee composed of the State Service Officers of the United Spanish War Veterans, the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Disabled American Veterans, the Marine Corps League and the American Veterans of World War II, have insistently petitioned the Veterans' Administration since January 1949, to reinstate in its hospital-building program a 500-bed hospital for tubercular veterans in this State; and

"Whereas it is a demonstrated fact that it is not in the best interest of the health and morals of the patients whose homes are in Michigan that they be transferred to distant points for treatment; and

"Whereas there are now approximately 338 service-connected and 122 presumptively service-connected tubercular cases scattered throughout our State in State and county hospitals, in addition to 87 patients in the Veterans' Administration hospital in Dearborn, which is not rated as a tuberculosis hospital, making in all approximately 550 veteran tubercular patients whose treatment is a direct obligation of the Veterans' Administration; and in addition there are another 500 non-service-connected tubercular veterans now in various State and county hospitals who are entitled to Veterans' Administration hospitalization under certain conditions; and

"Whereas a very great potential load of veteran tubercular patients is indicated in that Michigan is credited with 788,000 war-service veterans and stands seventh in the country in service admissions from the State; and

"Whereas the Michigan need for beds for tubercular veterans has been pressed repeatedly on congressional committees and on the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs; and

"Whereas there is not a single Veterans' Administration bed in the State of Michigan for tubercular patients to take care of the active load: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring), in vigorous support of the resolutions and demands of the Michigan Veterans' Hospital Committee and the various State veterans' conventions and in view of the impelling necessities of Michigan veterans afflicted with tuberculosis, that the Veterans' Administration build a 500-bed tuberculosis hospital in Michigan as originally planned, so that proper care may be given tubercular veteran patients eligible for treatment by the Veterans' Administration; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to each Member of the Michigan delegation to the Congress of the United States and to the Veterans' Administration.

"Adopted by the senate March 21, 1951.

"FRED I. CHASE,

"Secretary of the Senate.

"Adopted by the house April 12, 1951.

"NORMAN E. PHILLEO,

"Clerk of the House of Representatives."

To the Committee on Finance:

"House Resolution 17

"Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation amending the Federal Income Tax Act with respect to exemptions

"Whereas the high cost of living has placed a burden on individuals and families, and in order to bring about a more equitable application of the Federal income tax the exemption to married persons should be \$2,500, to single persons \$1,000, and the \$600 exemption for each dependent, now in the present law, should be retained: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the house of representatives, That the members of the house of representatives urge the Congress of the United States to enact legislation amending the Federal Income Tax Act so as to provide exemptions of \$2,500 to married persons, \$1,000 to single persons, and \$600 for each dependent; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution shall be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives in Congress, and to the Michigan Members in the Senate and House of Representatives in Congress.

"Adopted by the house April 16, 1951.

"NORMAN E. PHILLEO,

"Clerk of the House of Representatives."

#### 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. CHAVEZ:

S. 1418. A bill for the relief of Santina D'Agostino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUTLER of Maryland:

S. 1419. A bill to pay an annuity to Richard W. Goodhart; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

S. 1420. A bill for the relief of Pinfang Hsia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 1421. A bill for the relief of Masako Sugiyama; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 1422. A bill for the relief of Jerry J. Lenconi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. IVES:

S. J. Res. 68. Joint resolution to provide burial and hospitalization benefits to certain persons who served in the Armed Forces on and after June 27, 1950; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. Ives when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

#### BURIAL AND HOSPITAL BENEFITS FOR CERTAIN VETERANS

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, my attention has been called to the fact that members of the Armed Forces now serving in Korea and others who have been in active service since June 27, 1950, when discharged from service, are technically peacetime veterans and not eligi-

ble for hospitalization and burial benefits within the meaning of the Veterans' Administration regulation. I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution which provides by law for such burial and hospitalization benefits to any person who has served in the active military, naval, or air service of the United States on or after June 27, 1950, and prior to such date as shall thereafter be determined by Presidential proclamation or concurrent resolution of the Congress.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 68) to provide burial and hospitalization benefits to certain persons who served in the Armed Forces on and after June 27, 1950, introduced by Mr. IVES, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

#### INVESTIGATION OF CRIME AND RELATED PROBLEMS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. NEELY (for himself and Mr. CASE) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 136), which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia:

Resolved, That the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is hereby authorized and directed (1) to conduct a full and complete study and investigation with respect to crime and related problems, including law enforcement, in the District of Columbia; and (2) to report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of such study and investigation, together with such recommendations as to necessary legislation as it may deem desirable.

Sec. 2. For the purpose of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems advisable, and is authorized, with the consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government of the United States. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$50,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

#### THIRD SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. KNOWLAND (for himself and Mr. HOLLAND) submitted amendments intended to be proposed by them jointly to the bill (H. R. 3587) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. FERGUSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 3587, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

#### PRINTING OF GEN. DOUGLAS MacARTHUR'S SPEECH BEFORE CONGRESS (S. DOC. NO. 36)

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I venture the expression that in the history of this body, and in the history of this country, no more momentous expression has ever been made, either by Members of this body, by Members of the House of Representatives, or by any speaker before Congress, than was made before the joint meeting of Congress on the 19th

day of last month by General of the Army Douglas MacArthur.

The speech delivered by him before the joint meeting of Congress has been repeated around the world.

It has created in this country a thinking people, thinking deeply of their own welfare as individuals and as Americans, thinking seriously of their own future, and the future of their country. Indeed, it required such a speech to bring the people of the United States to their feet, so to speak, thinking of the welfare of their Nation.

I ask unanimous consent that the speech of Gen. Douglas MacArthur, delivered on the 19th day of last month, before the joint meeting of the two Houses of Congress, be printed as a Senate document. It is under 50 pages, and, therefore, does not require an estimate of cost.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

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. FULBRIGHT:

An article discussing the necessity of confidence in Government officials, written by Walter Lippmann and published in the Washington Post May 1, 1951.

By Mr. AIKEN:

Editorial entitled "Case for the Seaway," discussing the proposed St. Lawrence seaway, published in the Miami News of March 26, 1951.

By Mr. McMAHON:

Editorials entitled "The Soldier and the Statesman" and "The Great Debate," from the April 28, 1951, issue of America, discussing the place of the soldier and the statesman in the Government, and the MacArthur case.

By Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska:

Three tables making comparisons between tax rates and benefits under the Social Security and Railroad Retirement Systems.

By Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska:

Four tables giving comparisons between tax rates and benefits under the Social Security and Railroad Retirement Systems.

By Mr. CAPEHART:

Resolutions adopted by the executive committee of the American Legion, Department of Indiana, together with the opening remarks of Department Commander Jack McIntyre, April 12, 1951.

By Mr. CAPEHART:

Resolution adopted by Byron W. Thornburg Post, No. 10, American Legion, of Marion, Ind., regarding the Asiatic policy of the United States.

By Mr. O'CONNOR:

Editorial entitled "Democracy's Best Seller," regarding Maj. Henry Martyn Robert, author of Robert's Rules of Order.

By Mr. O'CONNOR:

Article published in the Baltimore Sun regarding decoration of Paul W. Ward by President Auriol of France.

By Mr. MARTIN:

Editorial entitled "General MacArthur," discussing the recall of Gen. Douglas MacArthur, published in the Army-Navy-Air Force Journal April 14, 1951, which will appear hereafter in the Appendix.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

Article entitled "Germany Treated Like Stepchild," written by Constantine Brown

and published in the Washington Star of May 1, 1951, referring to the treatment of Germany by other nations.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

Article entitled "Secrecy Is Blunderers' Refuge," written by David Lawrence and published in the Washington Star of May 1, 1951, having reference to the impending MacArthur investigation.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

Statement by John Nicholas Brown, former Navy Assistant Secretary for Air, and letter from Gen. A. A. Vandegrift, endorsing Senate bill 677, a bill to increase the strength of the Marine Corps and to make the Commandant a permanent member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

By Mr. MOODY:

Address on the subject of the free-enterprise system delivered by John S. Coleman, president of the Burroughs Adding Machine Co., at the annual Michigan Congressional Dinner held in Washington, D. C., April 30, 1951.

SUGGESTED REPUBLICAN PRESIDENTIAL  
TICKET OF 1952

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I should like to have inserted in the RECORD at this point the ticket which is suggested for the Republican convention of next year by the Hon. Robert R. McCormick, owner and editor of the Chicago Tribune. He has suggested General MacArthur for President and Senator ROBERT A. TAFT, our colleague, for Vice President.

The colonel also stated that this would be the greatest ticket nominated in his lifetime, and it seemed to me that the RECORD should carry these glad tidings.

PROPOSED ABOLITION OF RECONSTRUCTION  
FINANCE CORPORATION

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the body of the RECORD a letter from the Honorable Jesse H. Jones with respect to the abolition of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, also an editorial from the New York Times of May 1, and following that my testimony before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee on April 30.

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

THE HOUSTON CHRONICLE,  
Houston, Tex., April 10, 1950.

The Honorable J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: This letter is in reply to yours of March 6 stating that you would be interested in any views I have with respect to the RFC and its activities in recent years.

My views about the RFC are mixed. I have a great affection for the Corporation to which I devoted 13 years of my life, and have pride in its accomplishments during that period. I have great affection for my associates who shared the responsibility with me, some of whom are still with the Corporation. I also have pride in the confidence which the Congress repeatedly placed in the Corporation while it was under my direction and the regard in which it was held throughout the business and financial world, but am saddened by the way it is now being misused. It was a privilege to work with the Congress in meeting the emergencies that seemed always to be lurking just around the corner.

The Corporation was created an emergency agency when millions of our people were on short rations, when there was no market for farm products and no demand for anything but a square meal. It is hardly

necessary to do more than name the date of February 2, 1932, on which the Corporation was organized to bring back the memory of the depths of the depression.

To meet the ever increasing problems the RFC Act was amended many times giving it additional powers. These amendments came in a steady stream soon after the Corporation got started, but always after careful consideration by Congress. Prompting every one of those amendments was a problem of an emergency nature to be met by the extension of RFC's powers.

However, it was always assumed the RFC was doing what private enterprise was not in a position to do, and when the situation was met the Corporation would cease operations. It was never with the thought of creating a Government bank to compete with private enterprise that the RFC was created or maintained. It was always with the idea of doing an emergency job which could be accomplished in no other way.

The depression was over by the late thirties, but the war clouds were gathering and the existence of the RFC with its experienced personnel was a natural to take over war work, in which it did a herculean task. At the war's end, our banking structure having been fully restored and able to provide credit for all legitimate purposes, the RFC should have been placed in liquidation. That it was not is no credit to the Government, for the functions which have heretofore motivated the RFC do not appear to be those that now keep it in operation.

Excuses are found to make loans, and in large amounts, that under no circumstances can be justified. The RFC should not be regarded as a source of easy money, a place where improvident loans may be made for personal or political reasons; a bank of issue for the socialization of the Nation's economy and a spigot where funds flow to those who are classed as acceptable risks because of political expediencies.

As for the future of the RFC, I think it should be given a decent burial, lock, stock, and barrel. I say this first because none of the conditions which prompted the creation of the RFC and the various amendments to its powers exist today; second, Government lending in competition with private business is not a proper function under our free enterprise system; third, because it is being prostituted when making such loans as the Kaiser-Fraser, the Lustron, the Tex-Mass, and the Waltham Watch Co.; fourth, because there is ample credit for all legitimate and justifiable loans.

I mention these foregoing loans because they are the ones that have been greatly publicized. I am not familiar with loans by the Corporation generally, but have no doubt that many of them will work out. I did notice in one of the Corporation's reports, probably at the end of the year, an item carried as loans for consolidation of debt. That sounds very much like loans to pay creditors of the borrower which should not be a function of the Corporation and, I am sure, was never intended by the Congress.

As publicized, the Kaiser-Fraser loan was made to put men to work. The country can absorb only so many automobiles and if Mr. Kaiser does not make them, others in the industry will, and with private funds. If Mr. Kaiser does not employ the men to make automobiles, the industry in that same vicinity will. If he does not use Government money to carry automobiles for his dealers, private money will, at least it will for the more standardized automobiles. There are automobile finance companies throughout the country for just that purpose, but of course they cannot compete with Government funds. Banks are also glad to lend on automobiles because they have learned that people will pay for their automobile.

It is well known that stockholders of the Kaiser-Fraser company have lost heavily on

their investments in the stock of that company. Much of this loss ultimately comes out of the Federal Treasury as tax deductions. But if the automobiles were made by one of the more experienced companies, the Treasury would collect taxes from the stockholders' dividends as well as from the manufacturer on its profits in making the automobiles.

As for the Tex-Mass loan, there is no lack of credit for properly secured loans in the oil and gas industry. Banks and insurance companies are eager for such loans. But it appears that several million dollars of this loan is to be used in making payments on loans now held by large life insurance companies, and a substantial sum to pay banks. Certainly this is not a proper function for the RFC. If the loans are good the insurance companies and banks would want to keep them. If they are bad, they should not be unloaded on the Government.

Again, if a concern as old and experienced as the Waltham Watch Co. could not make a go of its business in such good times as we have been having since the war's end, the Government certainly could not, so why the loan?

When the Government finances business it is competing with private enterprise from which it gets much of its income. When it finances improvident business it takes from the profits of competing business, gets no taxes from the improvident, and loses on its loan.

If the Congress is not willing to liquidate the Corporation, then I suggest that it close its 32 branches and only make loans to business and industry in cooperation with banks and other financial institutions which would make and administer the loans and carry a participation in them of not less than 25 percent for their own account, and I would limit the RFC's participation in any loan to a few hundred thousand dollars.

I doubt that there is a county in the United States in which a bank could not be found to make loans on such a basis in cooperation with the Government. We established that method of lending before I left the Corporation. It worked very well. This procedure would do away with the necessity of the Corporation maintaining 32 large agencies and would greatly reduce its operating expense. It could, if it liked, maintain an agent at each Federal Reserve Bank or branch bank where it now has offices, to help work out loans between banks and borrowers. When I was with the Corporation we were often able to get banks to make loans without our even taking a participation in them simply by calling the bank on the telephone.

A thorough investigation of the making of the Kaiser-Fraser loan, the Tex-Mass loan, the Waltham Watch loan and the Lustron fiasco is clearly indicated. And this might be helpful to the committee in determining its recommendations for the future of the Corporation.

While I do not believe there is any lack of justifiable credit anywhere in the country, as long as the RFC is in the lending business, it will get applications for loans. Some people would prefer to borrow from the RFC rather than from their local banks. Some may feel that they can go to their Congressman or their United States Senator or possibly to the White House and bring political pressure to bear on the Government lending agent. The lending agent may feel that his job is a political one and that to hold it he must go along, or he might even feel that the judgment of men in high places in Government might be better than his, and accordingly approve a loan that should not be made. Without any information on the subject, that must have been the situation with respect to the four loans mentioned.

With the RFC all set for business, it is natural that those in charge of it would

rather make loans than not, in order to justify their employment and the continuance of the agency. And some people wanting to borrow money would like to be in a position to say to their bankers, "If you don't let me have the money, I will get it from the RFC."

Money lending is just as much a vocation as any other calling in life, including that of politics and statesmanship. A successful money lender would probably not make much of a success in politics, and the reverse is probably true. Particularly, Members of the Congress or those in the executive branch of the Government should not endeavor to interpret the act for, or otherwise influence, the directors of the RFC in making specific loans.

I have not read the act since leaving the Corporation, but there was a provision in it that required its directors to certify to the appropriateness of the salaries paid by borrowers, and whether in the act or not, we had a rule that we should also approve the appropriateness of lawyers' fees, accountant expenses, et cetera, incident to a loan. We did not allow the borrower to pay commissions.

Proper management of the RFC, if it is to be continued, is vital to the integrity of our Government, but it should be liquidated.

I have made these observations, comments, and suggestions from my long experience with the Corporation, and wish to remind you that where the sugar is you will always find the flies.

Respectfully,

JESSE H. JONES.

[From the New York Times of May 1, 1951]

MR. HOOVER ON THE RFC

Herbert Hoover added his own vigorous arguments yesterday to those of such veteran banking authorities as Jesse Jones and Mariner S. Eccles in advocating the liquidation of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

Mr. Hoover's views are highly pertinent to the debate, since it was he who, as President in 1932, fathered the RFC. At that time, however, as Mr. Hoover told the Senate Banking Committee yesterday, the institution was created to assist a temporarily crippled private banking system in protecting the solvency of agriculture, commerce, and industry. Its purely emergency character was reflected in the restrictions with which its lending operations were circumscribed and in the fact that its life span was set at 1 year.

The economic climate which brought the RFC into existence nearly two decades ago has not only ceased to exist; it has been succeeded by a condition that is just the reverse—a condition of chronic inflation. Even in normal times there would be no legitimate excuse for continuing such an institution as the RFC. But in such an atmosphere as that which has prevailed in recent years it becomes a financial, political, and moral liability. Nevertheless, the agency has been perpetuated over the years on one pretext or another and its lending requirements have been liberalized on at least three different occasions. "As a result," said the former President, "the institution now undertakes to finance by so-called loans almost anything, domestic and even sometimes foreign, on most any terms it pleases."

Mr. Hoover's testimony was particularly devastating when it dealt with the argument (the last stronghold of the RFC's defenders) that the departure of the agency would deal a crippling blow to small business. If it is solvent, he said, small business "can get all the credit it needs from private banking services." Where long-term venture capital or credit is required, the answer, he suggested, was not in Government direct loans but in "the mutualization of credit" with, say, Federal Reserve backing. Meanwhile,

said he, we should put an end to the fantastic practice of lending to distillers, brewers, theaters, poolrooms (and even snake farms) on the theory that such loans are invested in "the public interest." Where small-business loans are genuinely necessary from the standpoint of the public interest, plans could be worked out so they might be guaranteed by the Federal Reserve.

Mr. Hoover succeeded in showing, taking his testimony as a whole, that so long as there is an institution standing around with public funds to lend and no legitimate function to perform it will not only rush into any credit vacuum that may exist but that sooner or later it will succeed in creating new vacuums, which it will then proceed to fill.

TESTIMONY OF SENATOR HARRY F. BYRD ON S. 1376 BEFORE BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE PROVIDING FOR LIQUIDATION OF RFC

You have heard President Hoover present his views respecting the liquidation of the RFC.

I now want to read you a letter from Mr. Jesse Jones, who perhaps knows as much as anyone else about the operations of the RFC:

PASADENA, CALIF.

DEAR HARRY: I have your letter and your bill—which I approve. I am, of course, shocked at the exposures Senator FULBRIGHT's committee have brought out and doubt if he has more than scratched the surface. If we cannot have integrity in our Government why sacrifice our boys in Korea and our billions in defense of our country? To me it is beyond understanding, how good men can countenance the things that are going on and I, of course, know we have many fine men in the Congress, but they should stop the graft or acknowledge that right is not worth fighting for.

Your friend,

JESSE JONES.

Then I desire to call to your attention a speech made by Gov. James F. Byrnes at Raleigh, N. C., on March 14, 1951, in which he said:

"The people who are called upon to make sacrifices are not made happy by the disclosure of disloyalty of an employee of the Atomic Energy Commission and by the shocking disclosures before the Senate committee investigating the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. Worse than the loss of money is the loss of confidence in the honesty of men who have occupied responsible positions in government. There is no excuse for the existence of the organization.

"Why should your Government lend public funds to manufacture automobiles and fabricated houses or to build tourist hotels in Florida?

"A man can borrow money from the banks and private investors provided he has character and collateral. If he does not possess them, he should not be loaned your money.

"In March 1945 I expressed this view to President Roosevelt. In his administration the RFC had been wisely administered by Jesse Jones. But President Roosevelt realized the danger. He said it had served its purpose and when peace was restored it should be liquidated. He did not live to liquidate it.

"Because of the war situation, it may be necessary to make loans to a few manufacturers producing weapons of war. But these can be made by Charles E. Wilson, Defense Mobilizer, who has the confidence of the people. The Congress should promptly enact legislation to liquidate the Reconstruction Finance Corporation."

So, we have here the testimony of President Hoover, who established the RFC, Mr. Jesse Jones, who administered its affairs for many years, and Governor Byrnes, who has had as close a connection with the Federal

Government as any man living over a long period of years, and his direct quotation from President Roosevelt that it was his intention to liquidate the RFC after the war.

It is not my purpose at this time to discuss in any detail the shocking disclosures made by the Fulbright subcommittee. This committee, and especially the Senator from Arkansas, Mr. FULBRIGHT, deserve the gratitude of the American people. I do want to call attention, however, to this fact: With any agency of the Government with great sums to loan and without standards fixed whereby these loans can be made, it is nearly inevitable over a period of time that political favoritism, if not corruption, will creep into these transactions. The RFC has no standard except the discretion of its officials.

When it was established the RFC performed a most valuable service. It was a depression measure. No such condition exists today. In fact, we are now in a period of the highest plateau of inflation we have ever reached. The history of the RFC shows it did do a good job when needed but, as might have been expected, its access to the financial resources of the United States has been too great a temptation for political camp-followers in periods when it did not have a job to do.

It is my frank opinion that the good of the RFC has been more than offset by revelations of political favoritism, mismanagement, and so forth, which have occasioned a loss of confidence in the administration of our Government, and confidence in our Government is essential to the preservation of our democracy, especially at this time of great national crisis.

The bill pending provides that all funds of the RFC should go to pay on the public debt. We must remember that every dollar the RFC has come from borrowing through the Federal Treasury. It has added to the public debt.

It is my prediction that we are facing a long period of deficit spending, which, in itself, is inflationary and, if continued too long, may impair our solvency. Why should the Federal Government borrow money from some of our citizens to loan it to other citizens except during a period when such action is defensible from a standpoint of the public welfare?

At this time I will not discuss the question of whether the RFC has made money. It borrows from the Federal Treasury at 1½ percent, which is the average interest paid by the Federal Government. Since November it has made loans at 5 percent and 4 percent previous to November. With that margin it should make money, but this cannot definitely be determined until the RFC is liquidated. There is an old saying in the Blue Ridge Mountains of Virginia, "That you cannot measure a snake until it is dead." This applies to the RFC. We cannot take an appraisal made by its own officials as a basis of its financial standing. If these appraisals have been made in the same manner in which some of the loans have been made, they certainly cannot be relied upon.

Functions and programs of the RFC which are at present authorized by existing law and executive and administrative orders roughly may be grouped in four broad categories, as follows:

1. The old line lending programs which are currently active, such as loans to business enterprises and the purchases of their obligations, and loans to meet catastrophes in the event they occur;

2. The old line lending programs which are currently inactive, such as loans to financial institutions including banks and insurance companies; loans to States, municipalities, and other subdivisions and public bodies to finance public projects, and purchase of securities and obligations for the same purpose; loans to drainage, levee, and irrigation districts, loans for marketing agricultural

commodities; loans to foreign governments; loans to mortgage companies, and guaranteeing veterans' mortgages and insuring FHA mortgages; and liquidation of World War II activities including the affairs of the Defense Homes Corporation.

3. The servicing of the new defense production loans and civilian defense loans as an agent for other Federal agencies which have primary responsibility in these programs; and

4. The operation of defense plants and activities, such as those now engaged in the production of tin, synthetic rubber, abaca fiber, and aluminum.

Briefly, Senate bill 1376, Sponsored by Senators ROBERTSON, BRICKER, KEM, WILLIAMS, FERGUSON and myself, would discontinue RFC activities in the first two categories, and provide for the continuance elsewhere of the activities listed in the second two categories.

#### OLD LINE RFC LENDING ACTIVITIES

The sponsors of this bill take the position that the old line lending activities of the RFC, currently both active and inactive, under present conditions, and the requirements of the foreseeable future, are non-essential, inflationary, and constitute a temptation for abuse. And under provisions of the bill these activities and programs would be discontinued immediately upon enactment, and the Secretary of the Treasury would proceed with an orderly liquidation honoring all of the terms of agreements made in connection with all approved loans.

#### RFC SERVICE TO DEFENSE PRODUCTION LOANS

Primary responsibility for defense production loans, under the Defense Production Act of 1950, lies in the component departments of the National Military Establishment, the Commerce Department, and such other agencies engaged in procurement for the national defense as the President may designate. The RFC has been utilized largely for the servicing of defense production loans under directions set forth in Executive Order 10161. This Executive order could be changed within the provisions of the Defense Production Act without regard for any provision in the RFC Act of 1947. But as a means of precaution against any delay, interruption, or interference with Production Act loans which have been assigned to the RFC, the pending bill provides that the RFC may remain active with respect to Defense Production Act loans for as long as 120 days after the enactment, or until the Secretary of the Treasury or any other agency designated by the President indicates ability to take over action on these loans without delay, interruption, or interference.

#### CIVILIAN DEFENSE LOANS THROUGH RFC

The Civilian Defense Act provides for loans through the RFC. To date no loans have been made under this authority. Therefore this bill could cause little or no delay, interruption, or interference in connection with civilian defense loans. But the same 120-day provision, under terms of the bill, would apply to RFC lending activities in relation to civilian defense loans which may have been originated by the date of enactment.

#### ALUMINUM PLANT TRANSFER

An administration bill (S. 312) is now pending before the Senate to transfer the aluminum and magnesium forgings plan to the Department of Defense. Section 6 of this RFC bill (S. 1376) contains language in substantial conformity with the administration bill providing for the transfer of this operation from RFC to the Air Force. This language has been worked out with the assistance and advice of the Bureau of the Budget.

#### TIN, RUBBER AND FIBER PLANTS

The RFC is at present operating tin, rubber and fiber plants. Section 3 of the pending bill would transfer these operations to the Department of Commerce. The provisions of these transfer to the Commerce Department are modeled after those in section 305 of Senate bill 3936 of the Eighty-first Congress—the Defense Production bill—as it was reported from the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency.

#### ARGUMENT AGAINST ABOLISHING RFC

The burden of the criticism of proposals to abolish RFC, as represented by the chairman of the RFC Board, in a letter to the Senate Banking and Currency Committee on April 1, and by a letter from the Defense Mobilization Director to the Senate Committee on Expenditures in Executive Departments, dated April 4, was that it would interfere with the defense loan program and disrupt the operations of defense plants now under the supervision of RFC. Senate bill 1376 spells out in specific terms the precautions to be taken to preclude delay or disruption in any of these programs.

#### Long term and disaster loans

Another argument for continuance of RFC is that it would provide long-term loans for small businesses which have already been turned down by banks and other private-lending institutions, and to provide loans in cases of disaster. This contention appears to be refuted in large degree by figures contained in a table submitted to the Senate Committee on Expenditures in Executive Departments March 23, 1951, along with a letter by the Chairman of the RFC Board. These figures show that business loans of over \$100,000 outstanding as of January 31 this year totaled more than \$358,000,000 as compared with outstanding loans of \$100,000 or less which, as of the same date, totaled \$174,000,000. In 1950 RFC made 4,904 business loans of less than \$100,000, and of these approximately 3,000 were for less than \$25,000. In connection with RFC loans such as these 3,000 the Hoover Commission task force found:

"The majority of the loans now being made by the Corporation are small loans to finance new businesses or the acquisition of existing businesses by new owners. \* \* \* These are important enterprises, but, individually, they are not significant from a national standpoint. The assistance extended by RFC in many of these cases may even have a negative value from the national point of view in that it encourages the continuance of ventures which should be permitted to discontinue, and in that it prevents their owners from going into occupations for which they may be better suited. Any tendency to perpetuate mistaken enterprises will weaken the general economy out of all proportion to the individual gains which it may make."

#### Catastrophe loans

Ample funds short-of-war catastrophes are provided through the Farm Home Administration, the community facilities program of the Housing and Home Finance Agency and the President's emergency fund.

#### QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

In an effort, as far as possible, to be sure that all of the details incident to such a ramified operation as the RFC have been taken care of in Senate bill 1376, the Senate legislative drafting counsel has prepared answers, representing their best judgment, to a series of questions which either have been, or might be raised. These questions and answers may be summarized as follows:

1. Question. What would be the effect of the bill on old-line loans (exclusive of Defense Production Act loans) made by RFC prior to dissolution upon which there are still disbursements to be made?

Answer. Under the terms of the pending bill it clearly would be the duty of the Secretary of the Treasury as liquidator to provide for disbursements legally obligator' by the Corporation prior to enactment of the bill.

2. Question. What will happen with respect to servicing old-line RFC loans?

Answer. The servicing of loans in existence prior to enactment would become the duty of the Secretary of the Treasury as liquidator. Actually, in most instances, servicing provisions are included in loan contracts and therefore constitute legal obligation on the part of both parties to the loan. The agent through which the servicing would be performed would be determined administratively by the Secretary of the Treasury as the liquidator. This would be neither a new nor an insurmountable task for the Secretary of the Treasury who previously has used the Bureau of Accounts to liquidate the residual affairs of war agencies. Whereas, RFC now has 35 regional offices, the Bureau of Accounts has 26 similar offices throughout the United States and Territories.

3. Question. What would be the effect upon participation agreements with banks where, prior to dissolution of RFC, the entire amount of the loan has not been disbursed or the bank has not exercised its option to have the RFC participate in the loan?

Answer. The answer to this question is identical to the answer to question No. 1. Agreements entered into prior to dissolution would constitute legal obligation which must be met in all respects.

4. Question. How would this bill affect renewals of loans originally made prior to enactment?

Answer. The Secretary of the Treasury, to achieve orderly liquidation, may allow any obligor to make interim payments on revised schedules, but he is specifically denied the power to extend the maturity date of, or renew any loan made, or other obligation purchased by the RFC, beyond the date provided in the loan contract or other agreement.

5. Question. What would happen to the Defense Production loan program authorized by section 302 of the Defense Production Act of 1950?

Answer. The pending bill provides for uninterrupted continuity of the defense production loan program. The RFC is currently performing certain functions with respect to this program under authority of section 303 of Executive Order 10161, in which the President vested in the RFC functions conferred upon him by section 302 of the Defense Production Act.

In this connection the pending bill provides that the President may at any time transfer this program to the Secretary of Defense, the Federal Reserve Banks, or any existing department, agency, official or corporation of the Government, or to a new agency. Accordingly the President is given wide discretion with respect to the agency which shall administer the program, just as he has under the Defense Production Act. However, if the President does not make provision for the transfer of the program within 120 days after the enactment the program passes to the Secretary of the Treasury, and he may still transfer the program at any time to any agency he sees fit.

6. Question. What would happen to the civil defense loan program, authorized by section 409 of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950?

Answer. The pending bill would permit RFC to continue to administer the loans of this program for as long as 120 days after enactment. Thereupon or before, it is indicated if disruption is precluded, the program would pass over to the Secretary of the Treasury who would administer it in accordance with the Civil Defense Act.

7. Question. What disposition would be made of the defense plant operations now conducted by RFC?

Answer. Under terms of the bill the aluminum plant would be transferred to the Air Force in accordance with administration recommendations, and the tin, rubber, and fiber plants would be transferred to the Department of Commerce under provisions similar to those recommended by the Senate Banking and Currency Committee during the Eighty-first Congress.

8. Question. Are there funds available to the President for any other Government agency to make disaster loans such as the RFC now makes?

Answer. There is an emergency fund of \$1,000,000 available to the President for use in emergencies affecting the national interest or security without regard to provisions of law regulating expenditures of Government funds and to supplement efforts of State and local governments or other agencies in alleviating hardship or suffering, caused by flood, fire, hurricane, earthquake, or other catastrophe.

The Presidential fund is to be succeeded by the provisions of the act of September 30, 1950, authorizing Federal assistance to State and local governments in major disasters.

The Secretary of Agriculture, through the Farmers Home Administration, can make emergency loans for damage to agricultural crops and products.

In addition, the Federal Government, through the Federal Housing Commission, insures banks and other private institutions and loan agencies against certain loans and credit advances for repairing and replacing structures damaged as a result of catastrophes.

9. Question. What happens to personnel of RFC (a) engaged in lending activities, and (b) engaged in rubber, tin, abaca fiber, and aluminum operations?

Answer. Most employees engaged in the lending activities are covered under civil service and therefore would be entitled to reemployment rights granted employees with civil-service status. Such matters as retention of key personnel, etc., for work in connection with the liquidation would be a matter within the administrative decision of the Secretary of the Treasury as liquidator.

10. Question. What would be the effect of enactment of this bill upon court proceedings with the RFC as a party?

Answer. The bill clearly provides that suits, actions, or other proceedings lawfully commenced by or against the Corporation prior to the expiration of its succession shall not abate upon the expiration of its succession.

11. Question. Could any other Government agencies make or authorize the making of loans similar to the old-line loans now made by RFC?

Answer. There are a number of other Federal departments and agencies which can make loans similar to those now being made by RFC, although none of them has quite as broad authorization which RFC has with respect to whom loans may be made. Among these departments and agencies are the Federal Reserve banks, agencies of the Military Establishment, Farmers Home Administration, Commodity Credit Corporation, REA, Public Housing Administration, and numerous mixed-ownership corporations, such as Federal land banks, intermediate-credit banks, Production Credit Corporation and associations, banks for cooperatives, FDIC, etc.

12. Question. What happens to proceeds from the RFC liquidation?

Answer. The pending bill permits the Secretary of the Treasury to use the proceeds of liquidation to meet administrative expenses, but congressional supervision of amounts to be allowed will be continued and provisions of the Corporation Control

Act would continue to be applicable. Beyond administrative expenses incident to liquidation the proceeds would be applied to the curtailment of the Federal debt.

#### PERFECTED BILL

It is obvious from this analysis that Senate bill 1376 has been thought out in minute detail and drafted with extreme care. It has been introduced to substitute for Senate bill 1116 introduced at an earlier date.

The drafting has been done by the Senate legislative drafting counsel and it represents the combined judgment of practically all of the lawyers on the counsel's very efficient staff. In addition they have checked out many of the details with the Bureau of the Budget, the General Accounting Office, and the RFC itself.

Every effort has been made to protect and preserve the defense-related functions now performed by RFC and to continue them without disruption, interference, or delay. By the same token effort has been made to discontinue the old-line functions of RFC, which were spawned in depression and are not nonessential in inflation, and to liquidate these functions and the RFC as a corporate entity in an orderly fashion honoring all the agreements that have been made.

#### SUPPORT FOR THE BILL

Unqualified support for the objective of this bill has been given, among others, by the Honorable Herbert Hoover, former President of the United States who originated the RFC as an instrument to combat inflation; by the Honorable Jesse Jones, former Secretary of Commerce, and first administrator of the RFC, who for 8 years directed the tremendous operations of the Corporation without a suggestion of impropriety or scandal, and accomplished magnificently the purposes for which the instrumentality was originated and the Honorable James F. Byrnes, now governor of the great southern State of South Carolina, who probably among all men now living has the richest experience in Federal service, having served for years in both Houses of Congress, as Justice of the United States Supreme Court, and in the executive branch as principal adviser to the President of the United States as Secretary of State.

Mr. Hoover, who has appeared before this committee as a witness in favor of the bill to abolish RFC, recently said as a member of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Federal Government, "I favored the abolition and do yet."

Abolition of RFC was recommended by the task force of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Federal Government in connection with its report on Federal lending agencies.

The task force for this report was the firm of Price, Waterhouse and Co., certified public accountants who enjoy an international reputation in the field of business analysis. With respect to RFC this task force report said:

#### USE OF RFC TO AVOID THE APPROPRIATIONS PROCEDURES

"On a number of occasions beginning as early as 1933, RFC's statutory authority to borrow from the Treasury has been used by the Congress as a means of financing various governmental activities while avoiding the ordinary congressional procedures for the appropriation of public funds from the Treasury. \* \* \*

"It is characteristic of such loose financing methods that they lend themselves to abuse and greatly increase the Government's exposure to unnecessary costs and losses."

#### RFC AS A STAND-BY FACILITY

"It is not in the public interest for the Government to keep an emergency agency alive during nonemergency periods, in the

hope that its existence may mitigate the effects of a future crisis, the date, the nature, the duration, the scope and the magnitude of which are all unpredictable. \* \* \*

"RFC cannot obtain the services of first-rate executive during normal times.

"Outstanding executives who would be willing to service during emergencies would not wish to be bound by the organization forms and by the operating practices developed under nonemergency circumstances by less competent people, or people with less extensive business experience.

"The assignment of functions to an emergency agency to give it something to do and thus to keep its organization from stagnating during a nonemergency period, is not a good public policy.

"The contention that RFC breaks even on profits is based upon the \$552,000,000 net profit reported by the Corporation through June 30, 1947, and there may therefore be a fallacy in the related contention that the continued existence of RFC will cost the Government very little.

"The aggregate net profit reported with respect to operations for a period ended June 30, 1947, has not been corrected for a substantial difference between the interest paid to the Treasury by RFC and the corresponding interest cost incurred by the Treasury. The Corporation's accounting records do not distinguish between the various classes of loans insofar as financial net results of activities are concerned. There is no way of knowing whether past loans to business enterprises yielded a profit or a net loss. Furthermore, the business loans which RFC is making at the present time contain a risk factor different from that which characterized its previous lending activities.

"It should not be presumed that the Corporation's present operations can be conducted at no net cost to the Government.

"The majority of the loans now being made by the Corporation are small loans to finance new businesses or the acquisition of existing businesses by new owners \* \* \*. There are important enterprises, but, individually, they are not significant from a national standpoint. The assistance extended by RFC in many of these cases may even have a negative value from the national point of view in that it encourages the continuance of ventures which should be permitted to discontinue, and in that it prevents their owners from going into occupations for which they may be better suited. Any tendency to perpetuate mistaken enterprise will weaken the general economy out of all proportion to the individual gains which it may make."

The full Commission did not go all the way with the recommendation by the task force, but in fact it did recommend, among other things, that "Congress review the power to make direct loans, \* \* \* taking into account the problems of economy, efficiency, and integrity \* \* \*"; and that "The Government should not engage in direct lending where loans can be obtained from private sources on reasonable terms."

Some of the difficulties which beset the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Federal Government in arriving at a recommendation with respect to abolishing RFC are indicated in the published individual views by Commissioners Dean Acheson, James K. Pollock, and James H. Rowe, Jr., who, among other statements, said: "We have seen no evidence whatever in the material submitted to us to justify the blanket assertion of the Commission that direct lending by the Federal Government \* \* \* opens up dangerous possibilities of waste and favoritism to individuals or private enterprises."

#### A NONESSENTIAL CORPORATION

Without going into the recent disclosures by the Senate Banking and Currency Subcommittee under the chairmanship of Sena-

tor Fulbright, Messrs. Acheson, Pollock, and Rowe to the contrary, the RFC is now a nonessential, inflationary agency indulging in activities detrimental to the public interest.

While the Government is insisting on restricting private credit to curb inflation, the primary purpose of RFC is to make easy money available.

Some idea of the easy money operations in which the RFC is currently engaging and projecting will be obvious from the following summary of vital statistics on the Corporation:

1. RFC loans to business this year are estimated at \$623,000,000 and next year the estimate is \$692,000,000.

2. Under the RFC Act of 1947, RFC investments, loans, and commitments may total \$2,000,000,000 at one time.

3. The RFC is capitalized at \$100,000,000, but it is further authorized to issue notes, debentures, bonds, and other such obligations to the Treasury in amounts sufficient to carry out its functions.

4. The Corporation, including its franchise, capital, reserves, surplus, and income, is exempt from all taxation by Federal, State, local, and Territorial governments.

5. It is estimated that RFC loans and investments in the current year will total \$869,000,000 and that in the coming fiscal year 1952 they would increase to \$941,000,000. Its total assets in the current year are estimated at \$944,000,000 and for the next year at more than \$1,000,000,000.

6. Its interest-bearing obligations to the Treasury for general purposes this year are estimated at \$361,000,000 and for next year the estimate is \$441,000,000.

7. Its administrative expenses in the current year are estimated at \$20,000,000, and for next year the estimate is \$18,250,000.

8. The Chairman of the RFC Board last January 8 told the Senate Banking and Currency Committee that "the operations of the Corporation have not cost the taxpayers a single penny." This statement is at variance with the General Accounting Office reports; it is at variance with estimates by United States Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS, of Delaware, who, in a statement accompanied by Bureau of the Budget charts, inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD April 5, 1951, asserted that over the period of its existence RFC losses totaled more than \$12,000,000,000; and it is at variance with Hoover Commission task force findings.

#### CONCLUSION

In conclusion, Senate bill 1376 protects and preserves all requirements for defense production credit which have been created by Congress to this date.

Virtually every other aspect of the activities and programs of the RFC for emergency purposes are duplicated in other Federal credit facilities—even business loans which may be made through Federal Reserve provisions. And I have no doubt that if and when ordinary business loans are required by an emergency situation, they will be quickly adjusted to fulfill the requirement.

There are nearly a score of Federal credit agencies operating at this time with at least a hundred credit programs under their direction.

#### LOANING ACTIVITIES BY FEDERAL CREDIT AGENCIES

##### Authorized to make loans

1. Farm Credit Administration: To provide a complete and coordinated credit system for agriculture by making long-term and short-term credit available to farmers through:

(a) Federal land banks (12): For long terms on first mortgages on farm lands; and to issue farm loan bonds secured thereby (now the banks are a completely farmer-owned co-op system).

(b) Production credit corporations and associations (12 corporations and 500 asso-

ciations): To provide short-term credit for all types of farm and ranch operations. (One hundred and seventeen associations have paid off all Government capital.)

(c) Banks for cooperatives: To provide a permanent source of credit to farmers' cooperative associations.

2. Farm Home Administration: For mortgage insurance, farm housing, water facilities, flood and disaster, and veterans' assistance.

3. Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation: To insure banks to facilitate bank mergers or consolidations and to reduce risks or avert threatened loss to the Corporation.

4. Commodity Credit Corporation: For the construction of commercial storage facilities, and to the Secretary of Agriculture for application to the furtherance of soil conservation.

5. Export-Import Bank: To aid in financing and facilitating exports and imports and the exchange of commodities between the United States or any of its territories or insular possessions and foreign countries.

6. Puerto Rican Reconstruction Administration: (This agency services loans to cooperatives.)

7. Virgin Islands Corporation: To individuals for industrial, commercial, and agricultural purposes in the Virgin Islands, where such loans are not available from private sources.

8. Housing and Home Finance Agency: To local public bodies for slum clearance and planning; to public or nonprofit private institutions of higher learning for housing and facilities; and for construction in Alaska. (And FNMA insurance.)

9. Federal home-loan banks (11) (Government owns \$75,000,000 in stock held by Secretary of Treasury): On homes with special service to veterans.

10. Federal Housing Administration: To finance production of prefabricated houses; and insure loans to purchasers of prefabricated houses, mortgages financing purchases of certain types of publicly constructed houses, insure financial institutions against loss on property improvement loans, to insure mortgages on small family homes, insure mortgages on farm properties, insure mortgages on single-family dwellings, insure mortgages on cooperative housing, insure mortgages on rental projects.

11. Public Housing Administration: To construct and operate low-rent public housing dwellings.

12. Federal Reserve banks: Directly or indirectly to business for periods up to 5 years for working capital, and for not exceeding 90 days on promissory notes secured by direct obligations by the United States, and in unusual and exigent circumstances by discounting notes, drafts, and bills for individuals, partnerships, or corporations.

13. State Department: For the protection of private investments abroad.

14. International Bank for Reconstruction and Development: To finance rehabilitation, expansion, and modernization of industrial and agricultural facilities abroad.

15. Rural Electrification Administration: To finance construction of rural electric facilities, and to REA-financed power distributors for relending to individuals for wiring, appliances, and plumbing, and for financing rural telephone lines and providing technical assistance in connection with rural telephone installation.

16. Veterans' Administration: Guaranteed for purchase or construction of homes, farms, and business property.

17. Other: Including Indian and reclamation loans.

In a special Federal credit analysis the budget document for fiscal year 1952 states: "Federal credit programs, in the main, are designed to supplement or reinforce private financing"; and that, "Most lending agen-



cies either by law or by administrative policy limit direct loans to cases where the borrowers cannot obtain credit on reasonable terms from private financial institutions." And despite the Government's much-publicized policy of attempting to restrict private credit, the budget document continues with the statement that: "Under loan insurance and guaranty programs, the Government agency shares the risk and thus encourages private financing." In the next paragraph the budget document says: "Total new commitments for all of these types of programs (Federal direct loans and federally insured and guaranteed loans) for fiscal year 1952 are estimated at \$13,300,000,000."

The budget document shows that available Federal credit authority in the current fiscal year is estimated at \$58,600,000,000 and that more than \$44,000,000,000 would be used. It is estimated that total available Federal credit authority next year would increase to \$61,500,000,000 and that \$49,000,000,000 would be used.

This obviously is one tremendous fountainhead of inflation which is now contributing to commodity shortages and rising prices. Under these conditions there should be no doubt that we can get along without the RFC pipeline to the Treasury of the United States.

#### SUPPLYING OF AGRICULTURAL WORKERS FROM MEXICO

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 984) to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the hour of 12:30 o'clock today, namely, on the calendar day of May 1, debate upon any amendment to the pending bill or any motion, including appeals, which may be pending or which may thereafter be proposed to the said bill (S. 984) to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 shall be limited to not exceeding 40 minutes, to be equally divided, and controlled, in the case of committee amendments, by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], respectively, and, in the case of individual amendments or motions, by the mover of any such amendment or motion and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], respectively; provided, first, that in the event the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] is in favor of any such individual amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] or some other Senator designated by him; and second, that after Monday, April 30, 1951, no amendment submitted by a Senator—that is, any amendment that may not already have been submitted—intended to be subsequently proposed by him and ordered to lie on the table which is not germane to the subject matter of the said bill shall be received.

Ordered further, That debate on the question of the final passage of the said bill shall be limited to not exceeding 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] or some other Senator designated by him, respectively; provided, however, that during the consideration of any individual amendment or motion either of said Senators may yield to the mover of any such amend-

ment or motion, or to a Senator who is opposed thereto, any portion of such time of 1 hour allotted to him under this paragraph as he may desire.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may I inquire of the distinguished majority leader whether he has read the identical agreement heretofore presented?

Mr. McFARLAND. It is the identical agreement.

Mr. WHERRY. It is the identical unanimous-consent agreement for a limitation of debate which was presented last Friday, is it?

Mr. McFARLAND. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. The reason why I ask the question of the distinguished majority leader is that I must provide some time for the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] which was requested by him.

Mr. McFARLAND. That is all provided for in the proposed unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. WHERRY. I also wish to be able to grant to the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] at least 20 or 30 minutes for an address on the bill.

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. It is a long unanimous-consent agreement. However, if the majority leader assures me that such time is provided, I will have no objection.

Mr. McFARLAND. The Parliamentarian drew up the unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. WHERRY. I am not questioning in any way the distinguished majority leader's request for unanimous consent. We had agreed that the minority would have no objection to the unanimous-consent agreement which was proposed last Friday. What I wish to call to the attention of the distinguished majority leader is that if I am to control the opposition time of the debate on the bill, or the opposition time of the debate on any amendment, it was understood by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] and also by the majority leader that I could allocate 1 hour, to the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] on the bill for the presentation of his amendment, and that he could have 20 minutes on his own amendment, and that the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] agreed that if I needed more time, he would yield time to the opposition on other amendments.

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may I say that it was not more than 6 minutes ago that I talked to the majority leader with the idea of trying to get a unanimous-consent agreement for a limitation of debate. At that time the majority leader informed me that it was impossible to get such an agreement. I do not know whether he had at that time read the unanimous-consent agreement prepared by the Parliamentarian. I was of the opinion and in the mood of trying to get a unanimous-consent agreement.

However, I for one, will not consent to the request until I at least have a chance to investigate how the proposed agreement would actually affect me, no matter how much I desire to agree with the majority leader. Hence, I object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, as I said before, I anticipated that some Senator would probably object, but I thought that inasmuch as the Senator from New Mexico wanted me to try to secure an agreement, it was my duty to make the attempt.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I believe that the Senator from Arizona should at least consult me about a unanimous-consent agreement for limitation of debate on the pending bill, and not expect the Senate to accept anything he might consider fair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

#### LEASING OF CLEVELAND TANK PLANT, CLEVELAND, OHIO

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, today I call attention briefly to another instance of unnecessary waste of the taxpayers' money.

In 1950 the United States Air Force had under its jurisdiction the Schlegel Air Force Base located in Brook Park, Cuyahoga County, Ohio. This property was formerly known as the Cleveland Aircraft Assembly Plant and at the present time is the Cleveland Tank Plant. This property was being retained in stand-by status for possible future operation during a period of national emergency.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, may we have order? Will the Senator from Delaware please speak a little louder so we can hear him?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield for an observation?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. McMAHON. I should like to say to the Senator from Nebraska that what he has just referred to goes to prove that the plugs we have in the floor for a loud-speaking system might well be implemented, and then Senators like the Senator from Delaware or perhaps the Senator from Connecticut, who are not equipped with the vocal amplitude of the Senator from Nebraska, could be heard.

Mr. WHERRY. I object to being called a plug.

Mr. WILEY. No; the plug is on the floor.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, on April 25, 1950, the Secretary of the Air Force, on the assumption that this property would not be needed in the foreseeable future, negotiated a lease for this property with the National Terminals Corp., of Cleveland, Ohio, for an annual rental of \$25,000 per year, or \$2,083 a month. The officers signing the lease for the National Terminals Corp. were Mr. A. B. Efrogmson, president, and Mr. L. A. Kraus, secretary.

On May 16, 1950, 3 weeks later, National Terminals Corp. executed a standard storage contract with the Commodity Credit Corporation—another Government agency—for the use of this same property, upon which they collected an average of \$12,000 per month. As I said before, they leased it for \$2,083 a month just 3 weeks before.

In August 1950, following the outbreak of the war in Korea, the lease between the Air Force and National Terminals Corp. was canceled, and the property repossessed by the Army, and on October 27, 1950, the CCC shipments out of these facilities were completed.

The Commodity Credit Corporation, during the 5 months in which it rented the property, paid to the National Terminals Corp. \$58,601.65, or an average of about \$12,000 per month. This represented a profit to National Terminals of nearly 600 percent, without any investment whatever.

This is not the first instance in which the CCC has resorted to this questionable practice, and there is no reason whatever why, if the Secretary of Agriculture had need of this property, he should not have negotiated direct with the Secretary of the Air Force for its utilization.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

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

S. 300. An act for the relief of Lloyd F. Stewart;

S. 451. An act for the relief of James McGillic and Blossom McGillic;

S. 464. An act for the relief of Willard Cheek and Louise Cheek;

S. 568. An act for the relief of George W. Purdy;

S. 613. An act for the relief of Ernestine Bacon Jacobs;

S. 768. An act conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claims of G. T. Elliott, Inc., and M. F. Quinn;

S. 803. An act to authorize the sale of post route and rural delivery maps, opinions of the Solicitor, and transcripts of hearings before trial examiners, at rates to be determined by the Postmaster General; and

S. 998. An act to facilitate the financing of the defense contracts by banks and other financing institutions, to amend the Assignment of Claims Act of 1940, and for other purposes.

#### THE TASK AHEAD FOR THE CRIME COMMITTEE—DISCUSSION ON THE AMERICAN FORUM OF THE AIR

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, on Sunday, April 29, the American Forum of the Air observed its twenty-third anniversary. Mr. Theodore Granik is the moderator of that program. It is now being sponsored by a Michigan corporation, the Bohn Aluminum & Brass Corp., of Detroit, Mich., one of the Nation's leading industrial firms.

I believe that firm is to be commended in particular for the stand against communism it has expressed in a series of public-service advertisements. I read from one of its advertisements:

Think what you will lose if communism wins. You won't be able to insure your

family's future. You won't be able to pray in your church. You won't be able to argue your brand of politics. You won't be able to work where and how you want to. You won't live as a free man.

Elsewhere it is stated:

Listen for the deceitful words that promise new freedoms but promote slavery.

Freedom is never lost by a single act. It is stolen by innocent-sounding words that breed doubt, suspicion, and dissatisfaction.

Communism thrives on sugar-coated promises with pink centers.

Our country will remain free, only if we listen for the lies, the half truths, and expose them.

Mr. President, that indicates the high standard of public service we may expect from the televised American Forum of the Air and Mr. Granik, under his new sponsor. Mr. Granik's program is well known to Members of the Senate from their participation on it. Last Sunday his program rendered a service which is worthy of recognition by Congress. I feel, therefore, that the Senate should order the printing in the RECORD of the proceedings of the American Forum of the Air for Sunday, April 29, 1951. The title of the discussion is "The Task Ahead for the Crime Committee." Four of the distinguished members of that committee were on the televised program at that time.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the proceedings of that program, because I think all Senators should know about it.

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

#### THE AMERICAN FORUM OF THE AIR, SUNDAY, APRIL 29, 1951

##### THE TASK AHEAD FOR THE CRIME COMMITTEE

(Speakers: Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, Democrat, of Tennessee; Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, Republican, of Wisconsin; Senator LESTER C. HUNT, Democrat, of Wyoming; Senator CHARLES W. TOBEY, Republican, of New Hampshire. Moderator: Theodore Granik, founder and moderator of the American Forum of the Air.)

ANNOUNCER. Good afternoon. It's time again to join the American Forum of the Air and a discussion of the task ahead for the Crime Committee. The topic originally scheduled for today, entitled "What's Ahead—Peace or War?" will be heard at this time next Sunday.

Here today to discuss the task ahead for the Crime Committee is ESTES KEFAUVER, Democratic Senator from Tennessee; Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, Republican, of Wisconsin; Senator LESTER C. HUNT, Democrat, of Wyoming; and Senator CHARLES W. TOBEY, Republican, of New Hampshire.

This is the American Forum of the Air.

Now here is your moderator, who, 23 years ago today, founded the American Forum of the Air, Theodore Granik.

Moderator GRANIK. On Tuesday, the Senate Crime Investigating Committee will be filing with the United States Senate its third interim report. This historic document will be of tremendous interest to every law-enforcement official and every citizen of the United States. To give us the history of the committee's work and a look into its future, our distinguished guests, all of whom have performed such a magnificent public service, will discuss the task ahead for the Crime Committee.

Now, Senators, in our studio audience today are several hundred leaders of the Congress, of the Government, and the press.

They, like many of our radio and television audience, would like to know what you have found to be the outstanding discoveries by the committee.

Senator KEFAUVER. Mr. Granik, first let me say how good it is to be with you on the twenty-third anniversary of the American Forum of the Air.

I think the outstanding thing our Crime Committee has found is that crime does operate on a syndicated basis in the United States; that it is much more powerful and sinister and has a more devastating and undesirable economic influence upon the people of our country than anyone had thought; also, that it has political and law-enforcement connections.

I think we have also been heartened by the fact that since the facts have become known, all levels of people and Government officials are going to go after the proper individuals.

Moderator GRANIK. Senator WILEY, do you care to comment on the crime syndicates, to which your earlier report referred?

Senator WILEY. No. But I would just like to give an idea in relation to what is up ahead.

It should be noted that the public should not expect a series of intensive hearings, such as was held in the New York investigation, in the 4 months that are up ahead. The workload of the Congress is so heavy today as to make it practically impossible for us to schedule hearings more than once or twice a month. It is important, of course, that we concentrate the most critical issues of our times on the sound basis of first things first.

I sincerely feel that one of the things that has come out of this investigation so far has been an alerting of the public, a re-awakening of the public awareness to the need that they, the public, have a job to do.

Moderator GRANIK. How do you feel about that, Senator HUNT?

Senator HUNT. I think, Mr. Granik, that perhaps the most noteworthy effect has been the unprecedented public interest that has been aroused in the work that we have been doing. I do not believe that ever in the history of Congress has there been a committee that has received the wholehearted support of the people of the Nation as we have. I think that proves conclusively, Mr. Granik, that the great majority of our people throughout the country want good, clean law enforcement on all levels.

Moderator GRANIK. Senator TOBEY, Senator WILEY referred to future hearings. What cities do you expect to visit?

Senator TOBEY. I cannot say. The committee has not considered that. But we are going to places before we get through.

I would like to make this observation as to the committee: There are three Democrats and two Republicans. That is entirely appropriate because it takes three Democrats to hold down two Republicans any time.

I want to go a little further and say that there are two outstanding results of this investigation. The first is the marvelous invention of television, the miracle invention, which has brought the results of this committee's hearings into millions of homes throughout the country and has given the plain people for the first time the privilege of seeing their Government at work.

Moderator GRANIK. Do you plan to use television in the future?

Senator TOBEY. Yes, and we mean to do that every time.

Let me say that the fellow to my right, the chairman of the committee, is being succeeded by Senator O'CONNOR, of Maryland. That is all right by me. But I want to say that I would be guilty of negligence if I did not say to the people of the Nation, that this man, ESTES KEFAUVER, on my right, is a noble Christian gentleman, who deserves the high-

est praise from his country. And I pay him that tribute sincerely.

We are going on, and the greatest thing we can do is to uncover in this country the collusion between the crooked elements of this country and the public officials of the Government—State, city, and national. And we are going to do that, God helping us.

Moderator GRANIK. Do you want to discuss that collusion, Senator KEFAUVER?

Senator KEFAUVER. Before I do discuss it, I want to say that our committee, I think, has been very fortunate in that we have had no politics and no partisanship whatsoever in our work. I think we all agree that we have gone straight down the middle of the road and have tried to find the facts and to expose them. In that way, we have sought to bring public attention to them so as to provide a basis for legislation.

I think I should mention also that in Rudolph Halley and his associates we have had very excellent teamwork on our staff.

I do think there is still much to be accomplished.

I agree with Senator WILEY that the first thing to do now is to try to press for legislation to stop the use of interstate commerce in the furtherance of organized crime; to try to break it up, reduce it to a lower level, a local level, so that local people can more adequately deal with it.

Moderator GRANIK. Do you believe the committee can and should promote legal action against the racing wire service?

Senator KEFAUVER. Yes.

Of course, that is one of the unfortunate problems we have been holding hearings about, and that is one of the main things we have to get at. That is because, in my opinion, the racing wire service is public enemy No. 1 in the country. I do not refer in that way to all the people who are connected with it necessarily, but it itself is the arterial system of bookmaking all over the Nation. And, of course, that leads to all other kinds of crime and collusion which operate around bookmaking.

Moderator GRANIK. Do you feel such action will conflict with the freedom of the press, Senator TOBEY?

Senator TOBEY. No, I do not.

Moderator GRANIK. Do you want to comment on that, Senator HUNT?

Senator HUNT. I do not believe it will conflict with the freedom of the press. It seems to me it is a question of degree.

Incidentally, may I say that we have always had thorough coverage of Congressional investigations by the press. They have also always had thorough coverage by their photographers. We have had radio now for 25 years. Television is just one step further. I cannot understand the difference between having 30,000,000 people in their living rooms looking in on what is happening and having 200 people in a hearing room.

I think it squares with the Constitution, too. I think it is an agency for public service. It really is a great Godsend to this country, in view of the good effects we can have from television for good government.

Moderator GRANIK. Senator, you referred to collusion before. Why is it the committee found corruption among so many law enforcement officials, particularly among sheriffs and policemen?

Senator HUNT. Why is it? Because the human heart is despicable and wicked in all things in its normal state. Men have been guilty of avarice for filthy lucre, and they have sold their souls across this country. Witness New York City alone, where gambler Gross was indicted for paying protection for the calendar year 1950 and paid out \$1,000,000. He pleaded not guilty. But 1 week before he was called before the bar, he turned around and pleaded guilty. That is \$1,000,000 spent in the great Empire City of New York for police protection of officials in one calendar year.

Just think that over and get mad about it. If you do not, there is something wrong with the American public.

Moderator GRANIK. Senator KEFAUVER.

Senator KEFAUVER. Of course, organized crime and big-time crime, as Senator TOBEY says, cannot operate without protection of one kind or another. It may be in the ability to influence votes, but there must be corruption.

I do not think we should give the impression that any large percentage of our public officials or enforcement officers are corrupt or that they have any connections with organized crime, but if there is any amount of corruption in the United States it is too much, whether at a local, State or Federal level.

I do think it should be pointed out that if the people would take more interest in voting for and in backing up their good law enforcement officials so that they in turn would feel that they could be reelected for office and supported for office if they did an honorable job, then, we would have a lot less dishonesty.

Senator TOBEY. Senator KEFAUVER, may I amend your statement?

If the people would take more interest in voting—period. In the last election 50 percent of the registered voters used that prerogative and went to the polls. That is the tragic thing in America.

Senator WILEY. Mr. Chairman.

Moderator GRANIK. Senator WILEY.

Senator WILEY. So that there would be no misunderstanding, I would like to make a point.

First, we being a congressional committee and we being legislators, our primary function is legislation. The only reason why we have any jurisdiction is because crime is interstate, not intrastate alone.

And ancillary to finding the facts, of course, on which to recommend legislation to the Congress, probably another objective is, as has been said so dramatically here by my associates, to arouse the people to the fact that it is their job, not the Congress's job. We can pass a thousand pieces of legislation, but unless there is a rebirth in the minds of the public officials, and especially in our constituents, who must sense that on the local level, in the States, in the cities, that they have got to clean house, the job will never really be done.

The danger is that we have had for the last 15 or 20 years too much of a tendency to "let George do it"; that is, let the Federal Government do it. And I make the point now, as this goes over the air and television, to everyone who wants to see this country remain American in its morality, in its political system and economic system: each one in his community must do what has been said here: exercise his franchise and see to it that good men go into office—good, moral men, as well as men with intelligence.

Moderator GRANIK. What has been the general thinking of the Crime Committee in coping with the problem of infiltration by gangsters into legitimate business?

Senator HUNT, would you care to comment on that?

Senator HUNT. That is getting to be a very serious situation. It is a known fact that in New York they own the controlling stock in one bank. It is a known fact they are getting into utilities all over the country. It is a known fact they are buying into the large distilleries. They are in the real-estate business, they are in the hotel business. And when they get themselves thoroughly situated and in control of legitimate business, they will then utilize in legitimate business the same types of underhanded procedure, the same under-the-table tricks, that they have been using in their nefarious gambling activities.

I think it is a very serious situation.

Moderator GRANIK. Senator TOBEY.

Senator TOBEY. I will not speak on that.

But I will say—and I do not know whether or not the chairman intended to bring it up here—that we have this report coming out on Tuesday. I will say this much, without betraying any secrets; in that report are three or four solar plexus blows, any one of which can make a knockout of the criminal interests of this country. When you see it you will agree with me: Thank God for that report, and when that report comes out, pass the legislation and make it the law of the country.

Moderator GRANIK. What about the role of some of the lawyers and their associations with criminals? Would you care to comment on that, Senator TOBEY?

Senator TOBEY. I wouldn't dare to trust myself to comment on that.

Moderator GRANIK. Senator HUNT?

Senator HUNT. I shall be glad to comment on it.

Mr. Granik, I don't think these hoodlums, these gangsters, these criminals, could exist if it were not for the help they get from the legal profession.

Any attorney defending a crook knows the source of his fee, and, to my way of thinking, when he participates in those ill-gotten gains, and protects a known criminal he is certainly not doing a service to society although he may be getting a good fee.

And I think further than that, Ted, it is high time that the various States should start disbarment proceedings against the attorney who constantly follows that line of practice.

Moderator GRANIK. You are a lawyer, Senator KEFAUVER, do you have any comment on that?

Senator KEFAUVER. I used to be a lawyer; I am just a plain politician now.

Senator WILEY. In just a plain way, did you say?

Senator KEFAUVER. A very humble one.

We have three types of situations. Of course, anyone who is accused of crime has a right to someone to defend him. We recognize that in our committee.

But there is another type of representation where lawyers, we have found, advise criminals about how to operate so as to avoid the law. Of course, that isn't ethical. I agree with Senator HUNT that the bar associations ought to take action on that sort of trouble. We have found a third type as to lawyers and as to some few CPA's and tax experts, where they own part of the enterprises right along with the criminals and gangsters and racketeers. The evidence is known, the bar associations know it, and I think they are going to do something about it. That is one of the particular things that Judge Patterson's Committee of the American Bar Association is looking into.

Moderator GRANIK. Would you tighten the requirements for income-tax reporting by criminals, Senator KEFAUVER?

Senator KEFAUVER. Yes, indeed. There are a good many tax laws. Of course, the Ways and Means Committee of the House and the Finance Committee of the Senate have primary jurisdiction; but tax law is an integral part of getting at the big-time racketeers.

Moderator GRANIK. How about that, Senator TOBEY?

Senator TOBEY. Mr. Chairman, do you want me to touch lightly one of the high lights of the recommendations we are going to make in the report?

Moderator GRANIK. It would be wonderful if you would.

Senator TOBEY. Or would you rather we wouldn't?

Senator KEFAUVER. I don't think we ought to talk about it except in general terms.

Senator TOBEY. I see that some of the correspondents were talking about it today before this meeting.

Senator KEFAUVER. Frankly, it has been very unfortunate that an original galley—an initial draft by our committee was obtained. So I do not think that is fair to the other radio stations and to the press that anything more than a general statement be given at this time.

Senator TOBEY. I may say this: that the committee in its deliberations, and I think in its wisdom and devotion to the job it has to do, has devised some recommendations in the report, particularly bearing on income taxes, that will open your eyes and put a crimp in the style of a good many criminals across the country.

Moderator GRANIK. In a moment we will take questions from the audience.

I see one of our distinguished newspaper reporters, Merriman Smith. Mr. Smith, do you have a question?

Question. Thank you, Ted. All during the hearings there were a number of us in the newspaper business in Washington intrigued by one simple fact—that all the time the Crime Investigating Committee hearings were on the air from New York and Washington it was quite possible to put a bet down with any number of bookies in Washington and also to buy numbers tickets through a number of buildings in town.

I was just wondering what the committee can do to stop that?

Moderator GRANIK. To whom are you directing that?

Question. All of the Senators.

Senator KEFAUVER. Sir, the committee is interested in the interstate aspect of organized crime, where the facilities of interstate commerce are used. If it is purely a local matter, that is the responsibility for the local people to assume. It is not a healthy thing for us to try to ferret out every little criminal activity in every town, because that is a local burden.

Here in Washington we have a House committee investigating, and I think the Senate District of Columbia Committee is going to investigate. I imagine that our very able new chairman, Senator O'CONNOR, and the members of the committee will feel that there may be some interstate aspects that this committee should investigate.

But when the facts are exposed, then it's up to the people.

I would suggest, sir, you would give that information to the chief of police of the District of Columbia. If he didn't act, you might give it to one of these congressional committees. You would then be getting somewhere and you would be doing a wonderful job as a citizen.

Moderator GRANIK. Senator HUNT, would you like to comment on that?

Senator HUNT. I would like to make this comment: As usual, so often you can't see the mountains from the foothills. I would like to say to Mr. Smith we have almost exactly 100 cities in the United States having 100,000 people, and it is impossible for the committee to get to every one of them. We did get to 14 of them. I think we did establish the pattern, and I think we have proven to the people what is going on in most large cities. And I can assure you it hasn't been our objective to overlook Washington. Maybe we just haven't gotten around to it yet.

Moderator GRANIK. We will take another question. Go ahead, sir.

Question. Ernest Vaccaro, of Associated Press. I address my question to Senator KEFAUVER, because he is from my home State. Senator KEFAUVER. We are old friends in Tennessee.

Question. There haven't been public hearings in the home States of members of the committee, as I understand it. I wonder if there are investigations going on in those States by staff investigators.

Senator KEFAUVER. We have tried to get to the focal points of crime, to the nerve centers of crime. I think there are investigations

going on, and some have been made in some of the cities that members are from.

But I believe that any fair people in picking out the 14 cities that we should have held our hearings in would have picked the ones that have been picked.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Vaccaro, we have had witnesses before the committee in other cities about conditions in, I believe, some of the States represented by the Members of the Senate on this committee. We have tried to make our selections fairly and in the public interest.

Moderator GRANIK. Senator TOBEY, do you want to comment on that?

Senator TOBEY. I have no particular comment. There are 48 States in the Union. There are five members on the committee. We have covered 12 or 13 of the 48 States. I don't see how we could have done a better job or more complete job in that time. We are not through yet—there are 4 months to come, and if I have my way we are going to go to New England, which would embrace New Hampshire, as part of the New England States. And it is needed up there in the New England States very, very strongly.

Moderator GRANIK. Do you want to comment on that, Senator HUNT?

Senator HUNT. I might say that I, too, have thought of the question the gentleman just asked. But having no need whatsoever for them to go into Wyoming, I didn't think it was advisable.

Moderator GRANIK. We have another question. Go ahead.

Question. I am Joe Gambatese for the McGraw-Hill magazines. My question is addressed to Senator KEFAUVER.

There has been considerable speculation that you may be a candidate for President of the United States.

Senator WILEY. That's no crime.

Question. I wonder if the Senator would like to comment about his political future.

Senator KEFAUVER. If you want a comment, I will do so very briefly, but I think the question ought to be addressed to Senator WILEY and others.

I am not a candidate. I have no interest in it. I think it is far-fetched. Some of the people, in their overenthusiasm, have mentioned me but there is no factual basis for it whatsoever.

Moderator GRANIK. Do we find any endorsement from the Republicans, Senator TOBEY?

Senator TOBEY. Well, I should be tempted to take the stump for the Senator, if he ran.

Moderator GRANIK. I think the Senator would like to ask the reporter a question. Would you care to come back, Senator HUNT, and turn the tables?

Senator HUNT. No. I was just going to say with reference to the question, asked about the future of Senator KEFAUVER, if you should put that up to a vote of the committee, I can assure you that it would be a solid vote of approval.

Senator KEFAUVER. You fellows had better watch out, I might change my mind.

Moderator GRANIK. May we have another question? Go ahead, sir.

Senator WILEY. He's just MacArthur; he isn't a candidate.

Moderator GRANIK. Go ahead.

Question. My name is Stephen Andrews and I am Washington correspondent for the North American Newspaper Alliance. My question is directed to Senator TOBEY:

Why aren't some of these hoodlums already behind bars? Senator, you spoke of collusion between criminals and public officials. The committee has been talking now for months, and still the criminals are free. Why haven't you already put some of these men behind the bars and what action do you contemplate taking to make sure some of these people land behind bars?

Senator TOBEY. Here comes the answer, and I hope it will satisfy you.

This committee is an investigatory body charged with demonstrating to the American people that there is crime in interstate commerce, and we have done that. When it comes down to enforcing the convictions of these men, that is entirely up to the district attorneys of the United States Government and the several States, and the law enforcing bodies. That is elementary.

Now already some of these men are up before the court, 13 or 14 of them on contempt charges, which may lead to further imprisonment, after they serve that. Erickson is already serving 2 years in Rykers Island in New York, and before the grand jury gets through in New York, I think they will have brought in a good bill of indictment for several prominent men in New York. I hope and pray so, for they are guilty as hell.

Now, I don't think your question is based upon the facts of the case. You must recognize that we are not an enforcing body or a prosecuting body. We produce the picture. Let the existing agencies pick it up from there and prosecute to the hilt.

Moderator GRANIK. Senator WILEY, do you want to comment on that?

Senator WILEY. Yes. I think the question by the very distinguished newspaperman illustrates clearly how, you might say, ignorant we are in this country in relation to our own Government, with its division of power. We are not in the executive branch or in the administrative branch, as Senator TOBEY said. We are simply in the legislative branch, that is our function. We are not the judicial branch, either.

As a result of this committee, if the people in America could get a yen to study their Constitution and their form of government, and understand that that is the reason this Government is what it is, because of the division of power, they would see that what has happened is that the administrative branch, the enforcing branch, the executive branch of the Government and in the States has fallen down in enforcing the law.

Moderator GRANIK. We have time for one more question. Go ahead.

Question: I am Jerry Green, of the New York Daily News, Ted. I have one question to address to Senator KEFAUVER and Senator TOBEY. That is that more than 20 States have legalized horse-race gambling. What right has the Federal Government to tell citizens of the other States that they can't bet on a horse that is running across the line. For example, I believe there is a track in Senator TOBEY's State, Rockingham, which draws most of its patronage from Boston.

Senator TOBEY. We don't propose to tell them, we have never suggested it and never thought of it. Of course, the State is supreme in passing pari-mutuel legislation. If they want to, that is their business. We never intimated or thought such a thing.

Senator KEFAUVER. As I understand the question, it is a matter of what right we have to keep people in other States from betting on horse races in the States where it is legal.

We have a right to say what can be done in interstate commerce. That is the way we are getting at it.

Moderator GRANIK. Thank you, gentlemen. You have been listening to a discussion on the Task Ahead for the Crime Committee. Our speakers have been: Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, of Tennessee, Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, of Wisconsin, Senator LESTER C. HUNT, of Wyoming, and Senator CHARLES W. TOBEY, of New Hampshire.

THIRD INTERIM REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE ORGANIZED CRIME IN INTERSTATE COMMERCE (S. REPT. NO. 307)

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, from the Special Committee To Investigate

Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce, I submit, pursuant to S. Res. 202, Eighty-first Congress, providing for an investigation of gambling and racketeering activities in interstate commerce, the third interim report, and request that it be printed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received and printed as requested by the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The resolution (S. Res. 135) was read, as follows:

*Resolved*, That there be printed 6,000 additional copies of Senate Report Numbered 307, Eighty-second Congress, first session, being a report entitled "Third Interim Report on Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce," which was submitted by the Special Committee To Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce, pursuant to S. Res. 202, Eighty-first Congress, of which 4,000 copies shall be for the use of the Special Committee To Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce and 2,000 copies for the use of the Senate document room.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, how many copies are proposed to be printed, and what is to be the cost? Also, has the resolution been referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I am advised by Mr. Ives, the Senate printing clerk, that the resolution was taken up with the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]. I understand that a considerable sum will be saved if the resolution is approved now. I believe that the cost for an additional 1,000 copies is \$200.27.

Mr. McFARLAND. If the resolution has been approved by the chairman of the committee, I have no objection.

Mr. KEFAUVER. It has been submitted to the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to have the Senator from Tennessee repeat his request.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Will the Senator from Tennessee restate his request?

Mr. KEFAUVER. The request is for the printing of additional copies of the third interim report of the Special Committee To Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce.

Mr. WHERRY. Was the resolution presented to the Committee on Rules and Administration?

Mr. KEFAUVER. The resolution was brought to me with the statement that it had been submitted to the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. WHERRY. I am in favor of publishing the report, but I should like to

know whether or not the resolution has been approved by the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. KEFAUVER. There is a notation on the resolution that an additional 1,000 copies would cost \$200.27.

I am sure the matter has been presented to the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]. But if it has not been, I will ask his consent.

Mr. WHERRY. I am for the resolution, but I wanted the record to show that the Committee on Rules and Administration had handled the resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Nebraska object?

Mr. WHERRY. No; I have no objection.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The Senator from Nebraska has been advised that it has been submitted?

Mr. WHERRY. I have not been. I simply wanted to be sure that the Committee on Rules and Administration had been advised with respect to the resolution. I am for the resolution, as I stated when I rose a moment ago, but I wanted to know that the complete membership of the subcommittee that handled it was at least advised of the request.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The matter has been submitted to, and has been approved by, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN].

Mr. WHERRY. Very well.

#### COMMENTS ON THIRD INTERIM REPORT OF CRIME COMMITTEE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I should like to say just a brief word for the record with respect to the 195-page Third Interim Report of the Senate Crime Investigating Committee and with respect to the chairman.

I think that the most eloquent commentary on the historic third report is contained in its own vast and detailed text. Anyone who looks at the report can quickly note that a mountain of labor was involved in its preparation, and in all the long months of research, study, investigation, and hearings which preceded its writing.

It has been my privilege to be associated with the committee, and I look forward to our continuing operations. It is a source of regret to me not to have been able to devote to the committee's tasks all the time they so eminently merited, but my other responsibilities as ranking Republican member of the Foreign Relations and Judiciary Committees have necessarily limited my time.

#### TRIBUTE TO CHAIRMAN KEFAUVER

We are fortunate, indeed, however, to have had as our chairman since the inception of the committee the distinguished junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

With the filing of this third interim report my colleague from Tennessee is bowing out as chairman, although he will be serving with us as a member in the remaining months of the special committee's life.

I feel I would be remiss, indeed, if I did not pay tribute at this time to one of the finest jobs of public service that has ever been performed by a committee chairman. I know that my colleagues on

the committee join with me in expressing this tribute to him and to the members of his very able staff, including the chief counsel, Mr. Rudolph Halley, who is resigning today following a solid year of labor in the public interest.

I know that I speak for the other members of the committee when I bid Mr. Halley Godspeed in his resumption of private-law practice and in acknowledging our appreciation for the splendid, courteous, efficient, and conscientious way in which he has handled his heavy responsibilities. He has set standards as chief counsel of this committee which have even surpassed his previously high standards in a similar capacity with the Truman World War II investigating committee.

#### COMMENDATION OF SENATOR O'CONNOR

Mr. President, the Senate is fortunate indeed that we have in the very competent senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONNOR] our future chairman. We have confidence and faith in the fine job we know he is going to do.

#### WE HAVE TRIED TO BE FAIR

The final report mentions hundreds of names of communities, individuals, and companies. Intensive effort has been made to make sure that every single reference is fair, justified, and impartial. In no instance have we sought to smear any individual, any business, or any community, either directly or indirectly. If any unfair reference has inadvertently been made, I know that I, for one, certainly regret it, and I am sure that my colleagues do, too, although it is our earnest belief, following very close scrutiny, that we have kept to an absolute minimum any errors. If substantial errors do appear, we shall certainly endeavor to rectify them.

#### COMMITTEE WORK REQUIRED MUCH OFFICE STAFF AID

Ours was a difficult, complex job, one which absorbs a mountain of energy and time, both of members of the committee and, as recorded on pages 22 and 23 of the report, much energy and time on the part of members of their office staffs, who often had to sacrifice other official duties in the limited time available. But this was a job which had to be done, and which has been done, and done well, during these first 12 months.

#### I TRUST SUGGESTED BILLS WILL BE ENACTED

It is my earnest hope that the committee's various legislative recommendations will receive the prompt attention of standing committees of the Senate and House. Let not these recommendations languish in a mere report; let us get on with the job of smashing crime and corruption through constructive, fair legislation enacted into law.

#### MY OWN COMMENTS ON COMMISSION COMPRISED ONLY DISSENT

I do want to say a further word, because the only dissenting word in the entire 195 pages of the report comes in connection with my opposition to one of the committee's recommendations, namely, for the establishment of a Federal Crime Commission.

It was with the deepest of regret that I found it necessary to say any dissenting word at all because all of us on the

committee have prided ourselves on the fact that we have acted with complete unanimity for one entire year. While the recommendation for a crime commission is a significant one, and while my opposition to it is strong, I call the attention of the Senate to the fact that this lone dissenting instance makes the otherwise unbroken unanimity of the committee stand out all the more clearly. In all of the thousands of policy decisions we have had to make as to witnesses, hearings, questions, reports, and so forth, never once have the three Democrats and two Republicans parted ways. I think that is an inspiring record of unity which well could be a model for the Nation, particularly at this time, when there is so much difference of opinion as to certain matters, and since it is obvious that over-all unity is so important in the face of the present international challenge.

#### WHY I INTRODUCED WILEY-TOBEY RESOLUTION

I am glad that the committee will be carrying on. As I have previously stated in the Senate, thousands of appeals came to me for the committee's extension and that is why I submitted the Wiley-Tobey resolution, Senate Resolution 129, for such extension. I have in my hand one of the petitions which I received at that time, in the form of a resolution, which had been adopted at the annual meeting of the International Christian Leadership held in Washington on March 31. I am glad to point out this indication of the continuing interest of the people of the country and in particular the interest of the spiritual forces of the Nation—to which, incidentally, reference is well made in the report on page 188. I ask unanimous consent that this resolution be printed in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD following my remarks and that there be included thereafter the list of the officers and members of the Board of the ICL.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, these brief words in relation to the committee, I have felt obligated to make.

I wish to say that in my opinion as we face the challenges of the present, as I see them, they can be set forth in the following questions: First, can we maintain peace? Second, can we maintain the American dollar at its present basis, or must it, through inflation, diminish in value? Third, can we maintain, under the Constitution and the Republic, the American way of life, including the American system of free enterprise, the American system of freedom of worship, freedom of contract, and trial by jury?

Mr. President, one of the great instrumentalities that will help maintain these values is the reawakening in the consciousness of America of the need for the individual to be adequate, to realize that he cannot pass the buck to Washington, but that the job is his, in his local community and in his State, to see to it, first, that the moral law is lived up to; second, that the responsibility of citizens in relation to voting is lived up to; and, third, that public officials who

are elected do not come to Washington or to the State capitals to feather their nests, but, rather, to preserve the liberties and the freedoms which are recognized all over the world as the lighthouse of the American way of life. That is the job of all of us.

Mr. President, in my humble opinion this committee has added impetus or given vitality to the response which must be made in the breast of each citizen, in resolving that he will go forth as a crusader to maintain the traditions, the principles, and the freedoms of America.

#### EXHIBIT 1

The following resolution was adopted at the annual meeting of the International Christian Leadership held in Washington March 31:

"Whereas there is need for greater knowledge and awareness on the part of citizens of the true facts about conditions in the United States, in order that they may more usefully perform their duty as citizens; and

"Whereas the Kefauver crime committee has unearthed conditions not hitherto known to most citizens; and

"Whereas, as a result of these disclosures, there has been a rekindling of civic and Christian responsibility among citizens; and

"Whereas, by reason of the shortness of time, the Kefauver committee has been able to do only a part of the work that clearly should be done; and will not be able appreciably to add to its accomplishments in the 30-day extension voted by the Senate on March 29; and

"Whereas a congressional investigation is the surest instrument for the information and education of the American people: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That we express to each member of the committee our genuine appreciation for the fine work done and respectfully petition the extension of the committee in order to make a thorough and complete investigation of all serious crimes of every nature, to the end that the Congress may have full knowledge on which to base legislation, and to the end that the American people may have a complete picture of actual conditions.

"EDWARD M. CABANISS,  
"President.  
"ABRAHAM VEREIDE,  
"Executive Director."

#### INTERNATIONAL CHRISTIAN LEADERSHIP, INC., WASHINGTON, D. C.

President: Lt. Gen. Willard S. Paul.  
Vice president and chairman, executive committee: Senator A. WILLIS ROBERTSON.

Chairman ICCL: Senator RALPH E. FLANDERS.

Chairman national advisory committee: Nathaniel Leverone.

Vice presidents: Donald C. Stone; Nathan Bushnell, Jr.; O. Harold Folk.

Secretary: Hon. CLYDE DOYLE, Member of Congress.

Treasurer: James G. Gore.

Attorney: Glen E. Weston.

Executive director: Abraham Vereide.

Associate executive director: Robert B. Doing.

Members of the board: Edward W. Allen; Edward Cabaniss; Howard Coonley; James D. Cunningham; Hon. Paul Cunningham, Member of Congress; Hon. Paul B. Dague, Member of Congress; Hon. Clyde Doyle, Member of Congress; Dr. John Evans; Vice Adm. C. S. Freeman; Hon. J. Vaughan Gary, Member of Congress; Maj. Gen. Carl R. Gray; Dr. Ernest S. Griffith; Henry Gund; Hon. Brooks Hayes, Member of Congress; Hon. A. S. Herlong, Jr., Member of Congress; John P. Hilbert; Roy C. Ingersoll; Mrs. Aymar Johnson; Chief Judge Marvin Jones; Hon. Walter H.

Judd, Member of Congress; Senator Robert S. Kerr; Jesse Loeb; Paul Matthews; Arthur J. Morris; Hon. Norris Poulson, Member of Congress; Hon. J. Percy Priest, Member of Congress; George H. Roberts; William M. Scott; Hon. Katharine St. George, Member of Congress; Harvey Swenson; Dr. J. B. Thompson; Hon. Thor Tollefson, Member of Congress; Edward B. Wilber; Senator Alexander Wiley; Leonard C. Worthington; Edmond F. Wright; R. R. Zimmerman.

Field representatives: Dr. Henry E. Burke, George Eversfield, Yvelin Gardner, Dr. J. Edwin Orr, John W. Young.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I shall be very brief. Today the Special Committee on Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce has filed, by its chairman, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] its report on its progress.

At this time I wish to state briefly that the committee in carrying on its work has acted without fear of, or favor to, any man, but has fearlessly and, if I may say so, without egotism approached every matter in the interests of the people of the Nation.

Mr. President, there have been many features of the crime investigation which have disturbed the members of the committee. I wish to speak of three or four of them, in particular.

One has been the organized traffic across the country in the selling of narcotics to school children. In the city of Brooklyn, according to the testimony of District Attorney Miles McDonald, it was found that that traffic was on an organized basis. It is a tragic thing when young children are corrupted by the use of narcotics, with such a terrible, devastating effect on their lives in the years to come, with resultant delinquency, ruined lives, and an impaired basis for family life. It is an indictment of government that such a thing could happen in America.

Also, there have been the numerous cases of law enforcement officers—sheriffs and police officials—who, though they lifted up their hands and swore to obey the laws of the State and the Nation, have sold their birthright for a mess of pottage and have resorted to collusion and conspiracy with gangsters on a money basis. Some of them have broken down in their appearance before the committee and have pleaded guilty. It has been a tragic picture.

Another feature of the report, as will be found, is its reference to the ease with which the gangster interests have evaded the rules which circumscribe you and me and all other citizens in respect to the payment of income taxes to the Federal Government. In that connection, of course, there are definite rules respecting the deductions which can be made from gross revenue before income taxes are computed. The average citizen is very definitely bound by those rules. However, the gangster interests have developed a practice of making deductions for "miscellaneous" from their income from gambling speculations, whereas you and I have to set down the individual items of exemption, and they have to be blanketed in and definitely listed before such deductions can be made from gross revenue for the purposes of figuring income taxes.

So, Mr. President, in that connection we need regulations which have teeth in them. A measure incorporating such regulations will be most timely; and if the one we recommend is enacted into law, it will require the Bureau of Internal Revenue to assess all gangster interests for income taxes on the basis of their gross income without being able to make any deductions for expenses. If such a measure does not have a punch in it and is not a solar plexus blow, I do not know what is. If we adopt that program, it will be most beneficial. I shall have more to say about that matter later on.

Mr. President, today we have, as a result of this crime investigation work, an aroused public opinion the like of which I have never seen before. In my own little office I have received 15,300 letters from persons in all walks of life—from Catholic priests, Jewish rabbis, Protestant ministers, businessmen, college professors, husbands and wives, college students, even young boys and girls, some of whom have in their humble way sent cash to the committee, with the request that it be used to continue the committee's work. All of them bespeak their earnest interest in having the work continued—at the request of an outraged America. That public interest is a wonderful thing; but if it is only a transient interest, it will be entirely in vain.

However, Mr. President, I believe in my heart that we are on the eve of a great moral awakening in America. Time magazine has received 113,000 letters in that connection, and, as I say, I have received 15,300 letters, and my colleagues have received other letters of a similar tenor. It is evident that a great moral awakening is occurring throughout the Nation.

Thomas Carlyle said, in an essay which he wrote years ago, "The American people is that people which think they can avert fate and postpone doom-day by an act of Congress." That is the blind faith of so many of the American public, Mr. President.

A revived public opinion is now focusing upon those who have prostituted their office for paltry gain; but in America we need something deeper than that. We need a revival in the spiritual qualities, a revival in the souls of men and women, all over the land. That is what will save America, and I believe it is coming. Whether one is a Catholic, a Protestant, a Jew, or a Gentile, let all of us examine ourselves and bring to focus on these matters the great spiritual teachings of the Master of men, so that our America will be a land in which dwelleth righteousness, for all the people to come.

I say now, Mr. President, not only God bless America, but thank God for America.

It has been a great privilege to sit on the committee. I indulge in no exaggeration when I say that the distinguished junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], a noble Christian gentleman, has done fearlessly and on a nonpartisan basis, a wonderful job for the American people.

So, Mr. President, to each of my associates and to the very able staff of the

committee, I pay tribute. I reverently thank God for the privilege of being a humble member of this committee as we have carried on in the interests of the plain people of the United States. God bless America.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I should like to say a few words in connection with the filing of the third interim report of the Special Committee to Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce. First, I want to acknowledge with deep appreciation the remarks which have been made by my able colleagues, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONNOR], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT].

We feel that the facts presented in the interim report, largely present the picture of organized crime in interstate commerce across the Nation, as we are able to get it. I have always felt that the purpose, and the only purpose, of an investigating committee is to obtain facts for legislative purposes. Of course, as a byproduct, it has the purpose of arousing public interest, which, of course, is vitally important and necessary.

There may be certain limited fields in which we do not yet have the full picture, but I believe the facts, as we have presented them, are fairly full. It would be possible, of course, to present cumulatively evidence piled on evidence in connection with all the matters mentioned in the report but we have the necessary pattern for legislation.

The condition which we found to exist in the country at this time, as set forth in the report, is worse and more alarming than any of us anticipated. I refer to the organization of well-financed and well-organized gangs throughout the country, with interlocking connections, and of course, with political connections, which are necessary in order to enable them to continue their operations.

In the report, therefore, we have recommended certain legislation of a Federal nature, and we have made certain recommendations to the departments which we think will be very helpful, with reference to fuller participation by the Federal Government in the endeavor to prevent further use of interstate commerce by big-time racketeers. We have also made certain recommendations relative to internal-revenue matters and with reference to other agencies of the Government. I hope we may go forward vigorously with the presentation of legislative recommendations to the various committees, and that the committees will give them early consideration, in the light of the seriousness of the situation.

I trust that Members of the Congress and the public will not feel, since the life of the committee has been extended for 4 months, that there should be a let-up in the vigorous presentation of the legislative recommendations which are contained in the report. We feel that these recommendations, if enacted into law, will virtually bring to an end the big-time racketeering in interstate commerce, which is the basis of a great deal of the criminality in the country today.

We recognize that the Federal Government has but a limited jurisdiction in this matter, and that the greatest responsibility and the only possible real remedy is with local officials and the actions of local communities.

But we can help more effectively and now is the time for action. The criminal gangs of the country constitute an alarming economic drain on our people, a most sinister political and moral influence upon our people. They are a threat to honest businesses in many parts of the Nation.

The time is at hand for an all-out effort against these criminal activities at all levels of government—Federal, State, and local. Of course, none of these will be effective without public support. We now have that support. As the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] has said, there has been renewed activity on the part of local communities, as a result, partially at least, of the work of our committee. Many crime commissions have been formed throughout the country. Grand juries have been operating. Corrupt officials have been removed. An increased interest has been shown on the part of the great media for the dissemination of information on criminal conditions throughout the United States, so that I believe that as a result of this investigation to date we will have better law enforcement throughout the Nation, and that we shall have a cleaner and a better America.

Mr. President, the fact that certain officials have done business with racketeers and criminals has been mentioned, and that, of course, is true, because big-time criminal operations, particularly gambling, cannot take place without the acquiescence of law-enforcement officials, at some level. But I think it would be an erroneous impression if anyone should get the idea that we feel that any large number of officials, at any level of government, have connived with or worked with criminal influences. For the most part, throughout Federal, State, and most of the local governments, the great and preponderant majority of our public officials in America are honest, hard working, and loyal persons, who are fulfilling their obligations to the best of their ability in trying to enforce the laws.

I feel that if there has been a substantial dereliction of duty on the part of some officials, it is the result of a lack of public interest and a lack of public backing—that the public has failed to back up the officials when they have rendered good service. Of course, any amount of corruption on the part of public officials is entirely too much, and we are glad to report that real and vigorous efforts are being made to eliminate any corruption which may exist.

Throughout the year's activity on the part of the committee, while we have been dealing with a very delicate job, and while our work has not been pleasant, we have had, in our committee of five, a splendid working organization. It has been free from partisan dispute. We have never had any differences on policy matters, and I could not pay too high a tribute to the part each member

of the committee, aside from its chairman, has played. Each member of the committee—Senators O'CONNOR, TOBEY, HUNT, and WILEY—has carried his share of the load and has done his work, and done it well. Early in the life of the committee we determined that we were going to get the facts without regard to political or any other considerations. To the best of our ability, we have tried to do that and I think we have succeeded. This has not been a smear and it has not been a whitewash. We have tackled the rough and difficult situations and we now report the facts. We have had more than 650 witnesses before us and have investigated dozens of situations which have not been presented in committee hearings. I think we have gone straight down the line in presenting the true picture. We have let the chips fall where they may.

Mr. President, it has not been pleasant to present the facts in connection with certain people, either in business or political life, whose names are mentioned in the report; but we have endeavored to present the facts fairly, and to lean over backward in our effort to present the facts without smearing anyone. It is quite possible that in the report of 195 pages an improper adjective may have been used, or that someone may feel that he has been unfairly dealt with in the report. The committee desires to be entirely fair, and if it can be shown that mistakes have been made, the committee will be only too happy to endeavor to rectify them.

In the performance of its duty, the committee has conducted numerous hearings. Various members of the committee have served as chairman in the conduct of hearings at various times, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONNOR] having conducted the hearing in Detroit, and having presided over most of the hearings in New York; the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT] having presided as chairman at Tampa and at various other places. Each member of the committee has at one time or another acted as chairman. We have tried to be fair in our scrutiny of testimony and in seeking to prevent the unnecessary bandying about of the names of innocent citizens. We adopted rules for the conduct of the committee at our first session to try to insure fair treatment of witnesses. These rules have been scrupulously followed.

Before closing, Mr. President, I take the opportunity to thank the many Members of the Senate who have helped us so much in our inquiry, and to thank the President of the United States for the Executive order allowing us to see certain income-tax returns, and for his full cooperation at all points. I wish especially to thank the Attorney General, the Department of Justice, and various assistant Attorneys General, as well as J. Edgar Hoover, Jim Bennett, and many other persons who have assisted us in every way they could, together with the Secretary of the Treasury and the Treasury Department, who have cooperated splendidly, and have given us assistance. Harry Anslinger, the excellent head of the Narcotics Bureau, deserves special mention.

In previous reports, as in this report, we have been critical of certain activities of some few persons in the Treasury Department. We have criticized the Treasury Department for not going after racketeers and gangsters more vigorously on some occasions; but, in general, our work together has been pleasant, and I am very happy to say that the Secretary of the Treasury and the Bureau of Internal Revenue have taken very affirmative and effective steps to secure the collection of income taxes from racketeers and gangsters, to require their fuller reporting, and to expedite their prosecution for fraud for nonpayment of income tax.

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

Mr. KEFAUVER. In a moment.

In that connection, Mr. President, the listing of 2,500 racketeers and criminals, which was recommended by our committee and upon which action was taken a few days ago by the Internal Revenue Bureau, will be of tremendous assistance.

Informally, some time back, we recommended and have discussed with the Bureau of Internal Revenue the formation of a special fraud squad which will give special attention to income-tax returns and cases against big-time racketeers so that the handling of cases against them can be expedited both in the investigation and their prosecution. That, I think, will be one of the most effective steps that can be taken not only to secure tax money for the United States, but also to see that those men are brought to justice as expeditiously as possible.

I now yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I was wondering why the Treasury Department had not taken more drastic steps to prosecute racketeers prior to the report of the committee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I am glad the distinguished Senator asked that question. The testimony we have taken will comprise approximately 12 volumes, of which the last one has not been printed. We found, as a matter of fact, that the Department has not taken full steps to go after many of the racketeers. They explain that part of the difficulty has been the lack of sufficient staff; that they did not have full information about some criminals until more facts had been brought out; that some changes in the law were needed relative to the keeping of books and records, the violation of which, while now a misdemeanor, they feel should be made a felony. Yet, as the law now stands, they have not used it as they should.

In California and other places racketeers had connections with, and attempted to secure protection from, a few members of the Internal Revenue Bureau. Some of them were prosecuted in New York and in Boston some time back. Those whom we have ferreted out in California have either been dismissed or have been brought before and indicted by a grand jury. I believe there has been a general lack of appreciation of the importance of the matter. There has been indifference in going after these people with sufficient vigor, but I am happy to say that the situation is very

much better at this time, and the steps which are being taken are effective.

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

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Is it not a fact that some of these activities on the part of employees of the Bureau of Internal Revenue were known to the Department officials in Washington, and they had concealed the evidence, sitting tight on the information until it was exposed, and the men involved were not relieved of their jobs or their duties, nor were they prosecuted, until after the facts were made public?

Mr. KEFAUVER. In New York and Boston certain information of this kind was brought out. Some of the persons involved have been prosecuted and some of them have been committed to jail.

In California certain people were being investigated by the intelligence unit of the Department at the time the committee was holding a hearing in California. Some of the facts had not been brought out prior to that time. The Bureau of Internal Revenue criticized us for holding hearings before they had had an opportunity to complete their investigation by the intelligence unit. We felt that for one reason or another the investigation was taking too long and that it should have been finished. The fact was that about 5 or 6 months before that time the former head of the Intelligence Service in the area had retired, and a new man had taken his place who had to be oriented. We felt that in the public interest the facts we had, some of which had been brought out by the California crime committee, should have been presented. That was when we had our executive hearing. Following that time, the Internal Revenue Bureau discharged or suspended some of the persons involved. Some of them have been indicted; some are still under investigation. When we were in California holding public hearings, and also in Washington, we brought the facts of the situation up to date. I think too much time was being taken in the investigation, and we were justified in bringing out the facts when we did.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I think the Senator did a wonderful job in bringing to light improper activities on the part of employees of the Treasury Department. I am wondering if in his investigation he found who in the Treasury Department in Washington was sitting tight on the committee reports and not referring them to the Department of Justice. I know that in one specific instance one of the top officials in a Midwestern office was merely transferred by the Department to another office at a comparable salary, instead of being dismissed or prosecuted. He was not removed from the payroll of the Bureau until after the facts were exposed and an indictment was brought against him. I am wondering who in Washington is giving information to such employees.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I think it should be said in fairness that during the past few months a great many cases have been filed. Affirmative action is being taken. Throughout the country many fraud cases have been filed by the Treasury De-



partment. I believe that throughout the Department a great many things are being done which will greatly improve the situation. The bad apples, or the particular persons whom we have exposed, have been weeded out. Undoubtedly there are some few others. They too, I hope, will be removed. First, it will be ascertained who they are, and then they will be removed. A great deal of improvement has been brought about. I believe in giving credit for what has been done. I believe it is a mistake to give the impression that there has been a great deal of rottenness or lack of efficiency in the Internal Revenue Bureau. The Intelligence Unit is a career service. Generally throughout the country, as with other Federal departments, the employees are vigorous and hard-working men and women who are trying faithfully to do their jobs. In California we found three or four or five out of a thousand persons employed there who were unworthy to occupy a Government position. Of course, they had a bad effect on the whole agency. I am glad that we have been able to get rid of the bad apples.

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

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. I can hardly hear the distinguished Senator from Tennessee. I should like to ask one or two questions about the report. It has to do with organized crime in interstate commerce. I refer to the testimony of Ambassador O'Dwyer. Considerable evidence was adduced, was there not, about a great many things in connection with the testimony of the distinguished Ambassador?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes. It is covered in the report at considerable length.

Mr. WHERRY. Did the Senator draw any conclusions relative to the testimony?

Mr. KEFAUVER. We drew a conclusion relative to the over-all hearings in New York. I believe the conclusion will be found beginning at page 143. The preceding 25 or 30 pages are devoted to the New York hearings.

Mr. WHERRY. I have just glanced through the report, but I notice that at page 144, in paragraphs 4 and 5, there is this statement:

4. Despite Mr. O'Dwyer's frequent public castigations of Tammany Hall, and his acknowledgement that Frank Costello was a sinister influence therein, he has been on terms of intimate friendship with persons who were close friends of Costello. Many of his intimate friends were also close friends of racketeer Joe Adonis. He has appointed friends of both Costello and Adonis to high public office.

5. During Mr. O'Dwyer's term of office as district attorney of Kings County, between 1940 and 1942, and his occupancy of the mayoralty from 1946 to 1950, neither he nor his appointees took any effective action against the top echelons of the gambling, narcotics, water-front, murder, or bookmaking rackets. In fact, his actions impeded promising investigations of such rackets. His defense of public officials who were derelict in their duties, and his actions in investigations of corruption, and his failure to follow up concrete evidence of organized crime, particularly in the case of Murder,

Inc., and the water front, have contributed to the growth of organized crime, racketeering, and gangsterism in New York City.

Are any other recommendations made in the report with reference to the Ambassador?

Mr. KEFAUVER. It would be necessary to read the preceding 25 pages, which contain a discussion of the facts.

Mr. WHERRY. Does not the Senator feel in his own mind that there is a cloud over the Ambassador in his representation of the United States of America in Mexico?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I feel exactly what is stated in the two recommendations.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator feel that the Ambassador should continue to represent the United States in Mexico with such a cloud hanging over him?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I will say to my friend that I am not going to pass judgment at this time on the facts that we found in our New York hearings, except as to the conclusions in our report. It is a matter for the immediate determination of the President and of Mr. O'Dwyer.

Mr. WHERRY. I did not hear the Senator's last statement.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I will say to the Senator that as the facts stand now, without further explanation of a great many matters contained in the hearings and summarized in the report, I would not vote for the confirmation of Mr. O'Dwyer if it were submitted to the Senate today.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not wish unduly to press the Senator.

Mr. KEFAUVER. That is the way I feel.

Mr. WHERRY. What I was trying to get at was, Is the matter to be dropped now, does the Senator recommend further hearings, or has the administration been advised of the cloud which is apparently upon the representative of the United States Government in Mexico.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I am certain the administration and most everyone else knows of our report. The matter about Mr. O'Dwyer is still under investigation and inquiry by the grand jury in New York County. Most of the facts which are involved herein are under investigation and consideration. So I think final judgment as to guilt or innocence which the Senator has raised should await final conclusion of the grand-jury investigation being conducted by Mr. Hogan in New York County, by Mr. McDonald in Kings County, and Mr. Saypol, of the United States district court in southern New York.

Mr. WHERRY. I am merely asking questions about the recommendations and about the findings of the committee; that is all. I deeply appreciate the answers of the Senator from Tennessee.

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

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. On the question of guilt, is there not a difference between a recommendation of an investigating committee and a determination by a court of law in the United States?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes; that is quite true. It is pointed out definitely in the report.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Is it not basic in American law that until someone is declared guilty of—

Mr. WHERRY. Oh—

Mr. CHAVEZ. Oh, I know, but I am not playing politics; I am trying to discuss basic American law. Until someone is convicted he is presumed to be innocent. Neither by insinuation nor otherwise should anyone try to take political advantage because an investigating committee of the United States Senate has made some recommendations.

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

Mr. KEFAUVER. I should like to answer the Senator's question. The matter is before the New York grand jury. Other phases of the question are being considered by Mr. Irving Saypol, the distinguished and capable United States district attorney for the southern district of New York. I agree with the Senator from New York, as we have set forth in the report, that until they complete their investigation it is not a matter that can finally be determined or adjudged.

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

Mr. CHAVEZ. If the Senator will yield to me once more, the point I am trying to make is that irrespective of the sincerity of purpose—and the noble conclusions, I would say—of an investigating committee, the freedom of an American citizen should be paramount. No insinuation should go out to the entire world that because an investigating committee came to a certain conclusion an American citizen is guilty of a crime. Does not the Senator agree with me?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I agree with the Senator from New Mexico. We do not say in the conclusion that he is guilty of a crime. We say that judgment as to many of the things should be and must be withheld until the normal courses of court procedure have been pursued.

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

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. I certainly want the RECORD to show that the junior Senator from Nebraska is not accusing Ambassador O'Dwyer of what is set forth in the conclusions. I asked whether the Senator had reached any conclusions, and the Senator said he had, and referred to page 144 of the report.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. I asked the Senator whether, from the conclusions which he had drawn, he felt there was a cloud upon the Ambassador.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President—

Mr. WHERRY. Just a moment. The Senator has yielded to me.

Mr. KEFAUVER. My answer was that until these matters have been settled, in the course of judicial proceedings which are now taking place in New York, on the basis of the evidence we now have I would not vote for the confirmation of Mr. O'Dwyer's nomination if it were before us today.

Mr. WHERRY. I understood the Senator from Tennessee perfectly. I wish to say to him that I feel that in his mind he has come to that conclusion. I believe that his conclusions are valuable. That is why we understood the investigation. The last line of paragraph 3 reads as follows:

Costello also had relationships with some Republican political leaders.

No one has injected politics into this question in any way, shape, or form. I was only commenting on the report. The report is for the benefit of the Senate and for the people of the United States.

I was particularly interested in the conclusions which were drawn. I think the distinguished Senator from New Mexico called them "noble conclusions." I believe that these three or four paragraphs are noble conclusions.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President—

Mr. WHERRY. My question was predicated not upon the innocence or guilt of any individual, but upon the findings and conclusions of the report. The report states that—

His defense of public officials who were derelict in their duties, and his actions in investigations of corruption, and his failure to follow up concrete evidence of organized crime, particularly in the case of Murder, Inc., and the water front, have contributed to the growth of organized crime, racketeering, and gangsterism in New York City.

I believe that that constitutes a cloud, and that cloud should be removed. I believe that an immediate trial should be had, in order that one who is representing the United States as Ambassador to Mexico may have removed the cloud which is surrounding him.

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

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. When I said "noble conclusions," I meant every word of it. I agree with the conclusion of the committee that racketeering was going on. But when the Senator from Nebraska asked his question, I could see what he had in mind. I will tell the Senator from Nebraska my conclusions. In speaking about the American Ambassador to Mexico, the Senator from Nebraska said, "We do not have anything against him. We are talking about conclusions."

Mr. WHERRY rose.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Let me finish.

So far as concerns the Ambassador to Mexico, I am reminded of the story about a trout fisherman in either my State or the State of my good friend from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND], who was casting in a mountain stream. Suddenly he pulled out a beautiful mountain trout, sparkling and shimmering. He said, "You poor little fellow. I love you. You are so sweet. I am not going to hurt you. All I am going to do is to gut you."

That is what the Senator from Nebraska had in mind, in my opinion, so far as the Ambassador is concerned.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I am trying very briefly to outline the report of the committee.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a very brief observation?

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

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the distinguished Senator from Tennessee for the work he has done in connection with this investigation. I take it that everything in the report is submitted to the Senate, the House of Representatives, and the American people. Certainly we have the right to ask the distinguished Senator questions relative to this report. I do so in good old American fashion. I obtained answers. Whether we are gutting a little fish or a big one, if that is the interpretation the Senator from New Mexico wishes to place upon our action, it is all right with me. I still feel that the question is pertinent. I was seeking the judgment of the distinguished Senator from Tennessee, and I got it. He stated that he would not vote at this time to confirm the nomination of Mr. O'Dwyer.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, of course we want full discussion of the subject. I hope we can have time later for a very full discussion of all sections of the report, in order that the subject and recommendations may be considered by the standing committees of the Senate as soon as bills can be prepared and referred to the various committees. I did not wish to take a great deal of time today in interrupting the pending program, but I do hope that the report can be discussed on the floor of the Senate in greater detail as we go on.

I also wish to say that I think we have had a very extraordinary staff in the conduct of this investigation. I wish to pay tribute to the members of the staff.

Our chief counsel, Rudolph Halley, who was associate counsel of the Truman committee, has rendered a great and outstanding service. He conducted most of the hearings throughout the country. His keen mind, courage, and great ability are outstanding.

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

Mr. KEFAUVER. I wonder if the Senator will allow me to continue for about 3 minutes. Then I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. KEM. Certainly.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. George S. Robinson was our original associate counsel. He handled all the hearings in Chicago and conducted the office here for a considerable length of time. Due to his previous experience in the Annenberg wire service case he was of great value to our work. He has now returned to the legal staff of the Air Force in accordance with our previous agreement.

Harold G. Robinson, whom we obtained from the California Crime Commission, was head of the investigative staff of our committee. He is one of the best men in his line of business in the country. He brought the committee many years of experience with the FBI and with the Truman committee. He is now serving as deputy to the attorney general of California.

Alfred Klein, of Philadelphia, has served our committee splendidly as associate counsel and also as director of public relations. He has handled many hearings capably and always uses good judgment.

Downey Rice, associate counsel, has been with our committee throughout its existence. He has had great experience in investigations and trial practice and he ably conducted the hearings at Tampa, New Orleans, and the open hearings in California.

John Burling was one of our able associate counsels who presented the hearings with splendid skill in Detroit and St. Louis.

Joe Nellis, during the time he was an associate counsel, did an outstanding and very able job for the committee in hearings in Cleveland and he conducted an important part of the hearings in New York.

Patrick Kiley did outstanding work for our committee in Florida, New Orleans, Chicago, and elsewhere. His long years of experience and great energy were of tremendous benefit. Mr. Kiley is at present the clerk of the International Claims Commission. He is an outstanding and able investigator.

Mrs. Carmel P. Ebb and Ernest Goldstein have been of excellent assistance in the Washington office.

George Martin, who made an excellent crime reporter for the Scranton Times whom I met during the Judge Johnson investigation many years ago, has served ably as director of information and as a skilled investigator for our committee.

During the early months of its existence the committee was fortunate in being ably assisted by William Garrett, who took leave of absence from General Donovan's law firm in New York to do special work for us. He is an able CPA as well as a most capable lawyer.

Ralph Mills, formerly with the FBI, performed outstanding work for this committee in Florida. He has now been selected head of the new Tampa, Fla., crime commission.

John McCormick came with the committee at its inception and is one of our most able and loyal men. He has now been made Director of Public Safety in Cleveland, Ohio.

William D. Amis, a very competent accountant and tax expert, has rendered splendid service. The committee secured on loan Frank Ahern and Thomas Cahill, of the San Francisco police force. Their work was very excellent. Patrick C. Murray and John J. Murphy assisted the committee as investigators in a most competent way.

I wish to pay high tribute to the office manager, Miss Melba J. Coutsonikas; Mrs. Joyce W. Mack, who edited our reports; and Mrs. Edith M. Knight, chief clerk.

Boris Kostelanetz served ably as associate counsel in New York during the early part of our hearings.

John Elich, who was with the committee for a while in New York ably assisted him.

I wish to acknowledge with much appreciation the loyal and untiring efforts

of the permanent secretarial and clerical staff in the Washington office, consisting of Julia Arnold, Elsie V. Hileman, John E. Hirten, Jr., Mary E. Longland, Freda Lustick, Yvonne G. McDonnell, L. Carl Melton, Mary V. Mitchell, Paul A. Newland, and Lillian L. Sears. Mrs. Agnes Wolf and Mrs. Louise Bowie did excellent service in research and preparation of the report.

The committee was fortunate in being able to secure special services of capable attorneys and investigators in various parts of the country for special work in those places. Among those of the field staff whose names should be mentioned in this respect are David I. Shvitz, James D. Walsh, Louis E. Yavner, Reuben A. Lazarus, Arnold L. Fein, Edward T. Burns, Howard R. Brand, Thomas L. Karsten, Herbert A. Blomquist, Dennis J. O'Shea, John E. Kenny, Martin F. Fay, Lawrence C. Goddard, Thomas E. Myers, George Fickeissen, Herbert Van Brunt and William G. Ruymann.

I am grateful to the Dallas police force for lending us Lt. George Butler, who was a most able police officer and of great assistance to the committee.

For special assignments, the committee secured George White, one of the outstanding narcotic investigators in the country to assist in Missouri, Chicago, and other places. George White is an expert in his field. His assistance was very substantial. The committee is grateful to him and to Mr. Harry Anslinger for lending us his services.

The committee secured the able assistance of John King from the Maritime Commission to assist in the investigation of the water front and the water-front problems in New York.

As chairman of the committee, I acknowledge with much appreciation the great assistance of Judge Morris Ploscowe, of New York City, in the preparation of the last two reports of the committee. Judge Ploscowe is executive director of the American Bar Association Commission on Organized Crime. This commission, headed by Robert P. Patterson, former Secretary of War, has taken an active and helpful interest in the work of our committee.

Assistance of extreme value was given to the committee by the various crime commissions in the country. Outstanding in this regard was Col. Jack Younger and Daniel Sullivan, operating director of the Crime Commission of Greater Miami. Mr. Sullivan supplied the committee with a tremendous amount of basic information. Also outstanding was the assistance of the splendid Chicago Crime Commission, of which Virgil Peterson is director. Mr. Peterson's testimony before this committee and the information which he furnished gave the committee an original Nation-wide pattern of organized crime. Other crime commissions were formed during our hearings which assisted us greatly.

One of the most encouraging things about our work has been the awakened public opinion which is manifest by the formation of crime commissions all over the country and by the vigorous activity

of people insisting upon cleaning up in their own sections and upon better law enforcements.

In the report we expressed our thanks to the President of the United States, the Department of Justice, the Treasury Department, and to various Federal and State agencies.

In the report the committee makes note of the important part played by the media of communications—newspapers, radio, television, and news reels—in bringing the message of the committee to the people. The press of the country is entitled to additional thanks by virtue of the vast amount of information submitted by the competent crime reporters for many of the leading papers. Ted Link, of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch; Edward Leahy, of the Chicago Daily News; and George Reedy, a noted columnist and radio commentator, attended every hearing of the committee and gave the committee many important bits of information, which has been of tremendous assistance. Various papers in sections of the country have crime reporters who are experts upon criminal conditions in their section. These are too numerous to mention, but they cooperated fully and were of great value to us.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I cannot let this opportunity pass without saying a word of thanks to the administrative assistants of various Senators who have worked with the committee throughout our effort. I wish to mention especially Mr. Julius N. Cahn, the right bower of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], who attended most of the hearings with us. He has worked hard and with much ability on the report. His services and suggestions have been of very great value.

I wish also to thank Mr. A. J. Bourbon, the administrative assistant to the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONNOR], my own administrative assistant, and many others.

I now yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I should like to say to the Senator from Tennessee that I have not had an opportunity to read carefully the report of his committee. I have glanced hurriedly over the part which has to do with the investigations in Missouri, particularly in the cities of St. Louis and Kansas City. I think the committee has done fine work there, but I hope the Senator will not feel badly when I say that I think the committee has just scratched the surface in disclosing the partnership between politics and crime which has existed in Missouri for some years past.

I should like to ask the Senator—  
Mr. KEFAUVER. Let me answer that by saying that it is not the province of the committee to investigate every little detail, and we have not endeavored to do so in our investigation. If we had tried to get down to every little detail in every small echelon of criminals and public official activity, we could have spent all our time and all our appropriation on an investigation in only one place.

Mr. KEM. I am sure that is true.

Mr. KEFAUVER. In that connection I think I should call the Senator's attention to the fact that after our hearing in New York Governor Dewey named a State crime committee to investigate conditions in New York. Of course, our committee had already revealed a good many conditions. The splendid district attorneys, Mr. Hogan and Mr. McDonald, had made startling revelations. A citizens' committee headed by Spruille Braden, former Assistant Secretary of State, had been working in the field. The New York Legislature set aside \$250,000 for the State crime committee, just to make an investigation in the State of New York. I think our total appropriation up to date has been \$275,000. So necessarily we were only interested in the over-all picture. I believe that from the legislative viewpoint that is all we were justified in being interested in. We considered only the big over-all interstate transactions. I am sure the Senator understands the reason for that.

Mr. KEM. I do understand that; and I wish it were possible to get similar legislation in Missouri. However, for reasons with which I am sure the Senator from Tennessee is familiar, that seems to be an idle and futile hope. An effort was made to set up a State crime commission to conduct such an investigation in Missouri, but it died a-borning.

Mr. KEFAUVER. In that connection I wish to say that on a voluntary basis in St. Louis and Kansas City, in the last 7 or 8 months crime commissions have been set up, and they are doing a splendid job in those two cities.

Mr. KEM. I appreciate what the Senator said about inability to investigate all the different and devious connections in this partnership between politics and crime. But I should like to ask the Senator particularly whether the attention of his committee has been directed to what many people in our State regard as a mother crime, that is, the theft of the evidence that occurred on May 27, 1947, when 71 persons were under indictment for failing to count the ballots in the election as they were cast, and the ballots constituting the evidence in the case were stolen from the office of the election commissioners in the nighttime, never to have been recovered or seen again?

Mr. KEFAUVER. That was one of the most shocking crimes that I have ever known to be committed, and it is certainly despicable. It was committed on May 27, 1947, and the statute of limitations ran in 3 years. Our committee got started on its first hearing about the 15th of May last year. We did make some inquiry about the ballot theft, but again it was not our province to try to solve and find out who carried out and committed all of the various criminal violations in the country.

Mr. KEM. Does not the Senator agree—

Mr. KEFAUVER. Let me finish in that connection. If we could have done so, we would, of course, have liked to have found out who stole the ballots. Of course, as the Senator knows, the

FBI was called in immediately afterward. I think the record shows that the FBI used more men and spent more money on that investigation than on any they have ever carried on. There was a Federal grand jury under the direction of Max Goldschein, a most able assistant to the Attorney General, and also a State grand jury, investigating the matter. I certainly agree that it was a very bad criminal offense. But I assume that there again, if we had felt inclined to do so, we could have used all our manpower and spent all our money in trying to find out who stole the ballots.

Mr. KEM. The Senator is familiar with the fact that the hands of the FBI were originally tied in that investigation, and that at the outset the FBI were not permitted to make a full and complete investigation by the Attorney General; is he not?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I think the facts in that connection are not quite those. I believe there was some little delay in the calling in of the FBI pending a determination of whether it was a matter over which they had jurisdiction.

Mr. KEM. Were not the facts these, that the Attorney General—

Mr. KEFAUVER. Just one moment. So that there was maybe a short delay in getting the FBI in; but my understanding is that when once they got in they had the full backing of the Department of Justice, and that they used more manpower and spent more money in that investigation than they have in any other investigation in the history of the FBI.

Mr. KEM. Are not the facts that the FBI was directed by the Attorney General to interview a certain limited number of witnesses; that the FBI then reported to the Attorney General that those witnesses had been interviewed, and that nothing of importance had been developed; that the Attorney General then directed the FBI to close its files? Is not that the history of the original investigation as disclosed by the Ferguson committee?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Well, I cannot say. It is not my understanding—

Mr. KEM. Has the Senator had time to read the evidence that was brought to light by the Ferguson committee?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I have in times past, I believe, read that.

Mr. KEM. Are not these facts clearly set out there? Are these facts refuted in any respect?

Mr. KEFAUVER. We have testimony in the record of our committee, but I am not sure about the early history of what took place. I cannot say about that one way or the other. However, the FBI used a great deal of manpower and spent a considerable amount of money on that investigation. In any event the statute of limitations ran on the offense and it was more than 3 years old when our committee got under way.

Mr. KEM. I am inviting the attention of the Senator from Tennessee to the early part of the investigation, what might be called the first phase, before a further investigation was forced by the facts that were brought to light by the Ferguson Committee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I will have to say to the Senator that I do not remember all the details about the early part of the investigation. I cannot say about it one way or the other.

Mr. KEM. Then I would like to ask the Senator whether he can give the people of Missouri any hope that the committee in its new lease on life will have the time and the opportunity to make a further investigation of these conditions in the State of Missouri.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Well, of course, I will say to the Senator that the statute of limitations ran on this ballot-theft matter before the committee ever got started. It happened in May 1947. Let me say—

Mr. KEM. The Federal statute, yes; but the State statute has not yet run.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Let me say to the Senator from Missouri that the junior Senator from Tennessee has spent one entire year on this investigation, having hearings mornings, afternoons, and nights, day after day in many instances, and when that was not being done interviewing people, going over investigative files, talking with witnesses. The junior Senator from Tennessee determined that this work should be done and completed by March 31, when I hoped the final report could be filed and the committee could go out of existence. Because the report was not ready until just 2 or 3 days before March 31, that was not possible, and a 30-day extension was granted.

After this afternoon I shall not be the chairman of the committee any longer, because the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONNOR], who is very able, and who will utilize the remaining 4 months of the committee's life for the primary public interest, will take over. What will be done during those 4 months, I am, of course, not in a position to speak. That responsibility will be largely up to the Senator from Maryland. But I should think that first things should be placed first; that the important job now is to try to secure the drafting and the passage of legislation which will have to do with the matter the Senate Crime Committee had to investigate; that is, how the vehicle of interstate commerce is used by criminals in violation of the law of the United States or of the various States. We have made legislative recommendations in that connection. I think the paramount thing now is to get action while the people are interested, and while the facts are new, and while we still have time in the present session of Congress. I, personally, think the committee would make a mistake if it would spend all its 4 months or any great part of its 4 months in getting out on the road investigating again, because the facts are pretty well before us. The committee certainly could not in those 4 months solve many of the Nation's puzzling and unsolved crimes, even if it were proper for it to attempt to do so.

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

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. KEM. I should like to ask the Senator if he does not agree with me that if we are going to put first things first,

that there is nothing more important than to guarantee the integrity of the ballot so that the public officials who receive at an election the majority of the votes cast by the duly qualified electors are permitted to take the office to which they have been elected?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes; I agree very fully with the Senator about that.

Mr. KEM. How are we going to maintain our free institutions, if the ballots are miscounted, and then, when indictments are returned for the crime of miscounting the ballots, the evidence is destroyed?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Of course, this strikes directly at our free institutions. I agree fully with the Senator on that. I think the election laws ought to be tightened up, and certainly any case like this ought to be fully investigated. I doubt, however, whether that was exactly in the province or jurisdiction of this committee. Our job was to investigate transactions between the States. I do not know that this was a transaction between States, which was the kind of criminal transaction our committee was charged with investigating.

Mr. KEM. This was a Federal crime, because a Member of Congress was involved in a primary election.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes; I agree about that, but the interstate angle is just a little tenuous. However, there are committees which have direct jurisdiction of that matter. I believe this is the province of the Subcommittee on Election Frauds. I would agree with the Senator that any recommendations they bring in for the prevention of that sort of thing would certainly be in the public interest, and I would be strongly in favor of them.

Mr. KEM. I agree with the Senator that there is no interstate angle; but certainly there is a Federal angle, because a Member of Congress is being voted on in an election. If an honest election does not occur, certainly that is something in which the Congress should concern itself.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes; I grant that the Senator from Missouri is quite correct. However, there are committees which investigate election frauds and are charged with that duty. I think our committee would have been criticized if it had spent all its resources and efforts on that particular matter.

Mr. KEM. I do not wish to be in the position of being captious about the work the committee has done in Missouri, because I think it performed a very valuable public service. I attended some of the hearings the committee held in my State, and they were important and valuable contributions to good citizenship in our State.

Mr. KEFAUVER. We thank the Senator and he was very courteous to us when we were in Kansas City.

Mr. KEM. But I should like to ask the Senator from Tennessee whether this major crime or this mother crime—that is to say, the theft of the ballots on May 27, 1947—is anywhere mentioned in the committee report.

Mr. KEFAUVER. It may be, but at least it is not discussed at any length in the report.

Mr. KEM. Where is it mentioned in the committee report?

Mr. KEFAUVER. As a matter of fact, I do not believe it is mentioned in the report.

Mr. KEM. How is it that that mother crime, which has been followed by a long train of other crimes in our State, and has been recognized generally as evidence of a working partnership between politics and crime, is not mentioned in the report?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Of course we found many terrible crimes in the United States, including election crimes, murders, and other crimes, but I do not believe the Senator will find that they are all mentioned in the report. In it we mention and discuss the transactions we found in interstate commerce where criminals were using interstate commerce in violation of the laws of the Federal Government or of the several States.

Mr. KEM. The Senator spoke of putting first things first. Does not the Senator agree that it is a good deal more important to find out whether integrity of the ballot is being threatened than it is to find out whether bets are being placed on a horse race?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes, but of course we must act on and make recommendations concerning the things the committee is charged with doing. After all, the Committee on Privileges and Elections investigates frauds in elections and thefts in that connection. That matter was not in our jurisdiction, because, as the Senator from Missouri has said, it has no interstate feature. We did go into it to a limited extent, in asking the sheriffs and others to do all that they could; but I am sure the Senator from Missouri does not expect our committee to solve the crime when the Federal grand jury and the State grand jury and the FBI could not do so, and particularly when we went there 3½ years after the offense occurred.

Mr. KEM. I fully agree that the committee could not be expected to solve the crime; but I did indulge in the hope that the committee would make some constructive suggestions leading to the avoidance of similar incidents in the future.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, it was not our duty to make investigations in reference to the election laws of the Federal Government. I do not think one can read the resolution establishing the special committee and find that we were charged with any responsibility in reference to elections.

Mr. KEM. This matter involved more than that; it was a case of conspiracy and of larceny and of breaking into a public office in the night time. Other crimes were committed independently of the election laws, on May 27, 1947.

Mr. KEFAUVER. We have recommended that certain investigative officers be given additional staffs, and that once a year the Attorney General convene a special grand jury for the investigation of big-time interstate crimes and big-time racketeering once a year in the various districts of the United States. We have recommended the enlargement of a special fraud squad that

would investigate the type of crime the Senator from Missouri is discussing and would have special jurisdiction of it and would see that the cases are immediately brought before the grand jury.

So I think many of the recommendations which the Senator will find in the report will give him much aid and comfort in connection with the theft of the ballots at Kansas City, which all of us felt to be very heinous and sinister.

Mr. President, I now yield the floor.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question before he yields the floor?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I think the committee has done a wonderful job in documenting crime in interstate commerce. Perhaps the question I have in mind is answered in the report, but I have not had time to read it as yet.

A few minutes ago the Senator from Tennessee referred to laxity in the Bureau of Internal Revenue in regard to collecting income taxes from gangsters. I am wondering whether in the opinion of the committee the Treasury Department or the Department of Justice was more or less aggressive in collecting income taxes from gamblers and racketeers than it was in the case of collecting such taxes from the average citizen.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Of course, that is largely the job of the Bureau of Internal Revenue. We found the chief difficulty to be that racketeers and gangsters for the most part simply put on their income-tax return "commissions, \$50,000," or "winnings, \$75,000," or some such notation, and that they keep no books or records. So it is very difficult to prove just how much money they do make. We found that the misdemeanor law requiring the keeping of books and records for income-tax purposes is not being adequately enforced.

We also believe that in the case of all these tax-law violations, too much time elapses between the commission of the offense and the final prosecution, because such matters must go through approximately 14 steps before they finally reach the trial jury.

We found that an insufficient amount of attention was being given to the collection of income taxes from the big-time racketeers and gangsters, in our opinion. Of course, we felt that the determination of what was being done as to them came within our field of activity, but that the determination of what was being done in the case of other taxpayers did not come within the field of our activity. However, I think it is fair to say that the racketeers and gangsters do not usually file complete books or keep records to an extent at all comparable with those kept by the average businessman.

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

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Of course, the Senator from Tennessee knows, and already has stated, that it is now the law that every taxpayer must keep records available for the Bureau of Internal Revenue, in the case of his income and his business expenses. I wonder whether the committee found that the Treasury De-

partment is enforcing that law or is calling upon racketeers to keep books to the same extent that books are kept by the average American citizen. Certainly under existing laws the average citizen is called upon to keep such records. I wonder whether the Treasury Department or the Bureau of Internal Revenue have been lax in the case of the failure of such persons to keep books or records.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Frankly, I think the Treasury Department has been lax in bringing prosecutions for violations of the law in regard to the keeping of books. Several cases of that kind were brought; but I think one of them was thrown out of court, so the Bureau or the Department says it got discouraged. Those in charge of such matters say they wish to be able to prosecute such persons for the commission of a felony, rather than a misdemeanor—of course, a violation of the statute regarding the keeping of books and records for income-tax purposes is now a misdemeanor—and also that the language of the statute is not entirely satisfactory. However, I think those prosecutions could have been carried forward to a much greater extent than they have been. The committee was not at all satisfied in this respect.

We wish to recommend to the Finance Committee of the Senate and the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives that the statute be tightened and that the violation of the statute be made a felony.

Some representatives of the Bureau of Internal Revenue take the position that books and records filed by racketeers would not be valid anyway, and would not be believed, so there is not much use in insisting that they keep better ones. I do not accept that statement. I think they ought to be required to file them, and that, if they do not file them properly, they should be taken to task for it. I believe it fair to say that in the past sufficient enough attention has not been paid to requiring adequate books, or to the prosecution of gamblers and racketeers. But, in all fairness, I think it also should be said that substantial and very wholesome steps have been taken by the Internal Revenue Department, which I hope will continue. In any event we all now agree, and this includes the Bureau of Internal Revenue, that the law ought to be more vigorously enforced and that it ought to be strengthened.

I yield the floor.

#### SUPPLYING OF AGRICULTURAL WORKERS FROM MEXICO

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 984) to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Report on Migrant Labor," which appeared in the April 21, 1951, issue of America.

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

#### REPORT ON MIGRANT LABOR

"This report," said President Truman on April 7, "makes an impressive contribution

to a subject which should be of serious concern to all of us. It will be useful to Government officials and the general public alike."

The President was referring to the 80,000-word study that his five-man Commission on Migratory Labor (of which Archbishop Robert E. Lucey, of San Antonio, was a member) had just concluded. It is easy to agree with him that the report is impressive and that it can be very useful to all concerned with the difficult and complex problems of migrant workers. We can, unfortunately, do little more here than touch on some of the high spots.

The Commission's findings corroborate charges that migrant workers, especially in the Southwest, have been scandalously exploited. It noted, however, that the responsibility rested with a small minority of farms—the 125 thousand farms which amount to 2 percent of the farms of the Nation and produce crops equal to approximately 7 percent of the value of all farm products. Nor are these large-scale, highly mechanized agricultural units—factories on the land—solely responsible for the deplorable condition of migrant labor. Federal and State agencies, including the Farm Placement Division of the United States Employment Service, must share some of the blame.

The Commission insists that farm-labor needs can and ought to be supplied largely by domestic workers. The shortage which is said to exist, and which is used as justification to import foreign farm hands, is to a considerable extent relative. It is a shortage of Americans who are willing to work at the inadequate wage rates and under the substandard conditions which the farm owners offer. The report notes a growing inequity between agricultural and industrial wages. In the 1910-14 period hourly farm-wage rates amounted to two-thirds of factory wages. Today they are little more than a third. If annual earnings are used as a basis of comparison, the inequity is still more pronounced. In 1949, factory workers had annual earnings of \$2,600. The figure for farm workers was \$500. In addition, the farm worker is often obliged to put up with unsanitary housing, inadequate medical services, and inferior educational opportunities for his children. He is also deprived of most of the special benefits accorded city workers. He has no workmen's compensation, no unemployment insurance, no protection from the Taft-Hartley and Wages and Hours Acts. It is an astonishing fact that foreigners brought to this country by agreement with neighboring governments are better off than many American farm workers.

Among the Commission's recommendations, these are especially noteworthy:

1. Creation of a Federal Committee on Migratory Farm Labor to coordinate the activities of all groups, public and private, working in the farm-migrant field.
2. Guaranty of the right of farm workers to organize for the purpose of collective bargaining.
3. Extension of minimum-wage laws and unemployment compensation to farm laborers.
4. Insistence on minimum housing standards for all workers hired through the Federal Employment Service.

If past experience can be trusted, the members of the farm bloc in Congress will fight to the bitter end against these and all the other reforms proposed by the Commission. Only the constant pressure of an informed public opinion can force them to subordinate the greed of their powerful constituents to justice and human decency.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the first committee amendment, on page 1, line 9.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I hope we can proceed now with the consideration of the pending measure.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall take a few moments on the pending bill. The chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has stated, as the overriding reason for speedy enactment of Senate bill 984, a need for legislation to validate and implement an agreement made between the Government of the United States and the Republic of Mexico in Mexico City last January.

It is stated that, unless this bill is passed, the Republic of Mexico will not allow the migration of Mexican nationals into the United States for farm work after July 1.

It is stated that the bill must be limited to Mexican farm labor in order to get it enacted into law before July 1.

It is suggested that the recruiting, transportation, housing, and employment of other farm labor, including United States citizens in the continental United States, Puerto Rico, and Hawaii, and including also British subjects from the British West Indies, be postponed and dealt with in other bills, to be considered later by the Labor Committees of each House at some later unspecified dates.

It is stated that American agriculture must have continued importation of Mexican farm workers.

The senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] has cited the finding of the President's Commission on Migratory Labor that, with full and proper utilization of United States citizens, further such importation is unnecessary.

In fact, Mr. President, I wish that all persons who are interested in the problem of agricultural labor, including a great many of the farmers themselves, could read the report of the President's Commission on Migratory Labor, because I consider it to be one of the most important and finest jobs of fact-finding which has been done by a presidential commission in a long time. A summary of the report made to the President by his Commission on Migratory Labor was set forth in a release issued by the White House on April 7, 1951, from which I should like to quote one paragraph:

We have long wavered and compromised on the issue of migratory labor in agriculture. We have failed to adopt policies designed to assure an adequate supply of such labor at decent standards of employment. Actually, we have done worse than that. We have used the institutions of government to procure alien labor willing to work under obsolete and backward conditions, and thus perpetuate those very conditions. Although our Government is importing large numbers of foreign workers for employment on farms, we are convinced that they are not needed to meet the food requirements of the defense emergency period.

That is a very significant statement, Mr. President. As I read the report of the Commission, it makes a very strong case for the premises which it seeks to support, and the entire bill ought to be considered and weighed in the light of the Commission's finding.

I have pointed out that the Senator from New Mexico has cited the findings

of this Commission, and I have a number of observations to make about the findings. First, it seems to me that neither the Senate nor the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, of which I am a member, and which, under the La Follette-Monroney Reorganization Act, I believe has complete and exclusive jurisdiction over all labor and related immigration matters, was consulted in any way at any time regarding the making of the agreement with Mexico. Therefore it seems to me that we have no responsibility for validating or implementing whatever agreement was made.

By the way, I am not sure that the agreement has actually become a part of the record of this debate as yet. I doubt whether it has been published as a part of this debate. If so, it was inserted in the RECORD at some time when I was not on the floor, and in my research, I have missed finding the actual wording of the agreement.

Second, in my opinion, the necessity for such an agreement and for the continuance of the importation of Mexican labor has not been established in this debate as yet. We have the statement of the President's Commission that there is an adequate supply of United States citizens for farm work, if an effort is made to recruit them. Probably the situation is that in certain areas of the country there is a shortage of farm labor. I am not prepared to say whether in other sections of the United States there is American labor which could be moved into the areas of short-labor supply, but I am impressed by the fact that the President's Commission seems to be of opinion that if we made an efficient use of the labor which we have the supply would be adequate.

On the other hand, I cannot escape the conclusion that in the great Pacific Northwest, in my section of the country, strong representations are made by food processors, such as pea packers and bean packers, and by the fruit raisers, that they are looking askance at the harvest season, because they do not see where they can get the farm labor which they need in order to harvest their crops. Many of them seem to think that this bill is the answer. But I do not think its enactment would result in the Pacific Northwest being supplied with the farm labor it needs, unless there can be adopted some such amendment as that proposed by my colleague, the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON]. That amendment, of which I am pleased to be one of the sponsors, will provide us with a port of entry near the shortage of labor supply, such as the port of Portland, Oreg., with the understanding that the Government will transport the workers from whatever foreign country they are being taken, as, for example, in this instance, Mexico, to the port of entry, and that our farmers then will be able to work out with the Government at the point of entry a contract for the use of such workers, under acceptable terms and conditions, in the food-processing plants or in the orchards during the harvest season.

The information which I receive in my office from the growers and processors of my State is to the effect that, unless such a port of entry is provided, and unless the Government makes it possible to get the workers to the port of entry, at Government expense, it will then be a financial impossibility for them to hire the workers and pay the transportation costs from Mexico, for example, which, as is suggested in certain quarters, they would have to pay in order to obtain the foreign labor for a few short weeks in the orchards and in the processing plants of the Pacific Northwest.

That may suggest another subsidy, Mr. President, and I am perfectly willing to place it on that basis. If the imported workers are needed in the Pacific Northwest it is because the domestic labor supply in that section has been interrupted by the defense effort, either by taking workers into the armed services or by taking them at much higher wages into defense plants, with the result that the production of a very much needed food supply is being interfered with by the Government program itself.

Therefore, in the judgment of the junior Senator from Oregon, we may as well face the fact that it is one of the defense costs which must be added up in the ledger. It is not fair or right to require processors or small fruit ranchers to pay transportation costs from Mexico City to Portland, Oreg., in order to hire foreign labor for a few weeks in processing plants, in orchards, or on our farms. That should be taken into account, Mr. President, before we come to a final conclusion on this bill.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. The distinguished Senator from Oregon is making a very fine speech on migratory labor, and I am wondering if he will permit me to make a short statement on another phase of the farm problem.

Mr. MORSE. I shall be delighted to yield the time.

Mr. CARLSON. In my State, Mr. President, we have difficulty in regard to the deferment of farm boys who are needed for the operation of farm units. My office has received a large number of letters from farm leaders, from farm owners, and from farm operators whose sons are being called into military service. These operations are large. The farms are mechanically operated. Labor of the migratory type cannot be used on such farms.

Last week I received a letter from Ben Ludy, general manager of Radio Station WIBW at Topeka, Kans., the station which was owned by former Senator Capper. In one of the station's broadcasts some comment was made regarding the deferment of farm labor. The broadcaster wondered if the farmers themselves had any idea on the subject. The response in mail has been terrific, to say the least.

I have with me a number of letters and extracts from letters from farmers showing the need for deferment if farmers are to be successful in meeting the food requirements established by the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include extracts from these letters in the RECORD.

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

MANHATTAN, KANS., April 21, 1951.

DEAR ELMER: We have listened to your 7 o'clock news broadcast. We are writing concerning the draft of my boy. I am about 60 years old and have one boy here with me. We are taking care of 437 acres of ground. We have 150 acres of wheat, 125 acres to go to corn, 20 acres of alfalfa, 25 acres of oats, and 30 acres of clover; the rest is pasture. It is impossible for me to handle all of this land if they draft my boy. I have rheumatism in my shoulders and can hardly raise my arms. We have farmed in partnership for 3 or 4 years now. My boy has some machinery. We also have 40 head of cattle and about 20 brood sows. It is impossible to hire help, so this work will just not be done if my boy is drafted. I think farming and raising food is as important as any occupation and should receive a little more consideration.

Sincerely yours.

NORBORNE, MO., April 20, 1951.

DEAR SIR: You have just finished your 7 o'clock broadcast in which you said to write you about things on the farm. I will try and tell you what it would mean to us to have all the help taken away from the farm. Now our son had not intended to go to college. He wanted to be a farmer. So as his father is 60 years old, they intended to work a plan whereby in a few years the son by a sort of partnership deal, where the father furnishes the equipment and the son the labor, that the son could earn equipment to farm this place and the father would retire. And the son would be established for the future. Now I ask you isn't that just as important to that boy as a college education is to some other boys, and would it be fair to take him away from this and let some boy go to college that would only be going as a way out. That is not a fair order. We farm 364 acres of good Missouri river-bottom land. We plant some Pioneer corn too. It is a good corn. Last year we raised 14,900 bushels of corn and that's by weight, not guess. Also wheat, oats, and soybeans. Of course last year was a perfect season, but with average season we produce a lot of grain; besides we market over 100 head of fat hogs each year, as well as a few calves. But if they take all the help I will have to quit. I guess everyone will have to put our boys in college and let the food raising go. We will have to hope and pray for peace. Good luck to you.

COURTLAND, KANS., April 20, 1951.

Mr. ELMER CURTIS,  
WIBW, Topeka, Kans.

DEAR Mr. CURTIS: You said to write your problems about the draft and labor shortage to you, so that is what I am doing.

The following is a summary of what we have:

Wheat, 340 acres; corn, 148; alfalfa, 35; grain sorghum, 12; brood sows, 20; dairy cows, 8-10; feeder pigs, 100 or more; chickens, 500.

It will be necessary to sell the stock and quit most of the land if I'm taken. There is not such a thing as skilled labor that you can hire up here.

Yours truly.

MOLINE, KANS., April 1951.

DEAR SIR: In regard to your broadcast on farm deferments, I am writing as to our situation.

We have one boy who is 22 years old who will be inducted in the near future.

We farm 750 acres, 120 acres of wheat, 50 acres of oats, and about 30 acres of barley; 35 acres of row crop. Put up 60 acres of mowland. We run about 100 head of cattle a year and some steers. We have all kinds of machinery, including a combine. We do trade work with the neighbors so that all may get along. The father is not able to do much work due to a rupture.

I do not understand how a boy would be more useful in an army suit than at home with this set-up. Especially with no war being fought.

Yours truly.

SALINA, KANS.

DEAR SIR: I thought I would write you a few lines in regard to my boy that is supposed to go to the Army soon.

I had three boys in World War II. There is going to be a big demand for men's help as there was so much wheat died out and so much spring crop could be put out, but without help they will have to leave the ground lay idle.

Thanking you in advance.

Yours truly.

CHANUTE, KANS., April 20, 1951.

DEAR SIR: Elmer Curtis has been our 7 o'clock newscaster for years and years. As for our help on the farm, it is gradually vanishing.

The 24-year-old boy at home was classified I-A the first of the year, so he had no choice. He enlisted. The other younger married boy is also in the Reserves. No other choice when the draft board classifies them I-A. What I'd like to know is how do they expect us farmers to increase our crops with less help. And I'm sure not going to hire foreign labor, because Dad and my youngest boy cannot raise, harvest, and care for the crops that these two older boys have been doing.

My older boy at present has over 500 acres rented, over 600 hens producing six cases of eggs a week, 50 head of registered white faces, and 10 sows that will farrow this spring, and yet he's only waiting for the word, and will have to have a sale and go do as they tell him.

Yours respectfully.

RILEY, KANS., April 21, 1951.

Mr. ELMER CURTIS.

DEAR SIR: We are farming 346 acres of land and 200 under cultivation and milking 13 cows, forty-some head or other cattle. Only my son, his mother, and myself on the farm, and he is up for induction in the Army in May. I will have to sell my milk cows and some other stock, and cannot farm all of the land. It will have to lay idle if he is taken.

He is serving his country much better on the farm than in the Army. He is at home working all of the time.

Yours truly.

BELOIT, KANS., April 20, 1951.

DEAR ELMER: On the 7 a. m. news today you asked for letters about drafting the farm boys. I have been looking for an excuse to blow my top.

We farm 640 acres and have one child—a 20-year-old son. We couldn't get as much work from any two men we could hire—if we could hire any men.

We have 200 acres of wheat, 80 acres of alfalfa and could put out 300 acres of corn, but he is to be inducted into the Army June 1. A plea for deferment for farm work was ignored. My husband, in his fifties, will do well enough to harvest the wheat and put up the hay, etc., so we have no choice but to sprinkle some clover seed on the 300 acres and let it stand.

Sincerely yours.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I appreciate very much the courtesy of the

Senator from Oregon in yielding. The problem is a very serious one in my section of the country. The boys are not asking for deferment in order to avoid military service. The serious question is, Can we afford to take these skilled farm boys off the farms at a time when increased farm production is needed? We defer some persons in industry because they are in critical positions; and we must give some consideration to the deferment of farm boys who are needed in farm work.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I know the type of farm work in Kansas and the need for labor in order to enable that great breadbasket to operate in the interests of the American people and of the world. So far as help from the proposed legislation is concerned, neither the Senator from Kansas nor any other Senator, nor any section of the country, will get one bit of benefit, because the labor needed is the cheapest of labor. Hence, the bill, if enacted, would not help to remove the conditions which the Senator from Kansas has in mind.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Kansas and the Senator from New Mexico for their comments in connection with this subject. I should like to say to the Senator from Kansas that I believe there is great need for a reexamination of the entire exemption program in respect to service in the Armed Forces. I say that as a member of the Armed Services Committee, and as one who took a very active part in the debate and discussion of the manpower question, as the Senator knows, I agree with the Senator from Kansas that none of us wants to see any blanket deferment granted to any economic group. That is why I have taken a position against a blanket deferment for college students. I consider it to be a great mistake, and to be very undemocratic, and I know the Senator from Kansas will agree with me that it would be equally undemocratic if there were a blanket deferment for agricultural workers. But, as the Senator has pointed out, the Selective Service Act contemplates, in spirit and intent, provision for deferment in the case of men who, it is found, can render greater service to the defense effort by working in industry, or on the farm, or as students in laboratories, or in some other capacity where their skills and abilities are needed.

I have received a great many inquiries similar to those received by the Senator from Kansas. I say on the floor of the Senate this afternoon that I think the Selective Service should give very careful attention to the representations which are being made that not sufficient attention is being given to men in critical agricultural jobs.

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

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

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I know of no one who has followed this point more closely than has the Senator from Oregon, and I appreciate his remarks on the manpower problem. It is a ques-

tion of using our men to the best advantage. I am entirely in accord with the Senator's views on the deferment of college students, and I have expressed myself on that subject. I am opposed to any blanket deferment of any group.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. President, returning to my manuscript, I was making an observation to the effect that the necessity for an agreement with Mexico and for the continuance of the importation of Mexican labor had not as yet, in my opinion, been clearly established in the record of the debate.

We have the statement of the President's Commission that there is an adequate supply of United States citizens for farm work, if an effort is made to recruit them.

We have the statement of the senior Senator from New Mexico that, as chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee considering Labor Department requests, he has found that the United States Employment Service has not even assembled the facts about the numbers and locations of workers in the United States available for farm labor, much less conducted an all-out recruiting and placement campaign.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield in order that I may call his attention to a statement from the area wherein this type of labor is supposed to be sought?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I received yesterday and inserted in the Record a telegram from the American GI Forum of Texas Independent Veterans' Organization, representing 50,000 American veterans of Mexican origin, reading as follows:

Wish to ask you to continue to fight to exclude foreign workers especially in Texas.  
Thousands of veterans—

The ones who faced the music, the ones who would have made the supreme sacrifice, if need be, and the relatives of American boys who were buried, not in Texas, but abroad—

Thousands of veterans not able to make a decent living because of low-wage competition by wetbacks and imported labor. Thousands of children of veterans are not able to enjoy good health because veterans and their families are forced to work for starvation wages because of imported labor. Americans of Mexican origin in Texas must have opportunity to live like human beings and first-class citizens. Best way to do it is to stop all imported labor.

That telegram came from the midst of the area where so-called problem of the wetbacks exists.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator for reinforcing the argument I had just completed, namely, that, as contended by the President's Commission, under a proper program of recruitment we would have an adequate labor supply to meet our domestic needs.

Third, let us examine the suggestion that we pass this bill forthwith, without amendment, limited to Mexican labor alone and for the convenience of some large commercial farms along the Mexican border, and that we postpone until some later date action on the vastly greater and more important problem of

an over-all defense emergency farm-labor program for United States citizens, including residents of Puerto Rico and Hawaii and British nationals from the British West Indies.

The chairman of the Agriculture Committee has suggested that, because this larger problem is related to industrial employment, it should be handled by the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. I am somewhat gratified to have this generous and gracious concession on the record as to the jurisdiction of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. It does amount to recognition of the existence and the role of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee. I will have more to say about this matter before I close.

As a matter of practical reality, the suggestion that the major problem be handled later by the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee comes too late in this session.

That suggestion should have been made last January, before the United States-Mexican conference in Mexico City at which the agreement was worked out. It should have been made when this bill was introduced. The bill should have dealt with the whole problem. And the bill should have been referred, not to the Agriculture Committee, which under the La Follette-Monroney Reorganization Act has no conceivable claim to jurisdiction, but to the Labor and Public Welfare Committee which, under that act, has complete, sole and exclusive jurisdiction in the fields of labor and related immigration.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point, as a part of my remarks, the provisions of the Reorganization Act, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, which deal with the standing committees of the Senate, in respect to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, as contained on page 4 of the reprint of the act, and the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, as contained on page 8 of the reprint of the act.

There being no objection, the provisions were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

(a) Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to consist of thirteen Senators, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects:

1. Agriculture generally.
2. Inspection of livestock and meat products.
3. Animal industry and diseases of animals.
4. Adulteration of seeds, insect pests, and protection of birds and animals in forest reserves.
5. Agricultural colleges and experiment stations.
6. Forestry in general, and forest reserves other than those created from the public domain.
7. Agricultural economics and research.
8. Agricultural and industrial chemistry.
9. Dairy industry.
10. Entomology and plant quarantine.
11. Human nutrition and home economics.
12. Plant industry, soils, and agricultural engineering.
13. Agricultural educational extension services.



14. Extension of farm credit and farm security.

15. Rural electrification.

16. Agricultural production and marketing and stabilization of prices of agricultural products.

17. Crop insurance and soil conservation.

(1) Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, to consist of thirteen Senators, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects:

1. Measures relating to education, labor, or public welfare generally.

2. Mediation and arbitration of labor disputes.

3. Wages and hours of labor.

4. Convict labor and the entry of goods made by convicts into interstate commerce.

5. Regulation or prevention of importation of foreign laborers under contract.

6. Child labor.

7. Labor statistics.

8. Labor standards.

9. School-lunch program.

10. Vocational rehabilitation.

11. Railroad labor and railroad retirement and unemployment, except revenue measures relating thereto.

12. United States Employees' Compensation Commission.

13. Columbia Institution for the Deaf, Dumb, and Blind; Howard University; Freedmen's Hospital; and St. Elizabeths Hospital.

14. Public health and quarantine.

15. Welfare of miners.

16. Vocational rehabilitation and education of veterans.

17. Veterans' hospitals, medical care and treatment of veterans.

18. Soldiers' and sailors' civil relief.

19. Readjustment of servicemen to civil life.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, if the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare were to have jurisdiction over the matter, a representative of the committee should have been sitting in Mexico City at the time the agreement was drawn. We are faced, as is so frequently the case in the Congress, with an accomplished fact. We are being asked to put our stamp of approval on what has already been prepared. If the agreement contains some of the things which I believe it contains, although I have not been privileged to read it, I am sure that a consideration of the proposed provisions of the agreement by someone representing the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare at the time the Mexico City conference was held might well have brought about some changes in its language.

Now, seriously to propose that the major problem of farm labor during the defense emergency be postponed and handled in a separate bill to be referred to the Labor and Public Welfare Committee in the Senate and by the Labor and Education Committee in the other body would be a great mistake at this late date.

The majority leader was recently quoted in the press as announcing that he planned to do everything he could to bring about an adjournment by August 1. I am willing to take judicial notice of the fact that if now we should put aside consideration of the problem and should hold new hearings and have further dis-

cussion before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare of the Senate and the Committee on Labor and Education of the House, we would be doing well to get through with the hearings by August 1.

We are faced with a bill which we must do the best we can to amend on the floor of the Senate, so that it may meet some of the major objections, and then start planning for a long-term legislative program in connection with the whole problem of migratory labor, to be taken up in the next session of Congress. Because the farm-labor market of the country is disjointed I am willing to admit that there is need now for some legislation on the subject. I hope we can get the bill patched up on the floor of the Senate with appropriate amendments, so that it will at least be serviceable for the present harvest season.

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

Mr. MORSE. Yes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Everyone, I believe, is willing to admit that there is necessity for legislation of this type. Those of us who are opposed to the bill as reported to the Senate object only because we feel that, inasmuch as labor is needed we should provide in the bill for the importation of labor, be it from Mexico or elsewhere, only after an adequate investigation has been made as to whether American labor is available. I do not think it is asking too much of the Senate to consider an amendment which would provide for the protection of the American laborer, who is willing to suffer the fatigue of stoop work, to the same extent that protection would be given to a laborer who came from a foreign country. I do not think it is too much to ask of the Senate.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to be recorded at this point as being in agreement with the Senator from New Mexico in the comments he has made.

Mr. President, the plain legislative and political fact is that this bill is the only bill regarding farm labor that is likely to get to the floors of both Houses in this Congress. Unless it can be broadened to deal with the whole problem, to provide for the recruitment, transportation, housing, placement, and employment of United States citizens, including Puerto Ricans and Hawaiians and British nationals as well as Mexican nationals, the whole farm labor problem is going to be left untouched, except for the Mexican segment thereof. This is the only train that is going through. Unless it is stopped long enough to couple in cars for United States citizens and other nationals they are not going to be treated with the same consideration given Mexican nationals under the bill as it was reported to the Senate. The Republic of Mexico is going to provide more protection for its citizens than the Republic of the United States of America provides for its citizens, and such protection as we do provide will be given, because, in complying with the United States-Mexican agreement, we will have to pay some attention to the wages and conditions offered our own citizens.

Fourth, I want to raise a basic and fundamental issue that affects the rights, powers, and responsibilities of every standing committee of the Senate. To my mind, it is a legislative scandal that, in the first place, the State Department and the Labor Department passed over the Labor Committees of both Houses and chose instead to invite and include in the United States delegation to the Mexico City conference at which the agreement was agreed upon last January only representatives of the Agriculture Committees of both Houses. Second, in my opinion it is a mistake and an outright violation of the words and intent of the LaFollette-Monroney Act to have referred the bill to the Agriculture Committees of both Houses.

With what were the conference and the bill primarily concerned?

With farm labor, of course.

But with farm labor considered as human beings or as an article or commodity of commerce?

That, Mr. President, is the test.

Only if more than 1,500,000 farm workers are considered as a commodity, as human livestock, as work animals, to be imported, deported, housed and treated as animals, can the assignment of such a bill to an Agriculture committee be explained or defended.

Mr. President, were I to follow my inclination as a lawyer, as a Member of the Senate and as a member of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee, I would call for the defeat of this bill or its referral to the Labor and Public Welfare Committee on this ground alone. But in this case, and all other cases, I try to be practical. We are faced with somewhat of an emergency. We certainly are faced with a time emergency, as I have heretofore stated in these remarks. I do not believe that the time available in this session of the Congress will permit us, if we want to get the crops harvested, to follow the course of action of referring this bill to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare for its consideration. Harvesting the crops is a matter of first importance.

As I have stated, I think there are areas where there is need for some labor from the outside to meet the shortage of domestic labor in order to do the crop processing, the fruit picking, and the harvesting. Therefore, even though I think it means condoning this breach of the LaFollette-Monroney Act, I propose that we work this bill into proper shape by adoption of the amendment proposed by the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] and amendments proposed by the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], and the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], so that the bill as passed will deal with the entire problem of farm labor with fairness to workers and employers.

Mr. President, this morning my attention was called to a series of telegrams which were sent to the majority leader [Mr. MCFARLAND] by the leaders of organized labor and by the leader of the Farmers Union, concerning the farm labor bill now under consideration. I

have been advised that these telegrams have already been considered to a certain extent in this debate. Nevertheless, I should like to have them incorporated in the RECORD, as part of my remarks, because I wish to make a few very brief comments on them. I ask unanimous consent to have them printed in the RECORD, at this point, as a part of my remarks.

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

WASHINGTON, D. C., April 24, 1951.—The Railway Labor Executives' Association today appealed to the majority leader of the Senate, Senator ERNEST MACFARLAND, for assistance in opposition to the Ellender bill, S. 984, providing for the importation of Mexican workers to be employed on corporate farms in this country. Telegram of the Railway Labor Executives' Association to Senator MACFARLAND follows:

"The Ellender bill, S. 984, providing importation of Mexican workers to be employed on corporate farms in this country, which is now pending in the Senate, deeply concerns all organized labor. The measure as reported is virtually without standards and constitutes a threat to domestic workers, both agricultural and industrial. It runs directly counter to the findings and recommendations of the President's Commission on Migratory Labor, which was issued a few days after the Senate Agriculture Committee reported the measure. The Commission report, based on many months of study and hearings throughout the country by the distinguished and impartial members of that body, raises fundamental questions as to the need for any legislation to import foreign workers. Furthermore, the Ellender bill completely disregards the recent study published by the Joint Congressional Committee on the Economic Report, showing extensive unemployment and poverty among marginal farm families of the country from among whom large numbers of agricultural workers can be recruited. Recent series of articles in the New York Times and other newspapers and magazines have shown the scandalous conditions under which millions of Mexican immigrants, both legal and illegal, the so-called wetbacks, live in our country. Such conditions jeopardize conditions of all other workers. The Ellender measure is likely to add to these disgraceful conditions. In view of these facts it should be sent back to committee for further consideration and should go to the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare in accord with the explicit provisions respecting importation of foreign workers and labor standards contained in Public Law 601, the La Follette-Monroney Reorganization Act. Evidence is ample that in this critical period of defense mobilization enough of our own citizens can be mustered to handle food and fiber crops if working conditions of minimum decency are offered.

"G. E. LEIGHTY,

"Chairman, Railway Labor Executives' Association."

WASHINGTON, D. C., April 26, 1951.—A. F. of L. President William Green today made public the following wire opposing the Ellender bill (S. 984) providing the recruitment and importation of Mexican farm workers. This wire has been sent to Senate Majority Leader MACFARLAND:

"Senator ERNEST W. MACFARLAND,

"Senate Office Building,

"Washington, D. C.:"

"The American Federation of Labor offers its objections to the enactment of S. 984 to provide for the recruitment and importation of Mexican workers for agricultural labor in the United States, which is now pending before the Senate.

"The bill as reported by the committee does not provide adequate safeguards to protect the interests of domestic farm labor, and is contrary to the findings and recommendations of the President's Commission on Migratory Labor, which was issued March 26, 1951.

"The report clearly indicates that the importation of foreign farm labor would be to depress still further the wages and working conditions of American farm labor, a group which is worse off economically than any other in our population.

"The A. F. of L. firmly believes that the need for the importation of foreign labor is overemphasized. At the present time there are approximately 150,000 agricultural workers in Puerto Rico unemployed, and there are 190,000 partially employed—working less than 30 hours per week. However, if there is a genuine need for agricultural labor, the Puerto Rican and domestic labor market should be fully utilized before importing foreign labor.

"We strongly urge that S. 984 in its present form be recommitted back to committee with instructions to provide for the recruitment of American workers wherever they are needed, under decent working conditions and adequate wages, before any attempt is made to bring in foreign farm labor.

"WILLIAM GREEN,

"President, American Federation of Labor."

#### PATTON URGES DEFEAT OF ELLENDER FARM LABOR BILL

WASHINGTON, D. C., April 25, 1951.—In a telegram sent today to Senate Majority Leader ERNEST A. MACFARLAND, James G. Patton, president of the National Farmers Union, urged the defeat of the Ellender bill (S. 984) providing for the importation of cheap foreign labor.

The text of the telegram is as follows:

"National Farmers Union believes S. 984 should be defeated. Bringing in cheap foreign labor without setting decent standards and without first trying to recruit tremendous numbers of underemployed American agricultural workers breaks faith with the American people and their ideals. This supply of cheap foreign labor threatens both the family farm as the basic pattern of American agriculture and the hard-earned gains of American labor. This bill violates President Truman's manpower policy declaration of January 17 giving full assurance that full use of domestic manpower resources will be made before bringing in foreign workers. It ignores careful findings of Sparkman committee report on low-income rural families, revealing existence of equivalent of more than 2,500,000 underemployed agricultural workers. Bill was reported out before President's Commission on Migratory Labor gave its report to the President, portraying disgraceful conditions of migrant workers and subservience of many Government officials to pressures of big growers. We urge Senate to reject this bill and consider first legislation for the effective utilization of American workers."

NATIONAL FARMERS UNION,

Washington, D. C., April 30, 1951.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,

Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: In accordance with our conversation of this afternoon, I am sending along some material on farm labor which may be of use to you.

The Ellender bill is a vicious piece of legislation which threatens not only the standards of American workers, but also the family farm as the basic pattern to American agriculture. Ignoring ample evidence showing vast numbers of underutilized American agricultural workers, the proponents of this

legislation are intent upon bringing into this country all the cheap foreign labor that they possibly can get. In back of this bill have been the big growers as well as the food processors who have sought to have the definition of agricultural workers broadened so as to include workers in the various food processing industries. Fortunately this latter provision has been eliminated from the Senate bill.

It is significant that no attempt has been made by those crying most loudly for agricultural labor to say that they will offer decent standards of working conditions as an inducement. They much prefer to continue the shocking living and working conditions now existing for migrant agricultural workers, both domestic and foreign. They too often have enjoyed the sympathy and support of the Farm Placement Service in the Department of Labor, a group which generally has responded with amazing alacrity to the demands of the growers. An illustration of this is afforded by the structure and operation of the special farm labor committee to the Farm Placement Service. This committee is composed solely of grower and processor representatives. They have been quick to report great shortages of labor, and they have repeatedly indicated that it will be impossible to harvest the large crops needed in the mobilization period without the importation of farm labor. When it is suggested to them that might they not look toward the underutilized American workers they become angry and say there is no time for social revolution.

The moral issue here is quite clear. These migrant workers have been abused and ignored for many years now, and their conditions have gotten worse rather than better. Recent stories such as those in the New York Times have emphasized how shocking are their living and working conditions.

On the mobilization side the issue seems equally clear. At a time when the Nation is seeking to employ to the fullest capacity its total manpower resources, it is wasteful to ignore this potential pool. Yet the proponents of the Ellender bill propose to do just that.

The Report of the President's Commission on Migratory Labor, which I am enclosing, offers abundant evidence to document the misery and abuse which migrant workers know. Practically every page offers illustrations from the field of what is happening in America in 1951. This was a carefully drawn up report and was made by a group of outstanding people. Pages 177 to 185 summarize their recommendations. Yet, the proponents of the Ellender bill were most eager not to hear what was in this report.

Under employment of rural families, a study prepared for the Joint Committee on Economic Report, spells out the extent of the under-utilization of America's farm people. I have marked for your attention pages 3 to 5, 11, 19, and 20. This report concludes that if we were to utilize fully the rural people discussed here, we would achieve the equivalent of adding 2,500,000 workers to our total labor force. The proponents of the Ellender bill made clear at the Senate Agriculture hearings that they had not the slightest interest in utilizing these people. To employ them would mean setting up decent standards for agricultural workers. Like the industrialists of an earlier period, the feudal lords of agriculture much prefer to import cheap foreign labor.

I should emphasize that the issue is not that of opposing the importation of foreign labor. If these people are needed, then certainly we should take steps to bring them in. But we should also make certain that they come under decent standards. And even more important, we must be certain that we have tried to utilize our own neglected rural people. The hostility which many labor groups, church groups, and the Farmers Union have shown to this bill is

based upon a conviction that its advocates are not interested in such prior considerations.

If we can be of any further help to you, please do not hesitate to call upon us. We deeply appreciate your interest in this matter.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT ENGLER.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, while I am inserting material in the RECORD, at this point, as a part of my remarks, I should like to have printed in the RECORD a letter which I have received from the president of the Oregon Farm Bureau Federation in regard to the problem which is involved in the pending legislation, including a copy of a letter which he addressed to my senior colleague (Mr. CORDON), with copies to the other members of the Oregon delegation, and my reply to his letter.

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

FEBRUARY 19, 1951.

Mr. MARSHALL SWEARINGEN,  
President, Oregon Farm Bureau  
Federation, Salem, Oreg.

DEAR Mr. SWEARINGEN: Thank you very much for your letter of February 12, enclosing copy of a letter to Senator CORDON.

I am, indeed, very much interested in having Portland made a point of entry in regard to any program for getting offshore labor. You may be sure that I shall carefully scrutinize any administrative or legislative proposals on this problem with that in mind.

With kind regards,  
Sincerely yours,

WAYNE MORSE.

OREGON FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,  
Salem, Oreg., February 12, 1951.  
The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,  
The United States Senate,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: The enclosed letter to Senator CORDON is self-explanatory.

We feel that if this suggestion is sufficiently supported by many groups in the State of Oregon and by some groups in our neighboring States of Washington, Idaho, and the northern part of California, that Portland could be made a port of entry. While this would not solve the entire problem, it would help.

We thought you would be interested in what we are doing on the subject and we encourage you to advise us of your actions.

Yours very truly,

MARSHALL SWEARINGEN,  
President.

OREGON FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,  
February 12, 1951.  
Re offshore labor as it affects the Pacific  
Northwest problem.  
The Honorable GUY CORDON,  
The United States Senate,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CORDON: As you know, the general matter of offshore labor is of extreme importance for this coming harvest season. You further are aware of a series of meetings recently held in Washington, D. C. with representatives of the various grower organizations and the Department of Agriculture.

While the general problem has been undertaken with a workmanlike fashion, and we believe the steps on the general problem will lead to proper handling of the problem. None the less it appears that the Pacific Northwest, due to its geographical problems, has become a second cousin as compared to the over-all picture.

We refer to the great area of the South and the East, and even California, and the other States near or bordering on the Mexican boundary. These folks apparently seem quite satisfied with the way the program is going, and are not interested in any payment of transportation beyond the nearest point of entry.

As you know the nearest port of entry for even the Portland area is some 800 miles from San Francisco, and therein lies our suggestion for at least a partial solving of the Northwest problem.

We believe that Portland should immediately be made a port of entry and would like to submit that nearly all of the area which would be served from that point including Washington, Idaho, Oregon, and even the Tulalake portion of California is within the 500-mile limit.

Probably the establishment of Portland as a port of entry would do more to give the Northwest a break than any other move we might make at this time, although other alternate proposals may be made.

We have talked this matter over with Mr. Snyder of the Blue Lake Cannery, some of the folks of the Portland Chamber of Commerce, and we are now contacting the Farm Bureaus of Washington, Idaho, and the labor users in northern California.

We would appreciate your interesting yourself in this matter if you have not already done so, and at the same time advising us what further steps we might take to urge the establishment of Portland as a port of entry.

Yours very truly,

MARSHALL SWEARINGEN, President.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I also ask to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks another letter which was sent to my senior colleague, with copies to the other members of the Oregon delegation, from Robert K. Norris, of the labor committee of the Rogue Valley Traffic Association and Fruit Growers' League.

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

APRIL 23, 1951.

Senator GUY CORDON,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CORDON: Thank you for your letter of April 13, relative to the importation of foreign labor, together with copies of the Senate and House bills.

We have gone over both bills, and while in our opinion, some additional Federal funds should be appropriated, and might have to be appropriated in the future, to aid the farmer in carrying the very heavy added financial burden of importing foreign labor, we realize that because of other pressure, these bills are probably about the best that can be obtained at this time.

Medford growers, for example, have put a lot of money in the past years into their labor camp, but are digging up another \$10,000 at this time to put the camp in shape for the coming season. Payment of going wages for the foreign labor is fixed and satisfactory, but the three quarter guaranteed working time clause plus board payment for non-work days, together with transportation costs to and from the border, and a \$20 payment per man at the border will run our costs very high.

We are perhaps more fortunate at Medford than most other districts in that barring bad weather, we can give reasonable steady employment to these men for 2 months. Under the 4-month contract we plan to work with peas in eastern Oregon, which tie-in the 6 weeks ahead of Medford. If possible, we will try to help Hood River or Klamath potatoes on the tail end of the

season. This combination should work fairly well with a minimum expense for loss of working time.

We do not expect to break even on the allowed \$1.75 per day for board. Our total cost for use of the 450 men at Medford for transportation, loss of time, additional board cost, camp maintenance, \$20 per man to the Government for recruitment costs and transportation will run to approximately \$70,000 over and above normal wage payments. I hope the return for the fruit will warrant this expense.

The set-up in other districts of the State is generally worse than our own. I attended a meeting in Salem last Monday of representatives from different parts of the State, where they are worried about the harvest labor situation. When the picture of added costs above normal wages for this help was given to them, many of them shook their heads and left the meeting. They felt the added costs of qualifying to employ foreign workers would be prohibitive to their farmers.

A part of this would be caused by the required 4-month contract which does not lend itself too well to short peak use of foreign labor. Cherries, hops, beans, and other truck crops, all call for rather large numbers of workers, but only for a 2- or 3-week period. Frequently these crops overlap and all want them at the same time, with large gaps of unemployment between. Loss of time and board payment runs up the cost. Peas in eastern Oregon for a 6-week period ties in pretty well with Medford's 8 weeks. Loss of working time and board payments would not be too severe. Sugar beets also have reasonably long runs in the spring and fall, and can probably qualify.

But there will be such sizable gaps between cherries, the different truck crops, hops and late fruit in Hood River, and potatoes in Klamath, that the farmers are discouraged about the whole deal. They feel that with unemployment pay and board payments for loss of time between jobs, plus going wages and transportation for peak short time usage of foreign labor, the farmer cannot get out with a whole skin. Undoubtedly, most of these farmers will not sign up for foreign labor and will try to get by. As a result there will be a severe labor shortage, particularly in the Willamette Valley and probably in Hood River, and Klamath potatoes. A part of the crop will not be harvested. Looking ahead in 1952, when more men may be under arms and more employed in war industry, unless some help is given these farmers in the way of shorter contract periods, or part payment of subsistence and transportation of foreign labor, you would do as the farmers will do, simply not plant as much acreage and in many cases move to employment in war industry.

If foodstuffs are needed in the future and labor does not become more available, Federal assistance over and above mere recruitment at the growers' expense at the border will have to be given.

We still feel that emergency funds are used to transport labor across country to shipyards and other centers of industry and to subsidize industry in unusual costs of retooling and manufacture of needed goods. Certainly food is also a necessary part of the program and it is reasonable that more help must be given the farmers of the Northwest to help in covering some of their unusual expense, or production will be curtailed as the labor market continues to tighten. The Northwest, we believe, is a bit different from most other sections of the country, in that most of these high producing and specialized crop districts lie many miles to hundreds of miles from large centers of population. Farmers are dependent upon migratory workers, which supply dries up in times of heavy employment in industry.

If it is anticipated that a shortage of migratory labor will be with us for the next

year or two ahead, and if the Department of Agriculture is sincere in their request for greater production of foodstuffs, the present bill should be liberalized to allow for greater aid to Northwest farmers, at this time.

Harvest season is only a few months away. Even only a partial loss of crops this season from lack of labor would materially reduce fall planting and loss of production in 1952. However, the present bills are better than nothing at all, and rather than run the chance of having no bill, you might deem it best to go ahead with the present bills, and consider emergency appropriations as the situation becomes more critical.

Sincerely,

ROBERT K. NORRIS,  
Labor Committee Rogue Valley Traffic Association, and Fruit Growers League, Inc.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a letter which I received from Mr. Charles R. Jacobs, editor of the Western Canner and Packer, together with a news release and a brief article dealing with the question, "Where will we get the workers for the 1951 harvest season?"

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

WESTERN CANNER AND PACKER,  
San Francisco, Calif., April 17, 1951.  
The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Enclosed are tear sheets from the April issue of Western Canner and Packer on the article, Where Will We Get the Workers for the 1951 Harvest Season? The material contained in it is the result of carefully conducted questionnaires, personal interviews, and previously published material. Unquestionably, we feel that it accurately reflects the attitude of packers, canners, and farmers, and particularly those in the western regions.

Also enclosed is a photostatic print reproduced from a California newspaper emanating from Associated Press. The divergence of opinion between this press clipping and our article is quite evident and raises considerable doubt in my mind that the Commission is fully aware of the true facts. Certainly the California packer and canner does not feel complacent nor assured that domestic help is going to solve his difficulties without the need for foreign importation. The awareness of this need is just as fully felt by Gov. Earl Warren. Such findings by this Commission appointed by President Truman sound ridiculous and quite devoid of justifiable evidence to western packers.

I would like to invite any comments you might care to make either in justification, condemnation, or in explanation. As a publication, Western Canner and Packer is recognized as an authoritative, impartial trade journal that has been held in respect by the trade since 1905. We are not in the habit of publishing what we can't substantiate. From the standpoint of our readers and the industry we represent we would like evidence the afore-mentioned Commission knows what it is talking about.

Sincerely,

WESTERN CANNER AND PACKER,  
CHARLES R. JACOBS, Editor.

#### UNITED STATES DOESN'T NEED FOREIGN FARM HELP, COMMISSION FINDS

WASHINGTON.—A presidential commission has reported this country does not need foreign farm laborers. It urged more efficient use of Americans with better wages and living standards.

In a report Sunday, President Truman's migratory labor commission said there are about 1,000,000 migratory farm workers in this country, half of them from Mexico. Some 80 percent of the Mexican workers, it said, crossed the border illegally. Other foreign workers were brought into agricultural areas to meet local labor shortages.

The five-man commission, named by Mr. Truman last June 3, said foreign workers depressed wages of competing Americans and brought on serious health situations. It noted that some foreign workers also took nonfarm jobs, lowering the average pay.

Besides, it contended, the domestic labor supply would be adequate to produce all the food needed in the present emergency, if farm pay and living conditions were improved.

The commission proposed Federal aid to States and changes in administration and legislation to solve the problem.

President Truman, commenting on the report said it deserves the careful consideration of all of us—the Congress, the executive agencies, and the general public.

The commission drew a drab picture of the migratory farm workers on the move from one area to another:

"They neither claim the community as a home nor does the community claim them. Local authorities are not insensitive to the misery of migrants, although under present laws of residence, they are almost helpless to deal with it."

The commission recommended:

1. A Federal committee on migratory farm labor to coordinate Federal, State, and private activities relating to such labor.
2. Legislation prohibiting employment of aliens illegally, authorizing the immigration and naturalization service to search farms—but not farm homes—for illegal aliens and providing fines against persons hiring and transporting illegal aliens.
3. That United States citizens in Puerto Rico and Hawaii be given first call when outside labor is needed.
4. That agricultural workers be given legal assurance of their right to organize by extension of the Taft-Hartley Act to large farms.
5. Grants-in-aid by the Agriculture Department to States for the establishment of labor camps. Development of a rural non-farm housing program for migrants when they are not traveling to jobs.
6. That social security, public health, and education programs be extended to cover migratory workers, with Federal financial aid to the States and cities.

[From Western Canner and Packer for April 1951]

#### WHERE WILL WE GET THE WORKERS FOR THE 1951 HARVEST SEASON?—FOOD GROWERS AND PROCESSORS FACE AN EXTREME MANPOWER SHORTAGE IN THE MONTHS AHEAD; INDUSTRY AND GOVERNMENT ARE STILL SEEKING THE SOLUTION

Faced with a steadily increasing national defense program that is skyrocketing manpower requirements for all industry as well as for the armed services, agriculture, which is already suffering labor shortages, is confronted with an extreme shortage in 1951.

That this condition is readily recognizable is the fact that uneasiness is reflected among the growers, the processors, the canners and packers, and others who, by the nature of their business, will be directly affected. Men close to the problem estimate that for California and Arizona alone, the 1951 harvest season will require at least 35,000 offshore domestics and farm workers. Efforts to evaluate the situation in terms of majority reasoning point to a wide divergence of ideas and opinions depending, apparently, upon how the individual or group is affected.

In a sectional poll of a group of representative packers and canners, in a more or less localized California area, the consensus was this:

A labor shortage possibly even worse than that experienced in World War II.

The shortage will apply to skilled and semiskilled as well as common stoop labor.

The Government should do everything possible to import foreign nationals, such as Mexicans, Puerto Ricans, Hawaiians, etc., and should also recognize the necessity for certain types of farm workers and give them draft deferments.

The local communities are doing very little if anything about the situation.

Answers to the question, "What can an individual firm such as yours do?" produces replies that varied from "nothing" to a vague "I don't know," to "we can do little except support local, State, and Federal Government organizations and use labor-saving equipment wherever possible."

Oregon, Washington, and Utah, as well, seem even more vague in the wholehearted support of the use of foreign nationals but they have requested help from Washington, D. C., and appear to be willing to go along with any concrete solution to the problem that might be forthcoming from that source. Statewide and through local communities, they are making determined efforts to develop programs whereby help may be obtained through groups and, particularly, by the use of youth organizations and school children.

In connection with this, one source in the Northwest States, "as you know, one of the real troubles we run into is the unemployment pay and pension question and we are endeavoring to overcome this. However, it is not going to be easy; it looks as though a big crop is coming up this year and our chief difficulty will be to get it off the fields. We would certainly welcome suggestions as to how to get people to work when they do not want to."

#### ILLINOIS VIEWPOINT

In Illinois, the first meeting of the State placement advisory committee was held in January, together with members of the State Employment Service and the USES regional office. Responsible representatives of general farming felt that if a solution were not evolved there would be a definite decrease in farm production by 1952. Out of that meeting came the agreement that a method should be devised for deferring key men in agricultural positions from military service to some reasonable extent. It was also felt that as more farm workers are taken for military service, farmers, having a comparatively intimate acquaintance of long standing with their county agents, might likely feel that such agents could better handle the job of farm labor recruitment than the employment service. If this were the case, there might be developing pressure to remove agricultural labor procurement from the Employment Service once more and return it to agriculture.

#### HAWAII POSSIBILITIES

Insofar as Hawaii is concerned, there appears to be no anticipated shortage of harvest labor in 1951 and, according to published figures in December 1950, there were some 17,000 unemployed persons of whom 6,000 are Filipino agricultural workers (80 percent of them aliens). California is eyeing this source with considerable interest and it seems there is a possibility that recruitment of labor in Hawaii for the mainland may be undertaken under official supervision. A survey has been started there with the determination of that possibility as one of its goals. Heretofore, such private recruitment that has been carried on has been unsatisfactory in reported cases.

To send aliens from Hawaii to the mainland, many obstacles must be overcome and

plans to iron out such a procedure are now being studied. However, other thousands may be sent to California without such formalities. These include some 8,600 high school and vocational graduates who will leave school soon. In addition, according to press reports quoting official sources, there are thousands from the last 2 years' graduating classes who have never found employment. These are not included in the officially defined "unemployed" category.

The importance of farm labor in California's agriculture is indicated by the report from the farm placement chief of the State department of employment that at the peak of employment, the total farm work force was estimated at 492,000. California and the Southwest have always needed and used some kind of supplemental labor in the harvesting of crops. Chinese, Indians, Filipinos, Japanese, Hindus, and Mexicans have been used. As one authority puts it, "It is doubtful if our farmers will ever be able to get along without some type of supplemental labor in their harvesting."

#### MEXICAN PROBLEM

Despite the fact that most farmers, canners and packers unhesitatingly recommend Mexican farm labor, this problem, at present is a burning one and to understand it more fully some past history should be given. In 1942, the sugar-beet industry brought 1,500 Mexican nationals into California under contract for their harvest season and the present Mexican national program is an aftermath of this federally sponsored and financed program. All growers soon realized that larger numbers of such workers were a necessity and California reached its peak in their use in 1946 when 36,000 of them were placed under contract. This number has gradually decreased since the end of World War II as more domestic laborers became available until only 7,000 were working in California this year, most of them in areas close to the Mexican border.

After the close of World War II, Congress discontinued the appropriation of funds for a governmental program. The Farm Placement Service was taken from the Department of Agriculture and placed within the Department of Labor. This meant that the program on a State level was returned to the various departments of employment.

While the program was operated by the Federal Government, the agreements with Mexico and the individual contracts became more and more in favor of the worker. This trend increased after the Department of Labor took over and today, we find a contract which does not contain any semblance of the factor of worker responsibility. A prominent Southwest labor leader explains it thusly:

"Early in 1947, a simple workable agreement was reached by the growers with Mexico covering the placing of agricultural workers under contract with our Immigration Service approving and certifying as to need. It seems this agreement was too simple and workable for governmental efficiency, so in November 1947, a conference was called in El Paso, Tex., attended by Mexican officials, brass from our own Immigration Service, Department of State and United States Employment Service, together with subrepresentatives of the users of foreign labor.

"The users were allowed to meet and to offer suggestions as to details of the proposed agreement but were barred from the actual conference and finally told what the terms and conditions would be, whether they like them or not, even though the user would foot the bill. This attitude has prevailed in all subsequent negotiations and any change does not appear probable."

That this situation does exist is evidenced by the earnest appeals to the Washington departments concerned by men who voice the hope that our Government and Mexico can and will effect an improvement over the

present method of obtaining Mexican farm workers this year in the United States. One suggestion is that the recent yearly agreement between Mexico and the United States should be improved, and that our Government should pay the Mexican Government, for each worker sent here, an amount to reimburse Mexico for the recruiting and transportation. The reason for emphasis in regard to Mexican nationals is because of the fact that they have been the most consistent, most readily accessible source that can be recruited in large numbers.

#### SUGGESTED REMEDY

A special farm labor committee, a 48-man advisory group to farm placement on the Federal level, meeting recently in Washington, D. C., gave considerable time to discussion of the Mexican labor problem and unanimously agreed to a recommendation. It is as follows:

"The present contract under the international executive agreement is completely unsatisfactory, and almost entirely inoperative, and the committee cannot state too strongly its urgent recommendation that the Department of State change its policy of recommendation and negotiation with the Mexican Government to give America agricultural equal status in such negotiation to that accorded political and commercial interests.

"The Mexican Government has consistently demanded conditions in the contract which are in excess of those afforded the Mexican worker in his homeland and better than the domestic worker enjoys in the United States. Even after an agreement has been adopted by both Governments the Mexican Government continually violates the spirit of the agreement.

"This situation, grievous as it has been to many American farmers, has been tolerated for a period of time because while it caused irreparable damage to many producers it did not constitute a serious threat to our national economy. However, we are entering a period of extreme shortages of agricultural manpower which will retard production so that a great many farmers may find themselves unable to provide the food and fiber necessary to meet the demand of our own citizenry, the Armed Forces and the peoples of friendly nations.

"Therefore, the committee recommends that in order to alleviate this serious situation, the Department of State with the aid and advice from the Mexican Labor Committee, make an immediate, realistic, and determined effort \* \* \* to work out a new agreement in which the Mexican workers accept working conditions identical to those afforded the domestic worker and by which both parties will abide. If this is not possible, the American Government is requested to take the necessary steps, either through legislation similar to that now before Congress, or by other means, to make available to the American producers the Mexican Nationals who desire to work in the United States under the same conditions as our domestic farm workers during the present emergency."

Mexico City reports that the Mexican farm workers' attitude toward American farms is so enthusiastic that they are rushing to get over the border into the United States for agricultural labor opportunities without waiting for the formalities of any diplomatic decisions. If this news may be accepted, it would seem that the chief current problem is getting the Mexican Government to allow their agricultural workers to leave and the American Government to allow them to arrive.

A complete reversal of opinion are the views voiced by union officials. Their contention is that there is an adequate amount of laborers in the West and Southwest and there will remain adequate harvest workers without necessitating any influx of Mexican

Nationals. They further voice the opinion that, in this area, any assumption of a forthcoming labor shortage is highly colored and genuinely inaccurate, and that proper housing would pose a problem if foreign help was admitted. The union attitude is that the general wage scale would be seriously lowered and that importation is neither desired nor needed.

#### WHAT CALIFORNIA'S DOING

In California, a measure has been introduced establishing an agency quite similar to the California Farm Production Council, which rendered agricultural assistance in World War II. This type of service is designed to assist farmers in providing housing and necessary supplies for farm workers, as well as to expedite the securing of many supplies necessary to maximum crop production which may be increasingly difficult to obtain. Besides surveying available workers who might be introduced from Hawaii, the State is working on a program of assistance to migratory farm workers under the direction of a special committee of 15 appointed by Gov. Earl Warren.

They have submitted a preliminary report in which they have recommended, among other things, that the State: 1. Create a permanent State board to look after the farm labor problems in all its aspects—health, housing, work conditions, etc. 2. Crack down on unscrupulous labor contractors who abuse farm workers. 3. Set up easy loan systems to help migrants buy homes of their own. 4. Tighten up State housing regulations for labor camps so that higher standards of sanitation, health, and water supply are maintained.

It is felt that by making their farm labor housing as livable as possible, by carefully planning their work so that more continuous employment may be offered, and perhaps by cooperating with neighbors in providing more continuous employment for especially desirable year-round help, farmers can offer sufficiently attractive working arrangements that many workers will not seek other types of employment.

This labor shortage gives every indication that it will start in the field and go right through to the warehouse and loading crew with skilled men such as tractor drivers, truck drivers, etc., an equal problem along with common stoop labor. Some sources feel that even though a policy and manpower board may be set up this year, much of its effect will not be reflected until 1952. In any event, in such a situation, the farmer, the canner, and the packer will have to plan his operations carefully to make the best possible use of the help which is available.

#### NEW INSECTICIDE PLANT

Installation of a new insecticide processing plant and branch office headquarters at Santa Maria, Calif., for the California-Spray Chemical Corporation has been completed, according to Wade Choate, the firm's district manager.

Located on Catalina Avenue, the plant is equipped with a high-capacity dust mill capable of producing up to 6,000 pounds per hour. Other plant facilities include a warehouse and office facilities.

According to Choate, the new plant will process such organics as Vapotone (tepp), Isotox (lindane), Persisto (DDT), Orthene 3D (DDD), Ailttox (toxaphene), and Vapophos (parathion). It will provide freshly prepared Ortho dusts and wettable powders to growers in Santa Barbara County and adjacent areas.

#### STATE APPOINTS BRADEN

Joseph R. Braden, vice president of Richmond-Chase Co., San Jose, Calif., has been appointed by Gov. Earl Warren to the State water pollution control board, to complete the unexpired term of Ralph E. Sanborn, California Packing Corp., San Francisco, who resigned because of ill health.

Braden is a member of the waste disposal committee of Cannery League of California, San Francisco, and is president of Santa Clara County Cannery Association, a group of 14 canning companies in Santa Clara County organized for the purpose of attacking waste disposal and water-pollution problems.

He also is concerned with direction of the Cannery League waste-disposal experimental plant at San Jose, where with USDA's western regional research laboratory, joint pilot-plant studies have been pursued to develop a suitable method of making usable byproducts from fruit and vegetable cannery wastes.

#### FEEDING CROPS

According to Allen B. Lemmon, chief, bureau of chemistry, California Department of Agriculture, it costs California farmers \$1,000,000 each week to feed their crops. Sales of commercial fertilizers reached the record high of 640,000 tons during 1950. A total of 173,858 tons were reported during the last quarter of the year, the largest tonnage ever reported for any 3-month period in California, including 44,513 tons ammonium sulfate, 37,575 tons mixed commercial fertilizers, 22,248 tons ammonium nitrate, and 19,911 tons of normal superphosphate. Agricultural gypsum continued to account for the major portion of the tonnage of agricultural minerals reflecting the large usage of this mineral in the southern part of the San Joaquin Valley where much of the material is mined.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, as to the telegrams which have been received from the heads of various labor organizations and from the head of the Farmers' Union, it seems to me that those telegrams bespeak an earnest and understandable anxiety over the legislation now being debated. It stands to reason that any measure whose effect may possibly be to increase the large pools of foreign labor already in this country, particularly from Mexico—about which we have recently been reading in the New York Times, the magazine Look, and other newspapers and magazines—must naturally cause all domestic labor, whether industrial or agricultural, grave fears. For this alien labor comes almost exclusively from underprivileged groups in neighboring foreign countries whose standards of pay and working conditions are far lower than accepted standards in our Nation. The presence of these multitudes of foreign workers, many of them illegally here, cannot fail to be a serious depressant on the standards of domestic labor.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, may I help the Senator?

Mr. MORSE. I always appreciate any help I can get.

Mr. CHAVEZ. One who knows the problem, a member of the President's Commission, a religious man who has been dealing with the problem for years, sent me a telegram, which was inserted in the RECORD yesterday, but which I should like to call to the attention of my good friend from Oregon. The telegram reads as follows:

SAN ANTONIO, N. MEX., April 26, 1951.  
Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,  
Senate Office Building.

May I sincerely commend your efforts to amend the farm-labor measure now under Senate consideration so that it will contain at least some standards of decent working conditions and will not encourage a further influx across the border of large num-

bers of Mexican workers who are not needed. Having long studied the farm-labor situation in this area at first hand and in recent months as a member of the President's Commission on Migratory Labor in its Nationwide investigation I firmly believe that the demand for further Mexican workers is not justified. If a small number of alien workers are required immediate steps should be taken to organize our farm-labor force which in itself should be adequate for our needs. I wish you success in your noble undertaking.

Archbishop LUCEY.

He is on the ground and sees the problem daily—not in a conference with interested parties in Mexico City, but dealing with hunger and poverty, dealing with bad health, dealing with bad school conditions. He says that such labor is not needed.

I thank the Senator.

Mr. MORSE. Again I thank the Senator from New Mexico for this reinforcing evidence in support of the premise which I have sought to defend in this speech.

Mr. President, before I yielded to the Senator from New Mexico I was speaking of the problems which are created for our domestic labor by bringing into the country large numbers of foreign laborers. I point out that the report of the President's Commission on Migratory Labor discusses this situation in careful analysis and confirms the fears voiced by these labor leaders whose wires I have read.

We in the Pacific Northwest have a real problem in obtaining adequate farm labor in our peak fruit and other specialty crop harvesting seasons. But the legislation now before us is certainly not designed to help us solve our problem, as my colleague the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] has made clear in his testimony before the Senate Agriculture Committee and by his introduction with others of a measure very different from that now pending before the Senate.

The latter bill, as reported to the Senate, would quite clearly discriminate against my section of the country. Certainly it would discriminate against my section of the country and the Pacific Northwest unless an amendment such as that submitted by my senior colleague [Mr. CORDON] were adopted, which would establish in that area, say at the port of Portland, a port of entry for migrant workers. The Government would then undertake the responsibility and the obligation of getting the workers to the port of entry, and the farmers of my section would be allowed to make their contracts with the laborers at that point. Charges for the transportation of the workers should start at the point of entry.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Let me emphasize the disadvantage under which the farmer from Oregon will find himself unless such an amendment is accepted. The bill was designed for the purpose of helping only farmers along the Rio Grande and in California along the Mexican border. The reception centers would be there. All a Mexican worker

would have to pay would be three Mexican cents tribute to Stone & Webster of El Paso, and he could then cross the border and be available to the farmers of that area. But if the pear grower or the vegetable grower in Oregon, or Washington, or the wheat grower of the Northwest wants labor, he must go clear to the Mexican border before he can get any of those laborers, or deal with them to make a contract. So the bill is sectional in its spirit. I do not like sectional legislation. If we are to help anyone, let us help all.

Mr. MORSE. Again I am indebted to the Senator from New Mexico for his contribution to my discussion of the problem engrossing our attention. I completely agree with him, as I pointed out earlier in my remarks, in his statement that the bill discriminates against the Pacific Northwest and other sections of the country far removed from the Rio Grande. In my opinion the Senator from New Mexico is correct in stating that the effect of the bill, irrespective of its design, would be to produce great labor benefits for the people along the Rio Grande, but no fair benefits to the people of the Pacific Northwest, for example, unless such an amendment were adopted as that offered by my senior colleague, providing for a port of entry, and an obligation on the part of the Government to get the foreign workers there, thus affording an opportunity for contracts to be entered into between the farmers and the workers at the port of entry.

Again, in my opinion, the only justification that can be offered for the kind of involved subsidy, a travel subsidy, is the disjointure in the domestic supply of labor which has been caused by the defense program itself, both because of inductions into the armed services and because of "inductions," if they may be called such, into defense industries. Many of our domestic migrant workers, who usually travel the Pacific Coast from harvest field to harvest field as the harvest season changes, starting at the South and ending up at the Canadian border, are now going in large numbers into defense plants, and, as the farmers in my State tell me in communications I have received from them, that has enhanced their problem of labor shortage.

My position is that the travel expense involved should be considered a part of the cost of the defense program. I do not consider that the farmers of my State, or of Washington, or of the other States of the Pacific Northwest, should be expected to foot the cost of transportation from the Mexican border, as explained by the Senator from New Mexico, to the States of Oregon, Washington, and neighboring States, when the cause for the need of the laborers grows directly out of the defense effort itself.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. In my opinion, the amendment proposed to be offered by the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] is an excellent

one and it would certainly make the proposed legislation much fairer. But if it is adopted, should there not be some limitation on the number of the reception centers provided for, and some definite localities indicated where they should be situated?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Will the Senator from Oregon indulge me?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I have delved deeply into this matter. I come from the Mexican border, and am brought into contact with the problem daily. It affects the people in my State intimately. I fully agree with the Senator from Maryland that something definite should be provided. That is why I insist that an adequate investigation be made of the supply of American labor before any foreign labor is allowed to enter. If sufficient labor can be secured in Maryland, New Mexico, and Oregon, let us utilize it. I cannot see how we can be justified in bringing foreign labor to work in this country when there is a sufficient number of American laborers available. I believe we should investigate and ascertain whether a sufficient number of American laborers is available. If a sufficient number is not available, very well, let the necessary number of foreign laborers come into the United States.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator has made a very meritorious point. I feel that consideration will have to be given both as to the total number needed, and also as to the location of the ports of entry.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield to my good friend from the Pacific coast.

Mr. CAIN. I should like to ask the junior Senator from Oregon if, as he understands, it was not the intention of his senior colleague in his proposed amendment to be fair with respect to the rights of farmers in every other section of the United States, as well as being fair to the farmers of the Pacific Northwest?

Mr. MORSE. That is correct; and I have said in my remarks that the bill in its present form discriminates against everyone except those in close proximity to the Rio Grande. I believe we have to perfect it in such a way that it will be fair to farmers everywhere in the United States.

Mr. CAIN. Then the junior Senator from Oregon agrees, does he not, that his senior colleague has no interest in sectionalism in this question at all, and that his amendment is a complete contradiction of any sectional flavor.

Mr. CHAVEZ. It does away with sectionalism.

Mr. MORSE. I am sorry that my senior colleague is engaged in an Appropriations Committee meeting at the present time and is not present to give his own testimony, but I am sure I can testify for him that the answer to the Senator's question is an emphatic affirmative. By his amendment he has no intention whatsoever of fostering sectionalism, or discrimination in terms of sectionalism.

Mr. CAIN. If Senators generally are trying only to accommodate the reason-

able need of farmers throughout the country, every Member of the Senate can find a legitimate value in the Cordon amendment.

Mr. MORSE. That is my opinion.

I am about through, Mr. President. In conclusion, it seems to me the issues involved in this bill are of such a fundamental character, both from the point of view of our national economy and from the point of view of our relations with the countries from which we are importing workers, that the bill must be considered solely from the point of view of the Nation as a whole. I feel that we must assess the problem with careful deliberation and must weigh the evidence and recommendations adduced by the President's Commission. The work of these public-spirited Commission members, of the highest reputation for character and intellectual attainment, should certainly be given very careful consideration before we enact any legislation.

Let me digress long enough to pay a personal compliment and tribute to Professor Van Hecke, formerly Dean Van Hecke. I knew him for many years in law school work. In fact, it was my pleasure to sit at his feet as a student during one summer session. I cannot imagine anyone who could be motivated with finer public spirit, and a devotion to serve the interest of his country without fear or favoritism, than professor Van Hecke. I think he has done his typically fine job as a member of the President's Commission in coming forward with a report which I believe should be studied by every agricultural group in this country.

It is plain that the pending measure does not even nearly approach answering any of the recommendations of the Commission. In fact, I think quite the opposite is true. Consequently, since time does not permit the bill being sent back to committee, I believe it should be amended in major respects on the floor of the Senate if we are to get the workers who are needed in the various sections of the country where there in fact is a short labor supply.

Therefore, Mr. President, I sincerely hope that my colleagues in the Senate will give very careful consideration to the amendments which are being proposed to the bill. So far as I am concerned, I trust we will proceed with the consideration of this bill until it is finally disposed of, because if any legislative action is to be taken at this session of Congress it ought to be taken now. Therefore, the junior Senator from Oregon does not favor any postponement of the final consideration of the bill, but he does urge the adoption of the major amendments as recommended by his senior colleague from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], and by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the first committee amendment, which will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, line 9, after the word "from" it is proposed to strike out "foreign countries within the Western Hemisphere (pursuant to arrangements between the

United States and such countries) or from Hawaii or Puerto Rico," and insert "the Republic of Mexico (pursuant to arrangements between the United States and the Republic of Mexico)."

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURRAY in the chair). The Senator will state it.

Mr. CHAVEZ. If the committee amendment shall be adopted, will that preclude offering amendments to it?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the committee amendment were adopted, that would foreclose the offering of any amendment to it.

Mr. CHAVEZ. From the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. From the floor.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, if that is the case, I submit to the committee amendment my amendment marked "4-25-51-J."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, beginning with line 6, it is proposed to strike out through line 3 on page 2 and to insert the following:

SEC. 501. For the purpose of assisting in such production of agricultural commodities and products as the Secretary of Agriculture deems necessary, by supplying domestic agricultural workers (including those of the continental United States, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands) and, if a sufficient number of such workers cannot be supplied, by supplying (pursuant to formal agreements between the United States and foreign countries within the Western Hemisphere) agricultural workers recruited in such foreign countries, the Secretary of Labor is authorized.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PASTORE in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Green	Martin
Anderson	Hayden	Maybank
Bennett	Hendrickson	Millikin
Benton	Hennings	Monroney
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Moody
Bricker	Hill	Morse
Bridges	Hoey	Mundt
Butler, Md.	Holland	Murray
Butler, Nebr.	Hunt	Neely
Byrd	Ives	Nixon
Cain	Jenner	O'Connor
Capehart	Johnson, Colo.	O'Mahoney
Carlson	Johnson, Tex.	Pastore
Case	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Chavez	Kefauver	Russell
Clements	Kem	Saitonstall
Connally	Kerr	Schoepel
Cordon	Kilgore	Smathers
Dirksen	Knowland	Smith, Maine
Douglas	Lodge	Smith, N. J.
Duff	Long	Stennis
Dworshak	McCarran	Thye
Eaton	McCarthy	Tobey
Elliender	McClellan	Watkins
Ferguson	McFarland	Wherry
Frear	McKellar	Wiley
Fulbright	McMahon	Williams
Gillette	Malone	Young

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. UNDERWOOD] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a member of the United States delegation to the World Health Organization, which will meet in Geneva, Switzerland.

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

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SMITH] is absent by leave of the Senate.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] is absent by leave of the Senate on official committee business.

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

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] is absent on official business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment beginning on page 1, line 9. This amendment, if agreed to, would not be open to amendment unless the vote by which it was agreed to were reconsidered. An amendment proposed as a substitute for the entire section will not be in order until the committee amendments have been disposed of, and when the offering of individual amendments is in order.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CHAVEZ. At the time the first committee amendment was stated by the clerk I made a parliamentary inquiry, as to whether or not, in the event the committee amendment were agreed to, I could call up individual amendments I had prepared. I was informed that I could not. Do I understand correctly that after all the committee amendments have been disposed of, amendments which I have prepared and which I intended to propose will be in order?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment in the nature of a substitute for section 501 will be in order when the committee amendments have been acted on. However, any amendment to a committee amendment should be offered when the committee amendment is under consideration.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That was why I had the amendments printed, and why I stated that I intended to propose them. Do I understand correctly that after the committee amendments have been disposed of, whether approved or disapproved, the amendments I intend to propose will be in order?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That will depend on what is embraced in the proposed amendments. If an amendment were confined to the subject matter of a committee amendment, it would be in order, but it would have to be offered while the committee amendment was under consideration.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Clerk will state the amendment for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed, on page 1, beginning with line 6, to strike out through line 3 on page 2 and insert the following:

SEC. 501. For the purpose of assisting in such production of agricultural commodities and products as the Secretary of Agriculture deems necessary, by supplying domestic agricultural workers (including those of the continental United States, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands) and, if a sufficient number of such workers cannot be supplied, by supplying (pursuant to formal agreements between the United States and foreign countries within the Western Hemisphere) agricultural workers recruited in such foreign countries, the Secretary of Labor is authorized.

Mr. CHAVEZ. And then to continue with the rest of the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That carries it beyond the purpose of the committee amendment. The Chair is advised by the Parliamentarian that the Senator's amendment is not now in order.

Mr. CHAVEZ. At the moment?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. At the moment. It will be in order later, but not at this time.

The question is on agreeing to the first committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 2, line 5, to insert after "United States," the words "under legal entry";

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, is there a committee amendment on page 3?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment now being considered is on page 2 of the bill.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The amendment was, on page 3, line 15, after the word "for", to strike out "expenses incurred by it in the recruitment and transportation of workers under this title in such amounts, not to exceed \$20 per worker, as may be agreed upon by the United States and such employer" and insert "essential expenses, not including salaries or expenses of regular department or agency personnel, incurred by it for the transportation and subsistence of workers under this title in amounts not to exceed \$20 per worker."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

There are several amendments to the amendment lying on the table. The Senator from New Mexico has one.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, if I properly understand the parliamentary

situation, we are now considering the amendment on page 3, line 15.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is correct.

Mr. CORDON. May I inquire of the Senator from New Mexico whether he desires to offer his amendment to change the dollar figure in line 23 of the committee amendment? I take it that such an amendment would be in order at this time.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I intend to offer my amendment H relating to page 3, line 23. I send it to the desk and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico to the amendment of the committee.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, line 23, it is proposed to strike out "\$20" and insert "\$200."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico to the committee amendment.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, whether we adopt this amendment or not, it would appear to me that the question is whether the purpose of the bill is to provide agricultural labor for the farmers so as to make it easier for them to produce and make a good profit, or whether we intend the bill to be a measure to aid the country in producing more food and fiber. If it is the latter, as I suppose it to be, we should make labor available to whatever section of the country needs it. I fear that if the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico were adopted farmers far away from the Mexican border would not get labor, because, very obviously, a farmer who had a crop of fruit to pick would not want to pay a transportation expense of \$200 to and from the port of entry. So, if the purpose of the bill is to aid in the production and harvesting of crops, we should make the labor available in whatever areas of the country it might be needed.

The senior Senator from Oregon has an amendment which would cover that point.

I am afraid that if we adopted a requirement that the farmer had to pay up to \$200, unless that were the average cost for the whole country we would find most of the labor within a couple of hundred miles of the Rio Grande and the Mexican border, and Minnesota, Washington, and Oregon would find themselves quite short. I hope the Senator from New Mexico will explain why his amendment would provide labor at a cheaper cost in various States other than those near the Mexican border.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I have been working in this body for many years with the Senator from Vermont, and I have yet to find him wrong. He might reach an incorrect conclusion. I tried to state what I had in mind, and to make myself understood, in connection with the amendment which I have offered, fully agreeing with the remarks of the Senator from Vermont that all farmers should be helped. I have that in mind, and I want to accomplish that purpose, either by what I think might be the best way of doing it, through my



amendment, or possibly by accepting the amendment of the Senator from Oregon. I have no pride of authorship. I want to carry out the idea that all farmers in the United States should be helped. Whether by my amendment or by some other amendment, I want to reach that result.

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

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. I am quite sure the Senator from New Mexico has exactly the same idea in mind that others of us have. I am fearful, however, in this instance, that he is in error in seeking to add this amendment to the bill. I ask him to go back to the beginning of section 502 and notice the first sentence to which the several subparagraphs refer. I read:

Sec. 502. No workers shall be made available under this title to any employer unless such employer enters into an agreement with the United States—

(1) to indemnify the United States against loss by reason of its guaranty of such employer's contracts;

(2) to reimburse the United States for essential expenses, not including salaries or expenses of regular department or agency personnel, incurred by it for the transportation and subsistence of workers under this title in amounts not to exceed \$20 per worker.

According to the Senator's amendment and according to the committee amendment, the change, I believe, would result in an obligation on each employer up to \$200 for all expenses connected with the transportation of each worker. That would be an obligation which each employer would have to undertake.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes.

Mr. CORDON. Would not the Senator then agree that this amendment would simply guarantee that the inequity which the Senator has indicated he feels should not exist, must exist?

Mr. CHAVEZ. It must exist. At least it would put the employer on some kind of parity with the man who pays only \$20, so far as getting labor is concerned. At least if he was willing to pay that much to get the labor, he would not be handicapped.

Mr. ELLENDER. I should like to point out to the Senator from New Mexico that the \$20 provision in the bill relates to the payment for transportation and subsistence within Mexico. I know the Senator wants to be realistic. The highest figure that such a cost could reach would average around \$35 a person. Now the Senator wants to make it \$200, which is about six times what the highest average cost could be.

Mr. CORDON. I hope that after careful consideration the Senator from New Mexico will withdraw the amendment. I do not believe it carries out his intention.

Mr. ELLENDER. The provision applies to Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I do not know about that. If that is what it means, very well, but I do not interpret it that way. I do not know of anyone who would be willing to spend \$20 for food for this type of labor.

Mr. ELLENDER. The \$20 is intended to reimburse the United States Govern-

ment for the cost of transportation from centers within Mexico to centers within the continental limits of the United States near the border. That is what it would result in, and nothing else.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The item came under discussion during the Senate hearings. A statement was made by Mr. Ernest Falk, manager of the Northwest Horticultural Council, and representing the Northwest Agricultural Labor Association at Yakima, Wash. Perhaps some of the Senators from the Northwest know Mr. Falk. Mr. Magleby, representing the Northwest Agricultural Labor Association, of Walla Walla, Wash., also testified.

Mr. Falk before the committee made this statement which appears at page 83 of the hearings:

Mr. FALK. And we would assure a constant complete utilization of the force. It contemplates that we would pay the expense of transporting them from these various areas when they are once brought to the Northwest.

The CHAIRMAN. To a given place?

Mr. FALK. To a reception center, and we would take it on from there.

The CHAIRMAN. And you would expect someone else, that is, probably the Government, to pay for the transportation from the border to this center wherever it is fixed?

Mr. FALK. We would very much like to have that. In our statement we do make an additional proposal.

The CHAIRMAN. All right, proceed.

This is the significant part of his testimony:

Mr. FALK. If we were required to pick these workers up at reception centers at, or near, the Mexican border it would cost us approximately \$50 each way or \$100 per man to get them to and from the border, then these moves within the area already referred to, will cost at least \$30 per man for transportation and subsistence. Then, Senate bill 984 provides that we reimburse the Government for recruiting expense up to \$20 per man.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator from New Mexico would make the figure \$200 a man.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Let me see what was testified. I do not want to starve the laborer.

Mr. ELLENDER. The laborer would not get the money.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The testimony continues:

This would mean that under such a program it would cost us a total of \$150 a man in addition to camp costs and food and wage compliance.

Mr. Magleby of the Walla Walla pea growers tells me that in 1948 each of the Mexican nationals they brought in cost them \$2.72 per man workday in addition to their wages. They used 540 Mexican nationals.

He then goes into further statistics. I personally prefer the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. CORDON. I am hopeful that the Senator from New Mexico will withdraw his amendment. He could ask unanimous consent later to reoffer his amendment, even after the committee amendment was adopted. I believe it would be helpful to do so.

Mr. CHAVEZ. In order to expedite the passing of the bill, which I know is important, and with the understanding

that, if necessary, I may present the pending amendment at a later time, but also with the hope that the amendment of the Senator from Oregon may be adopted, I withdraw my amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Mexico withdraws his amendment. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment at page 3, line 15.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 4, line 2, after "501 (5)", it is proposed to strike out the comma and "an amount determined by the Secretary of Labor to be equivalent to the cost of returning such worker" and insert "and is apprehended within the United States, an amount determined by the Secretary of Labor to be equivalent to the normal cost to the employer of returning other workers."

Mr. O'MAHOONEY. Mr. President, I have a copy of the amendment which the Senator from New Mexico intends to offer to section 501. May I ask the Senator a question with reference to the amendment?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I shall be delighted to answer it, if I can.

Mr. O'MAHOONEY. I observe that it reads as follows:

On page 1, beginning with line 6, it is proposed to strike out through line 3 on page 2 and insert the following:

"Sec. 501. For the purpose of assisting in such production of agricultural commodities and products as the Secretary of Agriculture deems necessary, by supplying domestic agricultural workers (including those of the continental United States, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands) and, if a sufficient number of such workers cannot be supplied, by supplying (pursuant to formal agreements between the United States and foreign countries within the Western Hemisphere) agricultural workers recruited in such foreign countries, the Secretary of Labor is authorized."

It seems to me that it would be rather vague, and difficult of enforcement, unless the Senator should amend it so as to provide that there shall be a finding by the Secretary of Labor.

Mr. CHAVEZ. It was intended so to provide. One of the objections to the pending measure is that any certification made with reference to labor—in this instance, alien labor—shall be made by local agencies and States.

The purpose of the amendment is to protect domestic labor by making it a national proposition. I should be very glad, because it is what I had in mind, to adopt language providing that the proper agency, which is the Department of Labor, should make certification as to the adequacy or inadequacy of the supply of labor.

Mr. O'MAHOONEY. Inasmuch as the first sentence—

Mr. CHAVEZ. I may say to the Senator that I have another amendment which would take care of what the Senator has in mind. It is amendment D. Will the Senator turn to the bill at page 4?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator does not intend to offer the amendment, does he?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes; I intend to offer it. I thought it would take care of the situation. However, I think the suggestion of the Senator from Wyoming is a good one. I believe that in the amendment to which the Senator refers there should be inserted language specifying that the Secretary of Labor, or an agency which Congress may designate, shall make the certification of adequacy.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I should like to make an additional suggestion. Inasmuch as the first sentence of the Senator's amendment refers to the Secretary of Agriculture and authorizes assistance in the production of agricultural commodities and products, as the Secretary of Agriculture deems necessary, it might possibly be the Secretary of Agriculture who should make the finding.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Possibly so. The only reason the Secretary of Labor was suggested was that some discussion had been had on the floor, and it was felt that inasmuch as this bill referred to labor as such, farm labor being the type of labor considered, it should come under the jurisdiction of the Department of Labor.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I thank the Senator. My only purpose was to call to his attention what I deemed to be an omission.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Where would the Senator suggest that the new language be inserted, and what would be the new language?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I suggest that in line 6, after the word "if" the words "the Secretary shall find that" be inserted.

Mr. CHAVEZ. We are referring, of course, to the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I should think so. Perhaps the Senator might want to make it the Secretary of Labor.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I point out to the distinguished Senator that the Secretary of Labor already has the power to do this.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Then it should be the Secretary of Labor.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I was about to ask for a little more information along the lines of the amendment which the Senator from Wyoming suggested.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I wonder if we can get through with the committee amendments.

Mr. ELLENDER. I think that is what we should do, Mr. President.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I thank the Senator from Wyoming for clarifying the situation.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. What is the question before the Senate?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question before the Senate is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 4, beginning in line 2.

Mr. WHERRY. Is there no other amendment before the Senate? What amendment is being discussed?

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I understood that the distinguished Senator from Wyoming was about to leave the Chamber, and that he wished to make a suggestion.

Mr. WHERRY. Was he discussing some amendment which may later be proposed?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, for the information of the Senator from Nebraska, because it was necessary for me to leave the Chamber I merely addressed an inquiry to the Senator from New Mexico with respect to an amendment which he proposes to offer later, and made a suggestion with respect to it.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I should like to have my good friend from Wyoming, who knows how to frame correct legal language in legislation, make a notation so that when I am ready to offer my amendment I may have the benefit of his suggestion.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 4, beginning in line 2.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I should like to inquire of the Senator from New Mexico whether he expects to offer his substitute. I do not wish to suggest that it be offered, but I happen to have had prepared several copies of the bill showing the amendments intended to be offered by several Senators. On my copy of the bill, with the proposed amendment of the Senator from New Mexico, I have indicated a proposed amendment of section 503. I simply call it to his attention in case he desires to offer it.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, there are no committee amendments to section 503. We are now dealing with section 502.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. AIKEN. As I understand, the only amendments now in order are committee amendments or amendments to committee amendments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct.

The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 4, beginning in line 2.

The amendment was agreed to.  
The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 4, at the beginning of line 23, to strike out "shall" and insert "may, pursuant to arrangements between the United States and the Republic of Mexico.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, line 10, after the word "from", to strike out "foreign countries within the Western Hemisphere" and insert "the Republic of Mexico."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, line 12, to change the section number from "508" to "507."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, line 17, after the word "amended", to strike out "horticultural employment,

cotton ginning and compression, crushing of oilseeds, and the packing, canning, freezing, drying, or other processing of perishable or seasonable agricultural products."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, line 21, after the word "employer", to strike out "includes associations or other groups of employers" and insert "shall include an association, or other group, of employers, but only if (A) those of its members for whom workers are being obtained are bound, in the event of its default, to carry out the obligations undertaken by it pursuant to section 502, or (B) the Secretary determines that such individual liability is not necessary to assure performance of such obligations."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, after line 4, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 508. Nothing in this act shall be construed as limiting the authority of the Attorney General, pursuant to the general immigration laws, to permit the importation of aliens of any nationality for agricultural employment as defined in section 507, or to permit any such alien who entered the United States legally to remain for the purpose of engaging in such agricultural employment under such conditions and for such time as he, the Attorney General shall specify.

The amendment was agreed to.

The President pro tempore. That completes the committee amendments. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I offer the amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, beginning with line 6, it is proposed to strike out through line 3 on page 2 and insert the following:

SEC. 501. For the purpose of assisting in such production of agricultural commodities and products as the Secretary of Agriculture deems necessary, by supplying domestic agricultural workers (including those of the continental United States, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands) and, if the Secretary of Labor finds that a sufficient number of such workers cannot be supplied, by supplying (pursuant to formal agreements between the United States and foreign countries within the Western Hemisphere) agricultural workers recruited in such foreign countries, the Secretary of Labor is authorized.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ].

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I desire to make a very brief statement as to this amendment. It is simple. Either we are willing to treat American labor on an equal basis with foreign labor, or we are not. I wish to take my stand and to make it clear that in any labor legislation we should first concern ourselves with the welfare of our own United States citizens before considering employment opportunities for anyone else.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Labor Appropriations of the Appropriations Committee, I have come to the conclusion that we have not made a

reasonable attempt to recruit domestic farm workers or to pay them decent wages. I am sure that if a national farm labor recruitment program were to be undertaken we would certainly have a sufficient labor force to meet the goals of our agricultural production.

I have been a staunch supporter of fair and reasonable prices for the farmer. Likewise I have fought for fair and reasonable wages for the American worker. The producer should have a reasonable profit. In that respect I am a capitalist. The worker should realize a reasonable income because he is also a capitalist. In our economy the worker and the farmer are dependent upon each other. I feel that all American workers, regardless of whether they are office workers, miners, oil drillers, railroad workers, or Government employees, should have decent standards of living. I cannot allow myself to think that because an individual decides to follow agricultural pursuits he should be regarded as an inferior type of worker. To me the manual laborer is just as important in our society as the white-collar worker.

Given decent wages and conditions, hundreds of thousands of American farm workers would be available. Today there are available in Puerto Rico 50,000 United States farm workers who are good enough to become cannon fodder and to be slaughtered on foreign battlefields; good enough to have their legs amputated and to be at Walter Reed Hospital; good enough to die in Korea; to fight with the marines on Guadalcanal and on Okinawa, but discriminated against by legislation which would import foreign labor to their detriment. I say such discrimination is un-American.

I want Senators to listen to the argument and take sides on the question, so that noses may be counted. I say we should not discriminate against our own people. I prefer an American laborer to any foreign laborer, I care not whence he comes. If an American laborer is available, and it is not desired to give him an opportunity for employment, I want Senators to say so by their votes this afternoon. If they prefer foreign laborers to American laborers, one of whom might even today be receiving a decoration for heroism in Korea, very well, let them say so.

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

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. If the amendment should be adopted and the Secretary should find that there is a sufficient number of workers in Hawaii or Puerto Rico, let us say, what would be the mechanics by which a Nebraska farmer could get a laborer to Nebraska to work on a beet farm there?

Mr. CHAVEZ. We have always been extremely resourceful, even in connection with our labor, and I am sure the Secretary of Labor would find some method by which to get such a laborer to Nebraska or elsewhere where his services are needed.

Mr. WHERRY. Would such a laborer have the same opportunity of transportation being furnished him that is extended now to Mexicans under the con-

tracts which are made with them? I am speaking simply of the mechanics.

Mr. CHAVEZ. It is my intention that he should have it. He should have the same opportunity. I think American workmen should have a priority. Therein lies the difference between the proponents of the bill and myself.

Mr. WHERRY. I hope the Senator will not misunderstand me.

Mr. CHAVEZ. No; I do not.

Mr. WHERRY. I know that in my State laborers are needed in the sugar-beet fields. If the amendment should be adopted, and the Secretary should make a finding that there was plenty of labor in Hawaii, how could the farmer in Nebraska get into contact with the laborer in Hawaii and get him to a Nebraska farm to work in the sugar-beet field?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I assure the Senator from Nebraska, or the Senators from any other States, that if work is made available for American laborers, they will get to the location of the employment somehow, provided starvation wages are not paid. I know no one wants starvation wages to be paid.

Mr. WHERRY. As in the case of any other laborer, he would have to make his own contract.

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

Mr. CHAVEZ. Let me go a little further. What is wrong with the amendment?

Mr. WHERRY. I did not say there was anything wrong with it.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I am not accusing the Senator of having said there was.

Mr. WHERRY. I am trying to obtain information with respect to it.

Mr. CHAVEZ. What is wrong with it? If we were to say to the Secretary of Agriculture, "Look into the matter of farm labor; we need it," and he found that American labor could not be obtained but that he could get farm labor from Mexico, the provisions of the legislative bill by the Senator from Louisiana would prevail. All I am asking is that we take care of our own American labor, if there is any way to do it. If we can make American labor available, very well. I am against legislation that picks out one country from which to secure labor which might be subjected to exploitation. I do not like "one country legislation," except for our own country, and in that case I want it to apply to the entire country.

I now yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator from New Mexico whether there is now any restriction on citizens of Hawaii coming to this country, or on citizens of Puerto Rico from coming to this country now. My understanding is that they can come in and go out freely.

Mr. CHAVEZ. They certainly can.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. So what is the use of the amendment that applies to Puerto Rico and Hawaii? There is no restraint against citizens of Puerto Rico or Hawaii coming into continental United States now.

Mr. CHAVEZ. There is no restraint at all, except that involved in their ability to pay their way. There is no

restraint in the matter of buying mink coats, but many people do not have the necessary \$8,000. There is no restraint in the matter of boarding an airplane at San Juan, P. R., or Ponce, and coming to the United States, but many people do not have sufficient money to take that journey.

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

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. As I understood the Senator from New Mexico a moment ago—and if I am in error I want to be corrected—he said in answer to the Senator from Nebraska, who asked him how the Nebraska farmer was going to get the imported labor to work for him in his beet fields, that if work was available there was no need to worry, that the workers would find their own way to reach it. What is the need of legislation, if they can come here without restraint, if they can find their own way here? In that case there is no need for the proposed legislation.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I think many of them can, but many of them probably cannot.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. That is, the Senator is proposing to pay their way from Hawaii to the United States?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I would pay the expenses of a Puerto Rican or a Hawaiian before I would pay the expenses of one of His Majesty's subjects from Jamaica, yes. If necessary, I would do so. We did so during the war. What is wrong with doing so now?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Without the adoption of the amendment an employer could pay the expenses of a laborer from Hawaii to the United States or from Puerto Rico to the United States. He does not need the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico to do that.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Oh, yes, he does.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. That is the point I am trying to have cleared up.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The point I wish to make is that the Government should be made conscious of the fact that there is American labor available, and that it should be utilized, and the Government should be responsible for such utilization. That is why the amendment is necessary.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Does the Senator now propose to subsidize these workers by paying their transportation?

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Senator from New Mexico contends that there is as much need for the amendment to the proposed legislation as there is for the legislation itself. If the Senator from Iowa is correct, and laborers can come in from Hawaii and Puerto Rico, and if they are available for farm work here, and the farmer from Iowa is willing to bring them in, then why pass legislation providing for the importing of thousands and thousands of foreign laborers?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. My point is that the proposed legislation is not needed for the people of Puerto Rico and Hawaii. So far as the Mexican situation is concerned, an international question of law is involved. The immigration laws are involved. We must authorize entry under proper restrictions, otherwise we will have the wetback problem again, and illegal entrance and

complete breakdown of the immigration laws. As I understand, the only necessity for the bill is that there be proper compliance with our immigration laws, under certain control conditions, so that persons will come into this country legally and will leave the country legally. That is the only reason for the bill. We do not need it for Hawaii and Puerto Rico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I know it is not needed for Hawaii and Puerto Rico, but I still insist that even in dealing with international matters some consideration should be given to our own citizens who may need work.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The employer can go to Hawaii and secure laborers.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Oh, yes, certainly he can; but he will not.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Does the Senator intend that the Government shall subsidize the workers by paying their transportation from Hawaii to the United States? Does the Senator intend that the Government shall pay the expenses?

Mr. CHAVEZ. If it is necessary to subsidize the worker by paying his transportation, yes, and, as proposed in the bill, even to the extent of \$20.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The theory of the bill is that there shall be no Government subsidy; that employers shall pay the whole expense.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Let me say to the Senator that under the theory of the bill there will be a breaking down of American labor. Under the theory of the bill there will be slave labor. We have gotten away from such a thing in New Mexico and Louisiana long, long ago, and it is not coming back.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one more question?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Let me make a further point. In our international relations we should treat all foreign countries alike. Our international relations should be as the phrase itself implies—international relations. We should not show preference to any country by leaving it out of the effects of the proposed legislation. It is not right to reach formal agreements with only one country, establishing standards and conditions for the importation of its agricultural workers. In this instance the only reason why one country was picked out was because the available labor in that country was hungry and poor, because need existed there because in that country there was a class of labor which could be employed at starvation wages. However, eventually the use of that labor at such low wages and under such bad living conditions will interfere completely with our economic system, will break down the thing we love to brag about, the American standards, will establish different standards and conditions for imported agricultural workers, and will leave the door wide open for other countries to send their surplus labor into the United States. Therefore, all importations of foreign labor should be made under formal agreements, and then there will be no danger of having international tensions later on.

Last, but not least, I should like to call attention to the fact that in my home State, more American Indians could be recruited if decent working conditions and reasonable wages were made available to them. There are approximately 52,000 Navajos in the States of New Mexico and Arizona. We have perhaps 36,000 Pueblo Indians there. We also have the Mescaleros, the Zunis, and the Apaches. Yesterday I inserted in the RECORD telegrams from the governors of various of the Pueblos who are opposed to the original Ellender bill.

Mr. President, it is not easy for me to oppose the Ellender bill. It would have been much easier for me to keep quiet and thus satisfy a few greedy people in my home State. But I refuse to do that. When many people of my State have to leave New Mexico in order to find work in the sugar-beet fields of Colorado or Wyoming or to herd sheep in Montana, simply because a few greedy, selfish slave drivers would bring in to supplant them at their homes, Mexican labor that is starving to death, I will not agree that that should be done. I would rather lose my seat in the Senate than agree to have that done.

Mr. President, the issue is clear. Let Senators vote on it one way or the other, and let their stand on it be clearly understood. If Senators prefer Argentine beef, to American beef, let them vote for cheap foreign labor, as provided in this bill. If Senators favor the importation of the foot-and-mouth disease from Mexico, when we have spent \$120,000,000 to keep that disease away from our borders, let them so vote, but likewise they should vote for the cancer bill, because it affects human beings and the basis of human life and the entire economic system of our country and the things that Lincoln stood for.

Senators who favor the appropriation of funds to enable the Department of Agriculture to eradicate the Mexican fruit fly, should not vote for this bill, because the effect of the bill on health conditions and on labor and on the economic life of our country will be more disastrous than all the damage which can be done by the Mexican fruit fly. Senators who wish to exterminate the foreign boll-weevil should help us exterminate a thing which is much more dangerous and can be much more disastrous. Let us not take advantage of human misery.

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

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. THYE. I have studied the amendment which has been offered by the Senator from New Mexico. It does not propose to amend the bill in the manner the Senator from New Mexico has just been stating it will. In other words, I cannot understand how his remarks and his charges have any connection at all with a vote against the amendment. I fail to understand how a Senator who votes against the amendment will be expressing opposition to labor opportunities and proper laboring conditions for American citizens. The remarks of the Senator from New Mexico

are one thing, but his amendment is quite another.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I was stating my opinion. If the amendment does what the Senator from Minnesota says it does, he should have no objection to voting for the amendment.

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

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to ask another question about the mechanics of the amendment. Let us say that the Secretary of Labor finds that there is in Hawaii a surplus of farm labor—to the extent, say, of 20,000 persons; and let us say that ample information is made available in Hawaii in regard to agricultural jobs which are available in the United States; but let us say that none of the 20,000 surplus laborers in Hawaii wish to come to Nebraska to work, but, instead, wish to remain in Hawaii. Let us say that a similar condition is found to exist in Puerto Rico; in other words, despite the fact that those workers, if they come to this country to work, are offered regular American wages, the regular scale of wages, nevertheless they refuse to come. Perhaps I am stating a theoretical case which never will occur, but I am worried about the question of getting the needed labor in Nebraska.

Certainly our farmers are willing to pay the going wage for agricultural labor. I know of no one in Nebraska who is in favor of slave labor. Our people pay the going wage.

Let us say that the Secretary of Labor finds that a surplus of labor exists in Hawaii or in Puerto Rico, but let us assume that those surplus laborers do not take advantage of the opportunity to work in the United States. Will that mean that the amendment, if adopted, will not permit the Government or contractors to make negotiations on an international basis with Mexico to obtain Mexican labor?

Mr. CHAVEZ. No; the amendment means just the reverse. Under the conditions the Senator from Nebraska has outlined, if the surplus workers in Hawaii decide for their own reasons to remain in Hawaii and if the surplus workers in Puerto Rico decide for their own reasons to remain there, even under conditions which are much worse than the conditions under which they would work in the United States, then the Secretary of Labor will certify to that fact, and then contracts such as those the Senator from Nebraska has mentioned can be made, under the provisions of this amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. Mechanically it will be a rather difficult thing to do, will it not?

Mr. CHAVEZ. If the worker does not want to come to the United States, our farmers simply will be unable to have the benefit of his labor.

Mr. WHERRY. However, it would be difficult to have the survey made and to demonstrate the situation in regard to such a labor surplus. In other words, it would seem that that would be a rather difficult job for the Secretary of Labor to perform in the case of Hawaii.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I do not think it is a big job to protect American labor and American industry.

Mr. WHERRY. I am not quarreling about that at all; that is not the reason why I am asking the question.

On the other hand, if a contract is entered into with Mexico on an international basis, the Mexican labor will be brought to the border, and there will be proper distribution, for the Mexican authorities know how to contact those laborers. After all, they have been doing that for many years.

However, let us assume that under the provisions of this amendment, if it is agreed to, it is determined that we do not wish to contract any longer for such labor until we find whether there is a surplus of labor in Hawaii; and suppose we rely upon the Secretary of Labor to make that determination. I wish to know whether, in making that determination, the length of time required to make it or the mechanics involved or any other factor in that connection will result in blocking negotiations with Mexico, if in the final analysis it is determined that there is a surplus of 20,000 laborers in Hawaii.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The amendment will not do that.

Mr. WHERRY. That is what I wish to know.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I am as anxious as is any other Senator that American farmers shall have the labor they need. All I am asking by the amendment is that we find out whether sufficient labor is already available. If it is not, then let us import it.

Mr. WHERRY. I am not troubled about the labor we have in the United States; I am referring to the labor that may be available in Puerto Rico or in Hawaii. If this amendment is adopted, we shall have to determine what the situation is in Puerto Rico and in Hawaii.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. The Secretary of Labor will have to make that finding and will have to certify as to that situation before we shall be entitled to contract for the importation of Mexican labor. If the Secretary of Labor finds there is a surplus of labor in Puerto Rico or Hawaii, we shall be unable to make such contracts for the importation of Mexican labor.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Very well. General Hershey sends out his agents, and they have no difficulty whatever in saying, "Come here, Manuel; we are going to ship you to Fort Benning, and later on you will go to Korea." In view of that system, what is wrong with having the Secretary of Labor, for whose Department we appropriate millions of dollars, operate in a similar way in serving an even better purpose?

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

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I think the Senator from New Mexico has a very laudable motive and I believe that we should employ all available American farm labor before we import any. However, I recall that each fall a few thousand Canadians come into Maine to help harvest the

potato crop; they come into Maine year after year for that purpose. They are experts at that job. I wonder whether, under the provisions of the Senator's amendment, if it is adopted, those Canadians could be admitted for that purpose, so long as there were Puerto Ricans or Hawaiians who were willing to go to Maine to help harvest potatoes.

Furthermore, would not the amendment call for a formal agreement between the United States and Canada in that connection?

Mr. CHAVEZ. One of my objections to the bill is just that. I wish the agreement and the law might affect Canada as well as Mexico. If it did, I think possibly we would have a little happier situation and possibly a somewhat healthier one, because Canadians could not be treated the way the poor Mexican is treated. He is up against it, I may tell the Senator.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct. The Canadian receives the prevailing wage, under suitable living conditions.

Mr. CHAVEZ. He enjoys better living conditions than the Mexican.

Mr. AIKEN. There is no question about that. But I would still hate to have them precluded. They come for a month's time only.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I do not want them.

Mr. AIKEN. We have to obtain permission. In New England, it is necessary to obtain the approval of the Secretary of Labor and of the Immigration Service.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I am willing to go even further than the Senator. It happens to be the result of provisions of the bill that Mexico only is affected. I am trying to take care of American citizens, but I would join with the Senator in making the terms of the bill broader, so that they would include Canada.

Mr. ELLENDER. I may point out to the Senator that his amendment includes Canada.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes, it includes the Western Hemisphere.

Mr. AIKEN. The Western Hemisphere includes Canada. I was disturbed about the Canadians.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, addressing myself briefly to another line of argument, I may say that about 3 weeks ago, the United States, which is leading the world in an effort to bring about democracy, which sermonizes to the world about democracy and fair play and decent living conditions, and this and that, which is able to appropriate billions of dollars to help other countries, was represented at a meeting here with the so-called Latin-American countries, for the purpose of endeavoring to reach an agreement on military assistance. In view of the present world situation, I agreed with the purposes of that conference, and with what was being attempted. But I wish the time might come when we would have agreements whose purpose would be the uplifting of mankind instead of its destruction. If our country can make an agreement with the Latin-American countries relative to matters which could mean the destruction of human life, why is it necessary that, in dealing with labor, we deal with one nation only? Why? The

answer is easy. It is found in the necessities of the human beings across the border. It is necessary for them to eat. It is the old, old story of pelf and greed, which seek to exploit the needy. I repeat, I love the standards of living of the United States. I wish to continue to enjoy them. They are grand. We are endeavoring to carry out the basic concepts of those who dared to write the words, "We, the people of the United States." We are endeavoring to effectuate all the noble purposes of those who signed the Declaration of Independence, of those who, like Thomas Jefferson, dared to think and to believe that all men were created equal, of those who believed in the fundamental tenets of Andrew Jackson, of those who would put into effect the philosophy of Jefferson, of those who believed in the deeds and the words of the humble and meek man who was murdered at Ford's Theater in Washington, a man who did away with human slavery—in a word, those who believe in carrying out the noble purposes of those who are apostles of real Americanism.

Mr. President, I leave the subject there. No motives will be questioned. I am making a statement of my opinion and of how I feel about the matter. I still believe in majority rule, I still believe in this body's deciding for itself. My purpose in discussing the bill and in discussing the amendment is to contribute my opinion for what it may be worth in assisting other Senators finally to come to a definite conclusion as to what they should do. I thank the Senate.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, a good way to scuttle this bill would be to adopt the pending amendment. To begin with, the Secretary of Labor is now authorized to recruit domestic workers. Under the law he is in a position to recruit Hawaiians, Puerto Ricans, and those who live in the Virgin Islands. When the committee considered this bill, we intended to cover all of the countries of the Western Hemisphere, including Canada, Hawaii, and the islands off the eastern coast of our country. During the hearings it was brought out that under the existing law there is a procedure which has been in effect for quite some time in regard to recruiting workers from offshore, such as the residents of the Bahamas and Jamaica, as well as Canadians. The method pursued as to those islands was that the United States Employment Service should certify that within a certain period there was a scarcity of domestic farm labor. After the certification was made, employers could then go to the islands to make individual contracts with the islanders residing in the Bahamas and in Jamaica, and could do the same with Canadians. The plan has worked very well. Employers furnish subsistence and pay the cost of transporting workers from their places of residence to the United States. In most cases they are sent back at their own expense. The contract is signed and executed by the employer under existing laws. There can be no necessity for disturbing that method of dealing with these foreign

workers. As I have said on many occasions, it is necessary to enact the pending measure, because Mexico has refused to enter into agreements similar to those which can be entered into with Canada, Jamaica, the Bahamas, and other countries of the Western Hemisphere.

In other words, with Mexico refusing to continue the program under the law as it now exists, our employers will be precluded after June 30 from contracting for workers in Mexico as has heretofore been the case; therefore, the necessity for enacting this legislation without delay.

My distinguished friend from New Mexico has been pounding along with the argument that domestic workers should be taken care of first. I agree to that. The whole Committee on Agriculture and Forestry agreed to that, and we have placed in the bill a provision, under section 503, which states that—

No workers recruited under this title shall be available for employment in any area unless the Director of State Employment Security for such area has determined and certified that (1) sufficient domestic workers who are able, willing, and qualified are not available at the time and place needed to perform the work for which such workers are to be employed, and (2) the employment of such workers will not adversely affect the wages and working conditions of domestic agricultural workers similarly employed.

In other words, it is incumbent on the Administrator first to see to it that there are no domestic laborers in the area, which would include Indians and other Americans, who are able, willing, and qualified to do the work. If he should find there is not sufficient domestic labor, then and only in that event the certification can be made which would permit the importation of Mexican workers. In addition to that, Mr. President, we have heard a great deal about slave wages. But the bill provides that "the employment of such workers will not adversely affect the wages and working conditions of domestic agricultural workers similarly employed."

That language simply means that the employees who come from Mexico must be paid at least the prevailing wage as is paid to domestic workers who are employed locally.

Mr. President, this bill authorizes the signing of contracts between American employers and Mexican workers when the latter are brought from within Mexico to the United States. I have read to the Senate on several occasions the provisions of the agreement. Among the provisions which I am sure will be incorporated in future agreements will be the one which is now in the present individual work contract as to the payment of wages, as follows:

The employer shall pay the worker the prevailing wage rate paid to domestic agricultural workers for similar work and in the manner paid within the area of employment, or the rate specified on the last page of this contract, whichever is the greater.

With reference to the latter clause on wages, specified on the last page of the contract, the wages are agreed to in advance, and the minimum wage rate is

determined by employers in the locality, under the auspices of the United States Employment Service, and in all cases the actual wage is written into the contract so that the worker knows what he will receive before he leaves the place on the border.

The bill further provides that it is up to the employee as to whom he works for and what kind of work he will engage in.

As I pointed out in the earlier part of my remarks last week—and I may say this is the fifth day we have been considering this bill—there was a provision in the old contract which forced the employer to furnish a bond for the return of the Mexican laborers he employed. That was not desired by the employer, for the simple reason that there was no way by which the employer could make the worker remain on the farm. If the worker left, the employer could be made not only to forfeit the bond, but also to reimburse the Government for the entire cost of returning the employee to Mexico. It was shown that in many cases where the bond was forfeited, employees had already returned to Mexico, but it was not done in accordance with the Immigration Service regulations. They wanted certification that he had returned, and they wanted evidence of the fact, but in many cases, although letters were presented to show that the employee had returned, the bonds were forfeited nonetheless.

Under the terms of this bill, the United States Government, acting through the Labor Department, the Immigration Service, and the health authorities, will make selection of Mexican employees who are eligible to work in the United States. Those employees are brought to the border and there a contract is entered into voluntarily between the employer and the employees, with the understanding that the Government will guarantee to each worker the performance of the contract insofar as wages and transportation are concerned. That is why it is necessary that authority be granted for an agency of Government to enter into this kind of a program.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. As I understand the Senator, the function of the Department of Labor is to go to Mexico and recruit employees.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Who makes the contract?

Mr. ELLENDER. The workers and the employers. I do not know that my good friend heard what I said, but before certification can be made, which would be followed by recruitment, two things must be found, namely, that sufficient domestic workers who are able, willing, and qualified, are not available.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Qualified to labor?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes, that they are not available at the place and time needed to perform the work requested; second, that the employment of such workers will not adversely affect the wages and working conditions of domestic agricultural workers similarly employed.

Mr. CHAVEZ. What is the period of time as to domestic wages?

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, under the bill we are now considering, the certification that domestic workers are not available will be made by the director of State employment security. But I desire to state to my good friend that there are two or three amendments which will be presented to change that provision by designating the Secretary of Labor to make the certification, so that certification can be made on a national level.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Will the Senator pardon me for a moment on that point?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Is the chairman of the committee willing to accept such an amendment?

Mr. ELLENDER. I shall leave that to the Senate. I am directed by the committee to present its findings, but I will say to my good friend that I shall urge no serious objection. On the contrary, it is my purpose to present to the Senate a press release issued in Mexico by the Mexican Government to the effect that unless a provision of that kind is in the bill, the Mexican Government will not enter into any contracts. In other words, the Mexican Government is desirous that certification of need in this country be established on a national basis rather than on a State basis. The press release reads in part:

3. Mexico will not agree to State government agencies assuming any responsibility in connection with the operation of the bracero program.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I am glad the Senator from Louisiana thinks that some consideration should be given to the state of mind of the Mexican Government. I certainly would recommend for his consideration, before final determination, some of the statements made by American citizens on the same subject.

Mr. ELLENDER. Further to answer the question of my good friend, as I have indicated, two things would have to be determined on a national level should this amendment prevail, as it possibly will.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I wish the Senator would say "Yes."

Mr. WHEERRY. Which amendment is going to prevail?

Mr. ELLENDER. An amendment is pending to place certification on a national rather than on a State level. I am sure it would undercut many of the arguments which my good friend has been making for the past few days.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I think it would improve the bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am sure the Senator knew about it right along. He was aware of the fact that the amendments were pending, and he knew my attitude toward them. I pointed out that before any Mexican labor could be recruited, if the amendment pending with reference to placing the certification on a national basis is adopted, the Secretary of Labor would be bound to determine whether or not there was sufficient domestic labor available to do the work. If he found that there was sufficient domestic labor available Mexican labor

could not be recruited. On the other hand, if he found that there was not a sufficient amount of domestic labor available, he would have to take the further step of finding that the employment of such foreign workers would not adversely affect the wages and working conditions of domestic agricultural workers similarly employed.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. When we have records and statistics showing that local labor in the States of Texas and New Mexico is paid \$1.75 a day, and Mexican labor is paid \$3 a day, what can we expect?

Mr. ELLENDER. My good friend refers to wetbacks. To my knowledge, he has read into the RECORD, at least four times, a telegram from some veterans in Corpus Christi.

Mr. CHAVEZ. From a Catholic archbishop.

Mr. ELLENDER. No; from some veterans.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. If the Senator will look at the telegram again he will see that the veterans discuss wetbacks. It is true that the situation on the Mexican border at times is very unsatisfactory. The so-called wetbacks swim across the Rio Grande. They know they are violating the law. They want to work for an American employer. In many instances the employer hides them out and works them secretly, because he knows the wetback is illegally in the country. Therefore an employee working under such conditions would be willing to work for a bare subsistence.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. If the Senator were as well acquainted with conditions around the Rio Grande as are the junior Senator from New Mexico and the senior Senator from New Mexico he would not say that the wetbacks swim across the river. Sometimes there is not sufficient water in the river to cover their feet. They simply walk across.

Mr. ELLENDER. Would they then be called drybacks, instead of wetbacks?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Drybacks and wetbacks.

Mr. ELLENDER. I repeat that the amendment which is now pending is absolutely unnecessary, in that the Department of Labor now has the authority to recruit domestic labor.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, may I ask a question?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I have inquired along that line of the Labor Department, particularly its Employment Service. I may say that I have been closer to the problem of labor and what it is supposed to represent than the average member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I have been very close to it, I may say to the Senator from Louisiana. I have helped appropriate millions of dollars which they get for employment. When an inquiry was made of Mr. Goodwin, of the Employment Service, as to what they had done, he answered that

they had done very little with reference to finding out about American labor. What does the Senator think we can expect from the Department under such conditions?

Mr. ELLENDER. I am sorry that the distinguished Senator has so little respect for the Department of Labor.

Mr. CHAVEZ. After dealing with them for 10 or 12 years, I have come to that conclusion.

Mr. ELLENDER. I think if the Secretary of Labor is empowered to do the things that we propose he should do, he will do his duty.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I say that after we have given millions of dollars to investigate unemployment or employment—and Congress does it every year—and they still cannot come before a committee and give us definite information as to what labor is available, why should we not lose a little faith in them?

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I am trying to understand the pending amendment. I should like to ask a question, and perhaps the Senator's answer will help me to understand it. Is it not the purpose of the amendment to provide the same protection and services to American workers, including those from Puerto Rico, Hawaii, and other areas in the Western Hemisphere, as the measure proposes to give exclusively to Mexican workers?

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not interpret it that way, for the reason that the bill simply provides a method of importing Mexican labor. Under the law today the Secretary can recruit all the domestic labor that is required. The amendment as now presented does not change the present set-up. As I understand it does not assist domestic labor. It does not assist Puerto Rican or any other labor, but I presume the Senator will call up another of his amendments which in effect provides for a subsidy of domestic labor as well as Hawaiian, Puerto Rican, and other offshore labor.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. If the Senator from New Mexico were to make such a suggestion, which the Senator in his own mind anticipated, what would be the difference between that and voting for a subsidy on cotton or tobacco?

Mr. ELLENDER. It is the Senator's privilege. I am trying to answer the question of my distinguished friend.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I should like to give one answer to the distinguished Senator from New Mexico. Large groups engaged in agriculture in this country, utilizing offshore labor, do not want any subsidy in connection with their labor. They carry the full expense of bringing in the labor, putting up the bond, and returning the foreign laborers to their own country. They do not want to saddle their business upon the Federal Gov-

ernment. They do not in any way want a subsidy. It is certainly one good reason why no subsidy should be included when a large segment of agriculture which uses foreign labor does not want a subsidy.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I think that is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. I so indicated to the Senate in my opening remarks. I said relationships which now exist between employers of this country and employees in offshore islands are very satisfactory. The employers and the workers pay all the expenses. The Federal Government is not put to any extra expense at all with respect to the importation of labor by employers on the Atlantic coast.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Suppose we agree that the Federal Government does not pay one penny. Does the Senator think it is fair that the Federal Government should act in that manner? I presume the Senator agrees that that is correct. The Federal Government does not pay one penny. What difference does it make whether the Federal Government pays a part of the expenses in this connection, or whether it pays a subsidy on cotton or something else?

Mr. ELLENDER. That brings me to the next point, and that is that the bill places upon the shoulders of the employers the burden of the payment of practically all the expenses. In other words, under the terms of the bill the recruiting is done within Mexico, at certain points agreed upon by the Mexican Government and the United States Government. The expense of transportation from those points to a point determined upon in the United States will be paid by the employers, up to a maximum of \$20 per worker.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. In one moment. The cost of transportation from the point within the United States, where the contracts are entered into by employers, to the place of employment, is to be paid by the employer. The Federal Government pays none of that expense. Under the proposal which will be made, I presume, by my distinguished friend—

Mr. CHAVEZ. We are now discussing taking care of American laborers, and not some amendment which I may propose in the future.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator proposes to have the Federal Government—

Mr. CHAVEZ. What amendment is being discussed at the moment?

Mr. ELLENDER. It is the Senator's amendment.

Mr. CHAVEZ. It is an amendment to take care of American labor. It has nothing to do with paying a subsidy to any laborers. Is not that correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. The question of subsidies is not involved in the Senator's amendment that is now before us; but I presume that he is going to submit such an amendment a little later.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I do not know. Let us approach one question at a time. Let us discuss whether the Senator wants American labor or Mexican labor, or whether we are going to pay a subsidy to

foreign labor. The amendment now before the Senate deals with the question whether we want American labor or Mexican labor.

Mr. ELLENDER. If my distinguished friend does not intend to follow the pending amendment with his subsidy amendment which has been on the desk for some time, I do not see any point in the pending amendment, for the simple reason that the Secretary of Labor can now recruit domestic workers.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I try to deal with each point in turn as it is reached. If the Senator were to accept this amendment, I might feel kindly enough, or pleasantly shocked enough, so that, in order to comply with his wonderful idea of getting labor to the American farmer, I might not even suggest another amendment. However, I do not promise.

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not want to make the bill unworkable. If the Secretary of Labor can certify that there are 50,000 workers in Hawaii, but he cannot bring them over, the certification might go so far as to say that they could be made available if the employer wanted to send for them. But I do not want the American farmer to be put in that position. I would rather follow the thinking of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and that is to let the bill operate solely with respect to the Republic of Mexico. As I have stated, we have been put on notice that we cannot after June 30 recruit workers in Mexico unless a new agreement is reached between our country and Mexico. This bill does nothing but carry out the purposes of the proposed new agreement.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President—

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I have the greatest respect for the ability, loyalty, and patriotism of the Senator from Louisiana. However, let me ask him this question: Has he reached the point in life where he considers it necessary to sacrifice American institutions in order to comply with the wishes of a foreign government?

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, to begin with, we are not doing that.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The reason we are proposing to take this action is that we agree—

Mr. ELLENDER. It was the only way by which we could come to terms. I think it was reasonable. Mexico did not try to put anything over on us, nor did we try to put anything over on Mexico. We want to preserve the cordial relationships which now exist.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Mexican Government today has a very serious problem facing it, with respect to the wetback situation. While I was conferring with representatives from Mexico I stated on several occasions that it was my desire to assist them. This legislation is a step in the right direction.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Let me ask the Senator from Louisiana another question. I wish he would read to the Senate any particular clause in the bill which takes care of the wetback problem. Where is there anything in the bill which does so? The Senator is talking about legal entry.

Mr. ELLENDER. On several occasions I have told my distinguished friend that with respect to wetbacks, workers who are here illegally, recontracting is not permitted. We prohibit that in the bill. We say that no contract may be entered into between workers from Mexico and employers in the United States unless the workers have entered the United States legally.

Mr. CHAVEZ. They never had a contract. Millions of wetbacks who are now in this country never had a contract; but they are still working.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is in error if he has reference to Mexicans legally in this country.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Who ever made a contract with a "wetback"?

Mr. ELLENDER. I am talking about Mexicans who have been legally contracted.

Mr. CHAVEZ. They are greatly in the minority and would be so, even under the provisions of the bill of the Senator from Louisiana. I think I understand and appreciate the fact that he is trying to legalize the importation of foreign labor. But the point which the Senator does not realize is that while he would legalize the importation of Mexican laborers and contracts with Mexican citizens, nothing is done about the million or so who are here illegally, and who are not working under contract.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I have pointed out on several occasions during the debate, it is against the law at present for these workers to enter without permits.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Certainly. The passage of more laws and still more laws would not cure the situation.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I believe that if the bill which I introduced a few days ago is considered soon by the Judiciary Committee of the Senate, we may be able to correct that evil to a certain extent.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I beg the indulgence of the Senator. He has been most kind and patient with me, and I appreciate it. I am sure that he is just as sincere in his position as I am in mine. But if the wetback question is serious—and I believe the Senator will agree with me that it is serious not only for our country and our economy, but also from the standpoint of the Mexican Government—why can we not take care of it in this bill?

Mr. ELLENDER. I am willing to do so, but I doubt whether the Senate would adopt such a provision without hearings on the subject.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Everyone knows that 1,000,000 workers are here illegally.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator has an amendment to propose. No doubt the Senate will have an opportunity to vote on it.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I hope at that time the Senator will be as willing to take care of the situation as he now is.

Mr. ELLENDER. I expect to discuss the Senator's amendment later. At one time I thought that it was along the same lines as the bill which I introduced; but it will not accomplish the purpose.

Mr. CHAVEZ. We might get together. Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senate now has before it the amendment lettered "J" offered by the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], which has to do with investigation by the Secretary of Labor relative to the question of whether there is a sufficient number of workers in Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands, before contracts such as provided for by the bill can be entered into. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator a question similar to that asked by the Senator from Iowa. Is the amendment needed in order to protect American labor?

Mr. ELLENDER. No, it is not needed. Mr. WHERRY. They are protected now?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; the Secretary of Labor is already empowered to recruit domestic labor, including labor from our Territorial possessions.

Mr. WHERRY. Then all that is standing in the way of those workers coming to Nebraska farms is the contact to be made to get them there?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes, and then, I presume, the payment of transportation.

Mr. WHERRY. What about the transportation? Under the contract provided for in the bill, transportation is actually being paid to bring Mexicans to the border.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct. The employers in this country will pay for the transportation of Mexican employees to a point within the United States, and from that point to the place of employment, and there is nothing to stop an employer from doing the same with respect to Hawaiians.

Mr. WHERRY. Is any effort being made to accomplish the same purpose in Hawaii that will be accomplished with respect to Mexicans? I do not mean with respect to the Government paying subsidies. How are laborers in Puerto Rico, for example, to be collected and brought here?

Mr. ELLENDER. The way that is done now is that the United States Employment Service, let us say, will certify that in New Jersey 500 workers are needed to pick the pea crop. This certification can be used by the employers there to go to the Bahamas or to go to Puerto Rico and make arrangements for their labor requirements with Puerto Ricans or with Bahamans.

Mr. WHERRY. Is that being done? Mr. ELLENDER. Certainly.

Mr. WHERRY. So there is no need for this proposed legislation.

Mr. ELLENDER. No. That is why we have excluded it from the bill.

Mr. WHERRY. That is what I wanted to find out.

Mr. ELLENDER. I have made a statement to that effect on many occasions. I am sorry the Senator has not heard it.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, if the Senator will bear with me I should like to state what is being done about it. The Senator may think they are now doing what he said, but they are not. Mr. Goodman was a witness who ap-



peared before the Committee on Appropriations. I was chairman of the subcommittee handling the appropriations for the Department of Labor. I read:

Senator CHAVEZ. As the chairman of this committee, and as an individual only—and I do not represent the views of the committee—I am not in favor of giving the Department any money to go down and get foreigners to work in the country when we have people like the Indians and local citizens who are around here, and who are drafted, and yet who cannot get a job.

Mr. Goodman answered:

I agree with that, except that I would say that we are doing everything we can with the resources we have.

They are doing everything they can. Perhaps saying the Lord's Prayer, doing good deeds, meaning to do the right thing, but not getting the labor they could get. That was Mr. Goodman's testimony.

Mr. ELLENDER. The question of the distinguished Senator from Nebraska had to do with certification of local needs. Of course, the Senator, I presume, would like to have his amendments providing for subsidization adopted, so that more direct assistance could be rendered by the Employment Service in securing these laborers. The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry decided to make this a self-sustaining program, to make the farmers of the country pay all the expenses, and not saddle the Federal Government with any more expense than necessary.

Mr. CHAVEZ. It was intended to do that at the expense of domestic labor in favor of cheap labor.

Mr. ELLENDER. No, it was not. I repeat there was no such intention. I have read section 503 to the Senate many times. I will ask the Senator himself to read it now, and he will see that before certification can be made the Administrator must find that there is no domestic labor available to do the work.

That, Mr. President, is all I desire to present to the Senate at this time. I urge that the amendment be defeated.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I shall speak only briefly on the bill and against the amendment. As the bill first came to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry it would have included, along with Mexico, other countries in the Western Hemisphere. It would have brought within the purview of the control of the Department of Labor agricultural labor coming in not only from Mexico but from the Bahamas, Jamaica, Honduras, Canada, and other areas in the Western Hemisphere nearby the United States.

Mr. CHAVEZ. It referred to foreign countries within the Western Hemisphere.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator. It would also have provided that the expense of negotiating the arrangements for bringing in the labor from all those additional places would be borne by the United States Government under appropriations made for the Department of Labor. It would have provided that the expense of transportation, after the labor was contracted with, would lie upon

the United States Government. It would have provided that the expense of subsistence while the labor was on the way to the centers from which it would be distributed and to the farms where it would work, would also be paid by the United States Government. It would have saddled a tremendous amount of expense upon the United States Government which is now being paid by the local agricultural producers of all the States in the United States, except those who rely upon Mexican labor.

In other words, in the case of the States which bring in Canadian labor, as was stated by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] a few minutes ago, they make their own arrangements, they furnish their own subsistence for the individuals who come in from Canada to help them. They furnish the housing. They take care of the transportation. The United States Government is at no expense whatsoever.

The same thing is true, Mr. President, with reference to the many thousands of laborers who since World War II and during World War II have been coming in from the Bahamas and from Jamaica, and, for a time, from Honduras. Those laborers come in under arrangements made by our producers. They cannot get that labor without first having obtained certificates from the Department of Labor that no domestic labor is available. In other words, the domestic labor is certainly protected by that feature of the law.

Then they cannot get that labor until they make satisfactory arrangements with the Government of the Bahamas or the Government of Jamaica, or wherever the labor is coming from, to the effect that they are to be well-housed, that their transportation here is to be paid, that their transportation back home is to be paid. They are required to put up bonds to that effect. Likewise that the laborers will be paid the prevailing wage rate in the place where they will work. In other words, under the law as now applicable, no laborers coming into the United States from offshore areas or from Canada can be imposed upon, nor can domestic labor be imposed upon, because the offshore laborers or Canadian laborers cannot be brought in unless there is a shortage of domestic labor, which has already been determined and certified by the Secretary of Labor.

Mr. President, the members of the committee coming from all other portions of the United States except that portion where the Mexican labor problem exists, were anxious to help both the Government of Mexico and the citizens of Mexico and the agricultural producers in that portion of the Nation who look customarily to Mexican labor to help produce and gather their crops. But we were not willing to do that at the expense of building a tremendous hierarchy, with all the expenses I have just mentioned visited upon the United States Government, with subsidies such as I have mentioned being created for agricultural producers in all other areas of the United States, with extensive transient camps set up in various parts

of the Nation, such as have been mentioned in the testimony. We were not willing to do that at the expense of establishing such a tremendous hierarchy, because we felt it was sounder democracy and better government and better agricultural practice to have the system prevailing under the present law continued. Under that system we cannot get one laborer from outside the United States unless there is a shortage here, and we cannot get a single laborer from outside the United States without agreeing to pay him the prevailing wage rates and without taking care of his transportation in both directions and furnishing him with medical care, good housing, and the other things which have been set forth.

We think it is sound Americanism and soundly in the protection of American labor and soundly in the protection of American agriculture to insist, as we did in the committee, that this bill be limited solely to the question of Mexican labor.

Mr. President, what were the reasons why it was felt in the committee that Mexican labor could be brought within the purview of this bill, provided it was confined to Mexican labor, without doing violence to the principles of international comity, without doing violence to agricultural producers elsewhere in the Nation, and without doing violence to agricultural workers who are citizens of the United States?

There are two reasons, one of which has already been mentioned so fully by the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] that I shall not attempt to repeat it, but shall simply outline it briefly. That reason is that under the system now prevailing, Mexico has felt that instead of having Mexican labor taken from areas in Mexico where there is unemployment and instead of giving the help where it is needed and where it should be given, all too frequently the labor has been recruited from directly across the border, even though at that time those areas were prosperous, needed the labor of the Mexicans who lived there, and afforded an ample field for the employment of the local labor.

So the Mexican Government has insisted—and I think it is entirely within its rights in so insisting, because Mexico is great in expanse, and in many cases the conditions which are to be found in one part of Mexico are not to be found in other parts—that areas in Mexico in which there is unemployment shall be given preferment in the recruitment of laborers to come to the United States. The Mexican Government has given notice that beginning with the middle of this year, unless a law under which they can follow such a system is enacted, they will not favor the continuation of the present system and will not cooperate in its continuance.

I think the Mexican Government is entirely within its rights in taking that position. The members of the committee felt that the Mexicans are completely within their rights in insisting that the law be changed in such a way as to

allow the Mexican economy to be properly considered in connection with this matter, as well as to give proper consideration to our own economy in the sections of the United States where such labor is needed. So the bill is proposed by the committee to be changed in such a way as to meet that situation.

Enactment of the bill as reported by the committee is also badly needed in order to meet the situation which arises because of the fact that Mexico is the only one of our neighbors which lies just across a small river for some 1,500 or 1,800 miles, and across an imaginary line along the rest of the border, which not only can be very easily crossed illegally, but as to which illegal crossings have proved to be extremely frequent. Furthermore, it has been found that such illegal entries are prejudicial to Mexico and also to the welfare of our own people. As the distinguished Senator from Louisiana has said, the situation resulting from such illegal entries, when wet-backs, as they are called, illegally enter our country and are employed here, is that they are not paid fair wages, do not receive proper housing or medical attention, and often are so forced down economically that instead of being able to take back to Mexico material and substantial American dollars—which is one of the principal objectives of the exchange of labor—they are lucky to be able to return at all, even though while in the United States perhaps they have had a somewhat improved diet as compared to the one they would have had at home; but otherwise their condition has not been improved in any way.

So the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry thought it was entirely right and fair and decent to make this provision applicable only to Mexican labor for the reasons we have indicated.

Mr. President, I would dislike very much to see this amendment adopted, because it would put all of us who live at a distance from the border in the position of asking the Federal Government to subsidize a practice which we find is entirely acceptable to us and to the neighboring nations with whom we deal. We do not believe in subsidies; we do not want them; we do not ask for them. We think we can make our individual arrangements under the supervision of the Department of Labor and the Department of Justice and the Department of State. We think we can make our arrangements better as we have made them in the past, and without any expense whatever on the part of the Federal Government, and without putting our splendid and independent agricultural industries in the position of asking for and receiving a subsidy for something they are quite able to carry themselves and to do to their own advantage.

Mr. President, the proposal made by the pending amendment is so far reaching in its terms that I think it might be well for me to read into the RECORD a few of the statements made in the testimony at the hearings, so that what is sought to be established by means of the amendment will be crystal clear.

I shall read briefly from several of the statements made by the Assistant Secretary of Labor, Mr. Creasey, when he appeared before the committee during the course of the hearing.

First, I wish to read a few excerpts having to do with the proposed system of transient camps. The Secretary of Labor made it perfectly clear, through the testimony offered by his assistant—and, incidentally, the answer he gave in direct response to a question which was asked was that his testimony was the testimony of the Department of Labor, and not solely his own testimony—that they want a system of motels or transient camps extending from New England to California, and from the Canadian border to the Gulf of Mexico, transient camps at which would be housed these migratory laborers as they travel around. Certainly I do not have to say to the Senate that such a system, instead of simplifying and reducing the travel of migratory agricultural laborers, would make them much more widely traveled persons than they now are, because that would be an open invitation to them to go thousands of miles, whereas today they go perhaps hundreds of miles from one point of work to another.

I read now from page 26 of the hearings:

Senator HOLLAND. Excuse me there. Is what you are talking about there a series of transient camps?

Mr. CREASEY. That is right.

Senator HOLLAND. To house transient migratory labor as it is traveling from one part of the United States to another?

Mr. CREASEY. That is correct.

Senator HOLLAND. How many such camps do you have in mind?

Mr. CREASEY. Frankly we have not gone into it far enough to decide how many there should be. I do not think it would require very many.

Senator HOLLAND. But you are asking for the inclusion of that factor in this legislation?

Mr. CREASEY. That is correct.

I read now from page 27:

Senator HOLLAND. I was anxious to take a practical problem in this field. It is a well-known fact that migratory farm labor that starts out in south Florida in the winter ends up in Connecticut in the tobacco fields in the late summer or early fall. Is it your idea to have a series of tourist camps that would accommodate this migratory labor as it moves from south Florida to Connecticut through the course of the various seasons, extending from winter in Florida to early fall in Connecticut? Is that your idea?

Mr. CREASEY. That is correct.

Let us remember that he was talking, not only about labor which comes to the United States from the Bahamas, Jamaica, and Honduras, but about all migratory farm labor, because the essence of his entire statement was that since it is necessary under this program to have certain provisions made for housing and for the working conditions of the Mexican laborers who leave their homes in Mexico, therefore the same conditions should be established for the hundreds of thousands of migratory agricultural laborers who travel from one end of this country to the other. That

is clear from the testimony of Mr. Creasey, who said, in response to my question on that point, "That is correct."

My statement was that what they propose is to have a series of camps extending from Homestead, Fla., on the east coast, to Maine.

I read further from the hearings:

Senator HOLLAND. Mr. Creasey, is this testimony your own personal testimony or is it for the Department of Labor?

Mr. CREASEY. Which do you mean?

Senator HOLLAND. The tourist camps.

Mr. CREASEY. That is from the Department of Labor.

So that is the program we have before us, as proposed at this time.

Now let me go a little further. I read now from page 31 of the hearings:

Senator HOLLAND. Mr. Chairman, I would like to pursue one more point. If I understood the witness correctly, and I am going to ask him the specific question as to whether I did, his proposal embodies not only setting up of this series of tourist camps, but also of paying the transportation of domestic workers on a parity with the paying of the transportation of the offshore workers or Indian workers who he brought in from Mexico and other places; is that correct?

Mr. CREASEY. That is correct.

I then asked this question:

In other words, since you have to pay the transportation of a Mexican worker to work in the beet fields in the Midwest all the way from his home in Mexico, there and back, you feel that you should be prepared to pay the transportation of domestic farm laborers in similar amounts?

Mr. Creasey answered:

That is correct.

Mr. President, it ought to be very clear by this time what kind of set-up it is proposed to create, but there are one or two other things I wish to mention. On page 36, in my questioning of Mr. Creasey, I asked the following questions, to which Mr. Creasey gave answer as follows:

Senator HOLLAND. I would like to ask another question to make it clear. Do I understand that one of your principal grounds of opposition to S. 924 as now written is that while it provides for transportation of foreign workers to this country and return to recruitment centers from which they were obtained, which you favor, that you are not willing for the bill to fail to have a similar provision or identical provision with reference to domestic farm labor? Is that it?

Mr. CREASEY. Not identical, but similar. In other words, we say that the offer you make to Mexicans, you should be willing to make to Americans.

Senator HOLLAND. In other words, that the transportation costs to and from the place of labor should be paid by the Government in the case of domestic farm laborers just exactly as in the case of Mexican farm laborers?

Mr. CREASEY. In the same manner and to the same extent, and no more.

Senator HOLLAND. And that in addition to that you favor the setting up of these tourist camps along the lines of migration to house the migrant laborers and their families as they go from place to place?

Mr. CREASEY. We think it is a very desirable thing, Senator.

Mr. President, those of us who come from areas not contiguous to Mexico are

happy to cooperate with the Mexican Government, and to cooperate with the tens of thousands of Mexican citizens who want this outlet for their labor, this chance to enjoy better living standards, with better opportunities for themselves and their families. We likewise want to cooperate with the agricultural industries in that portion of the Nation which naturally looks to that source of labor after the supply of domestic labor is exhausted.

I am not willing to go along with this program if it be enlarged to include all the enormities which I have mentioned, which are shown by the record, which are included within some of the amendments which have been proposed, beginning with the particular amendment which is offered at this time. I hope the Senate will reject the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] on page 1, line 6.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. CORDON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McCLELLAN in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the suggestion of the absence of a quorum may be withdrawn and that the order for the call of the roll may be rescinded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the substitute amendment, of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ]. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONNOR], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. UNDERWOOD] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] is detained on official business in a committee meeting.

The Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a member of the United States delegation to the World Health Organization, which will meet in Geneva, Switzerland.

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

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SMITH] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Mississippi would vote "nay," and the Senator from Minnesota would vote "yea."

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT]. If present and voting the Senator from West Virginia would vote "yea," and the Senator from Arkansas would vote "nay."

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE]. If present and voting the Senator from Tennessee would vote "yea," and the Senator from Iowa would vote "nay."

The Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] is paired on this vote with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SMITH]. If present and voting, the Senator from New York would vote "yea," and the Senator from North Carolina would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] is absent by leave of the Senate, and, if present, would vote "nay."

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] is absent by leave of the Senate on official committee business.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] is necessarily absent, and, if present, would vote "nay."

The Senator from California [Mr. NIXON] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] are absent on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from California [Mr. NIXON] would vote "nay."

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF] are detained on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 12, nays 59, as follows:

## YEAS—12

Benton	Ives	Moody
Capehart	Jenner	Morse
Chavez	Johnson, Colo.	Murray
Douglas	McMahon	Neely

## NAYS—59

Aiken	Hennings	Maybank
Anderson	Hickenlooper	Millikin
Bennett	Hill	Monroney
Bricker	Hoey	Mundt
Butler, Nebr.	Holland	Pastore
Byrd	Hunt	Russell
Cain	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Carlson	Johnston, S. C.	Schoeppel
Case	Kerr	Smathers
Clements	Knowland	Smith, Maine
Connally	Lodge	Smith, N. J.
Cordon	Long	Stennis
Dirksen	McCarran	Thye
Dworshak	McCarthy	Tobey
Eaton	McClellan	Watkins
Ellender	McFarland	Wherry
Ferguson	McKellar	Wiley
Green	Malone	Williams
Hayden	Martin	Young

## NOT VOTING—25

Brewster	Gillette	O'Mahoney
Bridges	Humphrey	Robertson
Butler, Md.	Kefauver	Smith, N. C.
Duff	Kilgore	Sparkman
Eastland	Langer	Taft
Flanders	Lehman	Underwood
Frear	Magnuson	Welker
Fulbright	Nixon	
George	O'Connor	

So the amendment of Mr. CHAVEZ was rejected.

AMERICAN POLICY IN THE FAR EAST—  
SENATOR TAFT'S SPEECH BEFORE THE  
UNITED STATES CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, yesterday the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] made very strong pleas for more rapid rearmament of our country. During the remarks of the Senator from Oregon, at my request, he yielded to me, and I read to him a short dispatch which appeared on the Associated Press ticker. It was the report of a speech which had been made by the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] before the United States Chamber of Commerce. I did not pursue the matter at the time further than to read the dispatch. I regret that the Senator from Ohio is unavoidably detained and is absent today. I did not pursue the matter further at that time because I thought, after I read the dispatch, that it could not possibly be a correct report of what the Senator from Ohio had said. I today sought to get a transcript of the Senator's remarks, but was unable to do so. However, I find a story by Joseph A. Loftus in today's New York Times which bears out the Associated Press account of the Senator's speech. I believe now that the AP quoted him correctly.

What the Senator proposed to the United States Chamber of Commerce yesterday was that we cut the budget \$20,000,000,000, that we cut the Armed Forces 500,000 men, and that we pursue a more aggressive course in Asia; in other words, that we enlarge the war in Asia. I further note that the Senator's audience cheered him at the conclusion of that kind of speech, which leads me to observe that they cannot have truly appraised the situation.

I have rarely seen anything more illogical than the statement made by the senior Senator from Ohio. I know of no Senator who would not like to cut the budget \$20,000,000,000, and who does not regret that we are saddled with the tax load with which we are burdened at the present time, and with which we are going to continue to be burdened. I do not know of any Senator who would not wish that our Armed Forces numbered 300,000 men instead of 3,500,000. But I know of no Member of the United States Senate, except the Senator from Ohio, who believes that it is possible to cut the budget \$20,000,000,000, and to cut the Armed Forces by 500,000 men, and still carry on an invasion of the Chinese mainland. Yet, in my opinion, that is exactly what the Senator is advocating when he supports the proposals which have been made by General MacArthur for the very soft term—"logistical support." It is time that proposals of that kind cease, if we are to make the American people aware of the kind of situation we confront.

I thought it only right that this statement should be made for the record and the attention of the Senate called to the fact that this kind of proposal has been made by the senior Senator

from Ohio, who in the press of the country has been termed "Mr. Republican." I call upon responsible leaders of the Republican Party to repudiate this kind of statement, which I think is truly a most irrational approach to the problems of our time.

**ACQUISITION OR DISPOSAL OF REAL ESTATE BY DEFENSE DEPARTMENT**

Mr. SALTONSTALL and Mr. CHAVEZ addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, on Monday, April 23, the Senate passed Senate bill 285, a bill relating to the acquisition and disposal of real property by the three military services. This bill was unanimously reported by the Armed Services Committee and was passed by the Senate without objection. On the same afternoon, the House of Representatives passed House bill 3096, which is identically the same as the bill passed by the Senate with the exception of one word. As passed by the Senate, these agencies are not required to report inter-service transfers of real property while under the House bill they are required to report such transfers.

In order to correct this minor difference between the bills as passed by the respective Houses of Congress, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate consider House bill 3096, and I recommend its passage in place of S. 285, already passed by the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McCLELLAN in the chair). The clerk will read the House bill by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 3096) relating to the acquisition and disposition of land and interests in land by the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Federal Civil Defense Administration.

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

Mr. WHERRY. I have no objection, but I should like to ask the distinguished Senator what the one word is to which he refers.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senate passed the bill "excepting" real estate transactions between one branch of the military service and another. The House bill contained the word "including", thus covering such transfers; so that, if a transfer were made from the Army to the Navy, the provision of the bill which requires a report, either to the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate, alone, or to the Armed Services Committees of both the Senate and the House, would apply to the transaction; whereas under the Senate bill it would not apply to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

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

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the Senator ask unanimous consent to lay aside temporarily the unfinished business?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I asked unanimous consent that the House bill be considered. I understand from the Parliamentarian that it is not a privileged

matter, and that I would therefore have to obtain unanimous consent, in order to have the one word changed. In other words, the Senate passed the bill, without objection, and my motion is to pass the House bill, in which there is a difference of one word. There will be no debate on the bill, I hope.

Mr. ELLENDER. What I had in mind was ascertaining whether the Senator had asked unanimous consent temporarily to lay aside the unfinished business.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. All I asked was unanimous consent that the Senate pass the House bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. But there is a measure pending before the Senate at the moment.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If unanimous consent should be obtained to lay aside temporarily the unfinished business, I ask such consent. There will be no debate on the bill, so far as I know.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is the pending bill to be temporarily laid aside for that purpose?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised by the Parliamentarian that the consideration of the bill referred to by the Senator from Massachusetts by unanimous consent will not affect the present status of the pending bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is what I wanted to have clear, Mr. President.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, if we agree to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Massachusetts to pass the House bill, would we then automatically return to the consideration of the pending measure?

Mr. WHERRY. It is a very simple matter. The distinguished Senator from Massachusetts has asked unanimous consent to pass a House bill without displacing the pending bill at all. It can be done in 30 seconds.

Mr. ELLENDER. That was not mentioned, and that is what I wanted to ascertain.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of House bill 3096?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 3096) relating to the acquisition and disposition of land and interests in land by the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Federal Civil Defense Administration, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

**EFFECT OF PRICE ROLL-BACK ON LIVESTOCK YARDS**

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield for perhaps 5 minutes in order that I may invite the attention of the Senate to a situation which is developing in the livestock yards throughout the United States, and more particularly in the South St. Paul livestock yard? It will take only about 5 minutes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, of course I am always glad to accede to the wishes of the Senator from Minnesota. The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] wants to see what will happen to the pending bill and how long it will be before we have a vote on it.

Mr. THYE. I thank the distinguished Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. President, I am in receipt of a number of telegrams from the State of Minnesota as of this date. These telegrams have been sent because of the roll-back in beef prices as promulgated and issued on April 29 by Mr. Michael P. DiSalle, Director of the Office of Price Stabilization. There is one telegram which I received from a gentleman living in the southwestern part of Minnesota, which I should like to read:

Please explain how a farmer is going to feed cattle on the proposed roll-back. If it would include machinery and labor it might work. Many farmers put feeders in at 30 to 40 cents—

That is, they put them into the feed lots at 30 to 40 cents a pound.

Is the farmer supposed to take the whole cut? Please answer at once. Three to five hundred farmers will be at our sale this afternoon. I want to read your answer to them.

This is the reply which I sent within the past hour:

Replying to your telegram I wish to say that I have objected to beef price control program announced by OPS. Questions you raised cannot be answered in any other manner than that farmer is going to suffer the loss. Consumer will lose also as livestock today is going to market unfinished, and ultimately there will be less beef because of this unwise OPS order. I shall continue to protest order.

Mr. President, I received another telegram, from Mr. C. S. Carlson, manager of the Superior Packing Co., St. Paul, in which he says:

We have just sent the following wire to Donald L. Leach, OPS, room 1504, Temporary S Building, Washington, D. C.:

"Regarding the congested conditions in our yards and our inability to relieve the situation account of quotas, will you be good enough to contact and see if you can get a quick answer?"

That is signed by C. S. Carlson.

The Superior Packing Co. yards in St. Paul are so congested that their quotas forbid them to take any more livestock. The same situation is found in South St. Paul, so far as it relates to Armour, Swift, and Cudahy. I called by telephone within the past 30 minutes, and was told that the trucks are lined up for miles waiting to be unloaded.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President—

Mr. THYE. Will the Senator permit me a couple of minutes more?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Very well.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, my only reason for bringing this matter to the attention of the Senate is that cattle are coming in droves, which means that they are coming in unfinished, and that the animals are 200 or 300 pounds light of what they would weigh if they were finished. Within 90 days we are going to be short the number of pounds of meat which the animal would have gained had it been brought to the best marketable condition.

If this situation is happening in Minnesota, it is happening likewise in other yards throughout the United States. The consumer is going to be faced with less meat next fall, and rationing will have

to be put into effect. The farmer who paid from 30 to 33 or 34 cents a pound for feeders has been taking a cut of from \$2 to \$3 a hundred pounds within the past few days. The price of unfinished cattle has gone down from \$4 to \$5 a hundred pounds.

If the able Senator from New Mexico will permit me to take a few more minutes, I will show what some of the producer's costs are and how they have gone up.

Soybean meal is the only high-protein feed that has gone down in price. It went down from \$4.73 to \$4.59 a hundred pounds.

Linseed meal is one of the high-protein feed which is fed the feeder cattle to make high quality meat. It has gone up from \$4.40 to \$4.48 a hundred pounds.

Cottonseed meal has gone up from \$4 to \$4.89 a hundred pounds.

Tankage has gone up from \$6.49 to \$7. Tankage is a part of the ration in producing pork.

Gasoline has gone up from 25.8 cents a gallon to 26.3 cents a gallon. Distillates have gone up from 15 $\frac{1}{10}$  to 15 $\frac{1}{2}$ . The price of farm machinery has risen. A farmer must have machinery in order to produce the feed to grow the livestock.

Fertilizer was priced at \$38.60 a ton last fall. On April 1, this year, the same type fertilizer cost \$42.20 a ton.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield for a question?

Mr. THYE. I shall be happy to yield to the Senator from Nebraska for a question, if the Senator from New Mexico will yield for that purpose, without denying me the right to continue for a few more minutes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I am willing to let the Senator from Minnesota continue for as long a time as he has something to say.

Mr. THYE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. WHERRY. Is it not a fact, if a roll-back had to be imposed, that if opportunity had been given the feeders to keep the cattle in the feed lots for 60 or 90 days, there would have been an orderly marketing of the cattle which had been placed in the feed lots 60 or 90 days ago?

Mr. THYE. The Senator from Nebraska not only knows the livestock feeding business, but he knows it so well and presents the question in such a clear-cut manner that the answer can be only "Yes."

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator. I hope the roll-back will not go into effect immediately. Of course they have until May 20, when another roll-back will go into effect. What is going to happen is that there will be fewer cattle in the feed lots, the consumer will have to pay higher prices, and there will be a return to the black market.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? I should like to ask him a question.

Mr. THYE. Indeed I do yield. I was afraid the Senator was going to deny me further time. He has been very indulgent.

Mr. CHAVEZ. No; I wish to ask a question of the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. I am delighted to yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I should like to have the Senator discuss the subject for as long a time as he has anything to say about it.

Mr. THYE. I am delighted to yield to the Senator from New Mexico for a question.

Mr. CHAVEZ. We are discussing the matter of farm labor.

Mr. THYE. Yes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Senator is discussing the question of roll-backs on farm prices of cattle.

Mr. THYE. Yes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I fully agree with the Senator from Minnesota. What difference is there between rolling back farm prices on cattle and rolling back farm labor wages? Could the Senator be consistent, and tell me? I am sure he is trying to be consistent. In my opinion, the two subjects are related. I believe that a roll-back is wrong because everything has gone up in price, including the items which the Senator has mentioned. Everything the farmer and producer of cattle must buy has gone up in price within the last few months. It includes farm labor. For that reason I say the pending bill contains a roll-back of American wages. Does the Senator agree? I ask the question in good faith. I say to the Senator that although I respect every Member of the Senate, there is no one of whom I think more highly than the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. I thank the Senator. I shall try to answer the question of the very able and distinguished Senator from New Mexico. If we were to deny to an American worker the right to a job by importing a foreign laborer, we would be instigating a roll-back on American labor. I shall do all in my power to guard against the importation of labor so long as domestic labor is available.

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

Mr. THYE. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator contemplate any legislative procedure relative to the roll-back? He is a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. THYE. The date of Mr. DiSalle's roll-back order was the 29th of April. Today is the 1st of May. We are now only commencing to get the full effect of the order. Of course, the law will expire—

Mr. WHERRY. In June, I believe.

Mr. THYE. On June 30, as I recall. The subject will be examined as a study is made of the question of the extension or continuance of the authorization under which Mr. DiSalle is operating.

Mr. WHERRY. I hope the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry will undertake a serious study of the subject. It seems to me that if such things as roll-backs are to happen, the Senate and the House ought to have something to say. I doubt very much the legality of the directive. The law will terminate in June, and the directive certainly was issued upon the assumption that the law would be extended.

Mr. THYE. The subject would fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Banking and Currency, I believe.

The question was never considered by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. WHERRY. I understand that the Committee on Banking and Currency, would have jurisdiction, but I think the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry should take some positive action with respect to the roll-back on cattle. It was issued without any notice to the feeders. I think it is a matter that ought to be given very serious consideration by the committee.

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

Mr. THYE. I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The Senator from Minnesota has again called the attention of the Senate and the country to a disaster which will inevitably hit the American people by way of a meat famine if the present attitude of the Price Administration continues. They have been warned. The Senator from Nebraska knows they have been warned. The Senator from Minnesota knows they have been warned. Unless they take a realistic attitude toward meat production, we will have a meat famine which will lay in the shade the meat famine we had in the nefarious OPA days. Apparently they have not learned a single lesson since the mistakes of the last war.

They are about to put into effect again the same disastrous and ill-advised practices in connection with meat which proved so bad during OPA days.

I hope pressure will be brought to bear so that the neo-experts in Washington, who go by theory and not by advice from practical people, will finally come around to adopting a realistic approach to the situation. It is as nefarious a roll-back as can be imagined. It is proposed to go into the feed lots of the farmers of America, when they have been filled up with cattle at as high a price as 40 cents a pound, and roll back the price which farmers will have to take for finished cattle, if they feed them out to a point which will be less than they paid for the feeders before they went into the feed lots. The Senator from Minnesota knows that is exactly what is happening today in Minneapolis. It is exactly what is happening in Cedar Rapids, Chicago, Sioux City, and Kansas City.

Mr. WHERRY. And Omaha.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. What will happen will be a glut on the market now and a famine in 6 months. The experts, who are getting their theory out of books—and bad theory, at that—had better wake up to what they are doing to the meat situation in the United States.

Mr. THYE. The evidence is definitely clear, when we examine some records on the subject, particularly in the livestock centers, where the cattle are coming in to supply packers such as Swift, Armour, and Cudahy, as well as other packers, such as Superior, from whom I read a telegram. A feeder who last September or October acquired a great many calves as they came in from the western country and put them into his feed lots paid 30 cents, 32 cents, 35 cents, up to 37 cents a pound. The Senator from

Iowa said that some were bought for 40 cents a pound, which would be choice feeders.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I have a record of feeder cattle being purchased by people in my State for 40 cents a pound. Of course, they are fairly well along, but they are still 40-cents-a-pound feeders which have been purchased in recent months.

Mr. THYE. I concurred with the Senator from Iowa. I stated the price range for feeder calves last fall. The choice feeders are the ones which cost the feeder 40 cents a pound. Today the livestock market broke in South St. Paul to a varying extent, depending on the quality of beef cattle coming in, between \$1 and \$2 a hundred. Yesterday it broke from \$1 up to \$2.50 a hundred. That means that the price of those cattle has gone off from \$2 to \$4 a hundred. I am now speaking of the choice grade. In the case of the poorer quality unfinished cattle, light cattle went off from \$4 to \$5 a hundred, and no one was bidding to buy those thin cattle coming into the yards.

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

Mr. THYE. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. The reason for that is that those are the replacement cattle.

Mr. THYE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. A feeder who finishes and sells his cattle ordinarily buys replacement cattle. The feeders are scared. They do not know what is going to happen in the future. Therefore the replacement cattle, which ought to go back into the feed lot, as the distinguished Senator from Minnesota has already said, are a drug on the market.

Mr. THYE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. They are selling at prices which are not only going to hurt, but in some cases break the men who have put their money into such cattle to carry them over as feeders, so that they may sell them to the farmers of Minnesota and Iowa for the purpose of preparing to produce food for the Nation.

Mr. THYE. An animal will ordinarily gain 2½ pounds a day. Today such animals are coming to market when normally they would not have come to market if it had not been for this unwise OPS order. They would not have come to market for at least 60 or 90 days. That means that if the animal had been kept on the feed lot for that additional time, it would weigh 200 or 300 pounds more. The bone structure of the carcass of the animal would carry that additional weight, and the buyer would not be buying a large percentage of bone. I am getting down to the facts. The result is that steaks, roasts, short ribs, and all the other cuts of beef are less because of the 200 or 300 pounds shortage in the weight of the animal. The simple fact is that within 60 days the housewife will not find in the market the beef which she would have found if those animals had been finished to their normal condition and normal quality, as would have been the case if it had not been for the unwise order.

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

Mr. THYE. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator know how much the rollback is supposed to be when it is completed?

Mr. THYE. The rollback cannot be figured in dollars and cents.

Mr. WHERRY. How much is it per hundred pounds?

Mr. THYE. The fact of the matter is that the rollback is figured in the light of what has happened in South St. Paul and in the Omaha yards within the past 2 days.

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

Mr. THYE. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I may say that the rollback could not be more than \$6.96 a hundred, because that would roll the prices back to June 15 prices. I understand that it is planned to roll back prices 6 cents a pound to the farmer. At last they have found a short-cut to rationing, because they are going to reduce the supply severely, and possibly necessitate the rationing of beef by next winter if the roll-back is permitted to stand.

Mr. THYE. A reading of the order of Mr. DiSalle, which I hold in my hand, discloses that it shows specifically and in detail the effects of the roll-back on the producer. But when there is a congested yard and a heavy run, prices go back far beyond what the official rollback actually requires. That is what is happening, not only in South St. Paul, but in Sioux City and in other yards. It will continue to happen, because who can feed livestock in the face of a daily loss on the feed which is placed in the feed lots to feed those animals? The owners must sell them, because every day they feed they are taking a loss. Therefore, cattle are coming to market unfinished.

Mr. AIKEN. A moment ago I stated that prices could not be rolled back more than \$6.96 a hundred. I was in error. They cannot roll the ceiling back more than that amount. If they roll the ceiling back that amount, there is no assurance that farm prices will not go back further than that.

Mr. THYE. The ceiling and the official roll-back are not the only factors that are rolling back the prices of beef animals in the markets as of today. A reflex action is being felt on the pork market.

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

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

Mr. WHERRY. I have been to the Government agency and have talked this matter over with the administrators. There is a chance that by the time they get through, the maximum roll-back on finished cattle will reach \$9 a hundred.

Mr. AIKEN. That is on a particular grade. The average is \$6.96.

Mr. WHERRY. There are several grades, and there will be average roll-backs, but we are talking about getting meat for the housewife.

Mr. THYE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. I have it figured out that there can be a maximum roll-back, under the present plan, on the particular

grade of cattle which we want to be made into as finished beef, as high as \$9 a hundred before they get through. If they do that, there will be many a cattle feeder who will be next to broke. What is worse, as the distinguished Senator has pointed out, there will be no replacement cattle. I should like to ask any Senator who is a cattle feeder if he would purchase replacement cattle to put in the feed lot and feed under these conditions. Who would put them in?

Mr. THYE. He would not be exactly a wise and prudent man if he went into the market today to try to fill up feed lots which were emptied yesterday because of the OPS order.

I should like to read further information as to what the producer is faced with in the cost of his operations.

A two-plow tractor on rubber tires sold in March of 1948 for \$1,570. The same identical tractor sold in March 1951, 3 years later, for \$2,000.

A three-plow tractor on rubber tires sold in March 1948 for \$1,970. On March 1, 1951, the same identical tractor sold for \$2,580. Senators can note the increased cost with which the producer is faced.

On top of that, the producer is now beginning to get roll-backs. How is he going to sustain those roll-backs and still continue to face an increased cost in his operations, whether it be in machinery or whether it be in repairs or any other item which he must purchase, in order that he may continue his normal farming operations?

In order that we may take a good look at what the dairy farmer is faced with, let us consider a dairy producer operating in the Twin Cities milk shed area. That is Minneapolis and St. Paul. His milk is sold on the consumers' market. Last month he received for grade A milk 7.8 cents a quart. That is the same quality milk which is consumed in the Washington milk market.

Manufactured milk is the normal quality, grade A being the special quality. For manufactured No. 1 milk, he received 6.9 cents a quart. That is less than 7 cents a quart. Let any Senator ask himself what he paid for a quart of milk this morning, and he will have the answer as to whether the producer is the gentleman who is responsible for the high cost of living, or whether it is someone else.

In closing, let me say that the livestock run on the markets today is telling us all that unfinished beef is going to market. The cattle are light. Ninety days from now those cattle would normally have been in condition to give us the maximum amount of meat per animal. We are going to be short of beef in from 60 to 90 days, and the result will be far more drastic and costly to the consumer than any gains or saving that will be brought about by the OPS roll-back order.

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

Mr. THYE. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Does not the Senator from Minnesota think that the full impact of this artificial creation of a short-

age of beef will not be felt, however, until a few months later?

Mr. THYE. I would say that a man could sharpen his pencil and carry a pad with him and mark down what is happening in the retail market very closely, wherever he likes to do so, and I think Senators will agree with me that within 60 days he will have great difficulty in finding where much savings to the consumer will have been brought about as a result of the order.

Mr. AIKEN. There may be abnormal marketing before August 1 in order to avoid reduction of prices at that time, but the real shortage in beef is likely to come after that, when there is a smaller number of finished animals to be put on the market, when they will be going direct from the range to the market at 600 or 700 pounds instead of from the feed lot at 1,000 or 1,100 pounds. If such a condition continues sufficiently long the consumer can look forward to meat rationing, or obtaining no meat at all except through undesirable channels.

Mr. THYE. That is correct.

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

Mr. THYE. I am happy to yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I should like to ask the Senator from Minnesota if it is not true that the shortage will come about as the result of two things. The actual shortage to which the Senator from Vermont is referring may not come until 6 months from now, but the shortage will come for two reasons. First, because of the fact that the present animals on feed are going to be sold light. They are going to be dumped on the market. That will contribute to the shortage 6 months from now. Secondly, the feeders are not going into the market to buy feeder cattle to put on feed under the present chaotic conditions resulting from the actions of the Price Administration in Washington. Both factors will result in a shortage of meat. By reason of the sale of light animals there will be depletion of the amount of meat which will be available in the future. The farmer who would be a feeder of cattle would be scared to death of bankrupting himself if he should undertake to do that in the present chaotic condition; therefore he is not going to put the same number of cattle into the feed lot that he ordinarily would today, or in the next 3 or 4 months, and that will contribute to the shortage of animals.

Mr. THYE. As the Senator knows so well, one can drive across the good State of Iowa and find a tremendous number of beef calves going into the feed lots in the fall of the year. If one drives through there in the winter or spring one will find the feed lots full of unfinished cattle, that normally remain on feed in July and August and then are marketed. Such cattle are now going to be rushed into the market, because how can a feeder continue to feed the cattle when the cost of his feed is in excess of what he will receive for the cattle? Therefore, he is bound either to move the cattle or take a terrific loss.

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

Mr. THYE. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. The drastic drop in price in the last 3 or 4 days may be very welcome to and probably a sign of success to Mr. DiSalle. I think the Senator from Minnesota is absolutely correct, however, in the statement he has made. In a matter of a few months we will be paying through the nose, so to speak; we will be far more short of beef than we have ever been before, and rationing will be in order.

Mr. President, I think the shortage of beef in the past 3 or 4 years has been attributable almost entirely to the disastrous program of OPA during the war and afterward. Even that program, backed up by several billion dollars in subsidies, was unsuccessful. Administratively, I think that by the use of subsidies they can carry on a price-control program much more effectively. Either way, controls on meat are impossible and unwise, as they are trying to do it now, this thing will certainly result in disaster for all concerned.

Mr. THYE. I thank the distinguished Senator from New Mexico for yielding the time for this discussion.

#### SUPPLYING OF AGRICULTURAL WORKERS FROM MEXICO

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 984) to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I desire to call up my amendment B, which is rather short, and the disposition of which probably will require only a minute or so.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 4, lines 11 and 12, it is proposed to strike out the words "Director of State Employment Security for such area" and insert "Secretary of Labor."

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I do not desire to discuss the amendment, except to point out that all the discussion of this bill has indicated that certification ought to be made by the Secretary of Labor, and a statement was made by the chairman of the committee, to the effect that the provisions of the contract would require that it be made by the Secretary of Labor. I do not wish to discuss the amendment, but to urge that certification be by the Secretary of Labor. I hope the chairman of the committee may see fit to accept the amendment, or that the Senate may promptly adopt it.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I merely wish to say that on the suggestion of the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, the committee finally agreed to place the recruitment on a State basis. Since then, the distinguished Senator himself has proposed this amendment, and I have inquired further regarding the matter. I find that in a press release by the Mexican Government, it is said that Mexico will not agree to State government agencies assuming the responsibility. Therefore, I think it would be in line to accept the amendment now suggested.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I am very sorry that the Senator from New Mexico has proposed this amendment. I do not want any statement made, and I do not want any statement to be accepted, which indicates acceptance of the amendment by all members of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I am very much opposed to the amendment, as a member of the committee. I was very much in favor of the provision as it came from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, that the employment agencies within the States should determine, as a matter of efficiency, the question of labor shortages, in order that action might be taken at a place close to home. I feel that the arguments which were urged within the committee itself, and which resulted in the committee's reporting the bill, providing that the State employment agencies should make the determination, are good.

I am in sympathy with the Senator from New Mexico. I understand his desire. He now takes the position, and I think he has reason for it, that there is some confusion in Mexico about this matter, and that the Mexican Government demands that the Secretary of Labor make the determination. So far as I am concerned, I think we should write the legislation on this subject in the Senate of the United States, and I very much favor the way the bill came from the committee.

If there is not to be a yea-and-nay vote, I wish the RECORD to show that I shall vote against the amendment, because I want to keep the determination in the States, and keep the cold and distant hand of the Secretary of Labor out of the picture, so far as the determination of labor-shortage areas is concerned. I hope the amendment will be defeated. I do not mean to be in opposition to the chairman of the committee, necessarily, nor to the Senator from New Mexico, who has worked hard on this bill, but I disagree with the basis upon which he has proposed this amendment. I shall have to oppose it, so far as my vote is concerned.

I hope the amendment will be rejected and that the terms of the bill will be left as they were when the bill came from the committee as a result of careful committee consideration in its deliberations on this proposed legislation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. WATKINS. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered. The PRESIDENT pro tempore (putting the question). The "ayes" seem to have it.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask for a division. On a division the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the appropriate place in the bill it is proposed to insert the following:

Sec. —. Any person, including the owner, operator, pilot, master, commanding officer, agent, or consignee of any means of transportation who—

(1) brings into or lands in the United States, by any means of transportation or otherwise, or attempts, by himself or through another, to bring into or land in the United States, by any means of transportation or otherwise; or

(2) conceals or harbors, or attempts to conceal or harbor, in any place, including any building, or any means of transportation; or

(3) employs, any alien, including an alien crewman, not duly admitted by an immigration officer or not lawfully entitled to enter or to reside within the United States under the terms of this act or any other law relating to the immigration or expulsion of aliens, shall be guilty of a felony, and upon conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine not exceeding \$2,000 and by imprisonment for a term not exceeding 5 years for each alien in respect to whom any violation of this section occurs.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ].

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, as I understand the amendment, it is with reference to a subject which is covered in an omnibus immigration bill which will be before the Senate within a very short time. It is a subject which is within the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary. It seems to me that the amendment should not at this time be adopted as a part of this bill.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I offered the amendment in order to be able to make a statement at this time with reference to the pending bill.

The Senate has taken definite action on my first amendment. When I say "definite action" I mean overwhelming action as to the position which I have taken. The amendment against which the Senate has just voted so overwhelmingly would have protected American labor against Mexican labor. I want that fact understood. But the Senate in its wisdom has the right to determine even that question, and I have no complaint whatsoever.

My Republican friends love to attend Lincoln Day dinners and remember what he stood for. They have knocked down everything he stood for by voting against my amendment.

My Democratic friends, who like to brag about Jefferson, Jackson, yes, and Roosevelt and Truman, have, in my opinion, knocked down everything those men stood for.

I am not criticizing Senators. This body has the right to make a mistake if it wants to. It is one of the basic rights of an American to make a mistake if he wants to. But the Senate has gone on record for cheap labor.

There is not one of us but who had an ancestor who was an immigrant, who tried to get away from a foreign country to escape economic disadvantages or political or religious difficulties. I know the history of the United States. The Senate has made a mistake. Any time

this body prefers foreign labor to American labor it is undermining the things fought for in 1776. I know as well as does any Anglo-Saxon the history of this country. I know what Sam Adams and John Adams stood for. I know what Washington, Jefferson, Madison, and other Virginians stood for. They worked to give us a Declaration of Independence and a Constitution, and when they opened the door to immigration, they did not say that citizens of the United States had to come from Sweden, England, Spain, or elsewhere. The basic idea in their minds was their great concept of living standards. Many races and religions have been the beneficiaries of that concept which in my opinion has been knocked down today.

Any time we prefer foreign labor to our own American labor we are interfering with the basic ideas of our Government, especially when such foreign labor is so desperately in need of work, and that, of necessity, it will work for a miserable wage. Remember that none of us has a right to say it was our particular group alone that was intended to be protected by the Constitution. Our ancestors suffered throughout the ages, and the reason why they came to this country was to improve their condition, and try to obtain liberty.

I invite the attention of my good friend the junior Senator from Texas to a telegram I have received from his State. Under the laws and the rules of the State of Texas the Senator was nominated by less than 100 votes to represent that State in this body. Those who took part in that nomination are the ones I want to read about at this time. Their ancestors were at the Alamo. There were Navarros and other Mexicans as well as Americans there, fighting for the very thing we are talking about today.

I received this telegram from a boy in Texas, an American, not a Mexican. He says:

American GI Forum Veterans Organization, representing more than 50,000 American veterans of Mexican origin—

Some of us may have come from Norway; others may have come from Ireland, from Canada, from Scotland, from Wales, or some other country. We may have different ideas, but we carry out the ideal of America. The 50,000 referred to in the telegram are Americans of Mexican origin.

Thousands of veterans are not able to make a decent living because of low-wage competition by the wetbacks and imported labor.

The amendment which I submitted would take care of the wetback situation, which even my friend from Louisiana believes should be taken care of.

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

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that an amendment such as is proposed by the senior Senator from New Mexico is needed in order to prevent the illegal entry of wetbacks?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes; the wetbacks and those who come in legally ought to be considered together. If we admit 500,000

legally, and a million of them come across the border illegally, we will not solve the problem.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator's amendment would put teeth into the bill; would it not?

Mr. CHAVEZ. It would do more than that. What about the veterans who did the fighting? Do they deserve to be protected by us? Should we not do something at least to prevent wetbacks from coming in and keeping a veteran from making a living? It is not a question of politics. It is a question of taking care of our own people. I do not care if my amendment gets only seven votes. I still prefer American labor to foreign labor. I prefer American labor to foreign labor irrespective of the fact that we can get foreign labor for 70 cents or 80 cents a day.

Thousands of children—

Children—

Thousands of children of veterans are not able to enjoy good health because veterans and their families are forced to work for starvation wages because of imported labor.

The labor would come in legally under the bill; illegally under the wetback system. Is it not fair, I ask those who believe in Jefferson, those who believe Adams, and those who believe in our way of life, to give American laboring men a chance to exist?

Americans of Mexican origin in Texas must have—

They are even begging—

must have opportunity to live like human beings and first-class citizens. The best way to do it is to stop all imported labor.

Is that asking too much? The greatest characteristic of an American is not the tendency to brag about this and brag about that, or brag about patriotism or loyalty. The greatest characteristic of an American is fair play. Why can we not be fair with our own? All they want is an opportunity to live like human beings and first-class citizens.

The Senate has exercised its judgment. The judgment of the Senate will not be questioned by me. I think it was wrong, but it was in accordance with our system. The Senate has overwhelmingly voted against my amendment. In my opinion, it would have protected Americans. I simply wish to make the statement for the record so that my position may be clear, and Senators may realize what they have done. I am disappointed, of course, because I think the Senate took a wrong stand, but the Senate had the right to take the stand. Senators have a right to exercise their own judgment. The Senate has spoken overwhelmingly on a very important amendment.

I now wish to ask that the remainder of the amendments which I had intended to propose be printed in the RECORD, together with my argument on each of them. Then I wish to withdraw the pending amendment and the other amendments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendments are withdrawn. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Do I understand that the amendments to which I have re-



ferred are to be printed in the RECORD at this point together with the accompanying arguments, and that then they are to be withdrawn?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendments intended to be proposed by Mr. CHAVEZ and accompanying arguments are as follows:

#### AMENDMENT 2

On page 2, beginning in line 4 with the word "including", it is proposed to strike out through the word "entry" in line 6 and insert in lieu thereof "not including any workers illegally in the United States."

My interpretation of "including any such workers under legal entry" leaves the door open for the protection of illegals by large-scale growers who want to exploit them. I believe that the Immigration and Naturalization Service has been doing an excellent job in the enforcement of the Immigration laws of the United States, and I have full confidence that they are following the letter of the law. Therefore, instead of using the term "legal entry," I would substitute "including any such workers illegally in the United States." There have been several attempts within the past few sessions of Congress to legalize the so-called wetbacks. I think that my language in this instance is clear and without question as to its proper meaning.

#### AMENDMENT 3 (A)

On page 2, line 8, after the word "into", it is proposed to insert a comma and the following: "and of their anticipated employment in."

#### AMENDMENT 3 (B)

On page 2, it is proposed to strike out lines 13 through 17 and insert the following:

"(3) To provide transportation for such workers from recruitment centers inside or outside the continental United States to such reception centers (or to places of employment in the case of domestic agricultural workers, including those of the continental United States, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands) and transportation from such reception centers (or places of employment in the case of such domestic workers) to such recruitment centers after termination of employment."

Transportation costs is one of the prime considerations in recruiting an adequate farm labor supply. Our domestic farm labor force could be better distributed if the farm labor could be transported from one area to another within the United States with mobility. Air transportation costs from Puerto Rico to the mainland and return are in the neighborhood of \$120. Farm labor cannot adequately meet this expense if he is to return to Puerto Rico with savings at the end of his period of employment in the United States. Then too, we cannot expect the employer to bear all of this expense since those in the Northwest or Northeast would undoubtedly pay several times the amount that the employer in other parts of the country would have to pay. I have a subsequent amendment which will enable the Secretary of Labor to implement this program.

#### AMENDMENT 4

On page 3, line 10, after the word "under" it is proposed to insert "section 501 of."

On page 4, beginning with line 10, strike out through the word "available" in line 14 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 503. No workers recruited under section 501 of this title shall be available for employment in any area unless the Secretary of Labor has determined that (1) sufficient domestic, Hawaiian, Puerto Rican, or Virgin Islands workers who are able, willing,

and qualified are not available and cannot be made available under the provisions of subsection (b) of this section."

On page 4, between lines 18 and 19, insert the following:

"(b) The Secretary of Labor shall take whatever steps may be necessary and proper to provide an adequate supply of domestic, Hawaiian, Puerto Rican, and Virgin Islands agricultural workers in the continental United States, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands, including, among other things, (1) the collection, compilation, and dissemination of information relevant to farm labor, labor-deficit areas, and housing and working conditions; (2) the recruiting, training, and placement of workers; (3) the transportation of, and the furnishing of housing, and health and medical care, and burial services to workers and their families; and (4) the construction, lease, repair, alteration, relocation, expansion, and operation of labor-supply centers, labor camps and homes, child-care centers, and other necessary facilities and services."

There is no doubt in my mind that the Secretary of Labor could do a more efficient job of recruiting and supplying farm labor if he were directed by statute to do so. Only when a person has a definite outline of his duties and responsibilities can he be protected from unjust criticism that he is not properly executing the duties of his office. Provisions of this amendment clearly outline these duties and responsibilities to be executed by the Secretary of Labor and they are in conformity with the recommendations made by interested groups and, in substance, the recommendations of the report of the President's Commission on Migratory Labor.

I have every reason to believe that this will be a great step forward in the administration of our farm-labor problem.

#### AMENDMENT 5

After section 509 it is proposed to insert the following:

"SEC. 510. Notwithstanding any provisions of law conferring similar benefits upon them, American Indians who are recruited for employment as farm workers shall be entitled to the protection and benefits of this act to the same extent and effect as other farm workers."

The protection of the social and economic welfare of the American Indians should be our paramount consideration in any legislation before this body. I have been told by the United States Employment Service that throughout the United States thousands upon thousands of American Indians would be available for farm labor if given decent wages and living conditions. The American Indian dislikes charity as much as any of us. The American Indian is a proud person. He feels that he survived without governmental relief for centuries. Today he is asking an opportunity to regain that self-reliance and economic freedom which he enjoyed for so many centuries. Many of our Indian farm laborers have been treated in such un-American ways by certain employers that I feel we should take special pains to afford them protection.

#### AMENDMENT 6

At the end of the bill it is proposed to add the following new sections:

"SEC. —. The Secretary of Labor shall authorize placement of workers recruited or transported under this act, whether United States citizens or aliens, only after the employer agrees with respect to such workers (1) to pay not less than prevailing wage rates set for the crop and area by the National Farm Labor Board pursuant to this act; (2) to pay such workers their wages in legal tender at the end of each week, or at the end of a customary payroll period not

exceeding a semimonthly interval; (3) to provide employment for each such worker for not less than 75 percent of workdays (as defined by the Secretary and the employer in conformity with industry practices) falling between the beginning and end of each such worker's employment by such employer; (4) to cause any housing, subsistence, transportation, or other goods or services furnished such workers by the employer to conform to such standards as the Secretary may establish; and (5) to comply with all applicable Federal, State, and local laws relating to employment, to elect to cover such workers by State or local workmen's compensation laws if such laws permit such election, to obtain insurance to protect such workers in case of occupational accidents or diseases if coverage by compensation laws cannot be obtained, and to pay all expenses for hospital, medicines, and medical attention necessitated by occupational accidents and diseases. Insurance required pursuant to this section shall provide benefits no less favorable than those set out in the following schedule:

Accidental death.....	\$1,000
Loss of—	
Both hands.....	1,000
Both feet.....	1,000
Sight of both eyes.....	1,000
One hand one one foot.....	1,000
One hand and sight of one eye.....	1,000
One foot and sight of one eye.....	1,000
One hand or one foot.....	500
Sight of one eye.....	500
Total loss of a digit.....	50
Partial loss of a digit.....	25

"SEC. —. The Secretary of Labor shall take such action as may be necessary to insure himself that employers perform agreements entered into by them under the act; that workers receive the wages due them without any unwarranted deduction therefrom, or restriction upon the expenditure thereof; and that any housing, subsistence, transportation, or other goods or services furnished by employers shall conform to the standards established by the Secretary.

"SEC. —. A National Farm Labor Board, consisting of three representatives of agricultural employers, three representatives of agricultural workers, and three representatives of the general public, shall be appointed by and serve at the pleasure of the Secretary of Labor. Such Board shall, after public hearings in particular areas with respect to particular crops, determine the need for agricultural workers in such areas for the production of such crops, and the prevailing hourly, daily, piecework, and other wage rates and other conditions of employment applicable to such crops in such areas. The Board may delegate any of its functions to any of the employees of the Department of Labor. Members of the Board shall be compensated in accordance with the Classification Act of 1949.

"SEC. —. An advisory committee shall be established, composed of representatives of the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Department of Agriculture, the Federal Security Administration, Department of the Interior, Selective Service, and of such other departments, agencies, and organizations and such individuals as the Secretary of Labor may deem advisable. The committee shall advise the Secretary, upon his request, on housing, health, education, and vocational training, subsistence, and transportation standards and problems, and such other matters in connection with the program as the Secretary may see fit. The members of the committee shall receive no compensation for their services as committee members."

#### SECTION A

Strange as it may seem to my fellow Members of the Senate, Mexican nationals imported for farm labor under contract are today enjoying better working conditions and

benefits than our own domestic farm workers who are United States citizens.

Realizing that every Senator present is ever conscious of his oath of office, I have every confidence to believe that in this hour of national emergency we are not going to forget the first responsibility imposed on us lawmakers by our beloved Constitution, that the welfare of our own people, yes, the welfare of United States citizens, should be uppermost in all our actions.

Gentlemen, I say that we should never adopt any legislation which would place the foreign worker imported for temporary farm labor on a higher standard than our own workers who are United States citizens.

The amendment which I am offering does not exceed the working conditions and benefits which now exist in our present agreement with Mexico. I have simply duplicated those conditions and benefits in this amendment. Let us not forget our duty to the United States citizen who is a farm laborer.

#### SECTION B

The creation of a National Farm Labor Board is consistent with the report of the President's Commission on Migratory Labor. This board is the practical approach to the many arguments on the part of the growers and the workers that they are mistreated by our governmental officials in the matter of regulations, wages, and standards. This Farm Labor Board would conduct hearings throughout the United States, and could render just and equitable decisions on matters involving supply of labor, prevailing wages, and working conditions. It would be composed of nine members, three representing the employer, three representing the agricultural worker and three representing the public interest. I believe that such a board would be the vehicle whereby we would have greater uninterrupted production of our agriculture production. The board would be appointed and serve at the pleasure of the Secretary of Labor. It would not duplicate any of the functions now exercised by that department, but would add to and strengthen those functions.

#### SECTION C

For years various reports, including the report of the President's Commission on Migratory Labor, recently issued, have stressed the imperative need for a concentrated and coordinated attack on the farm labor problem by the various governmental agencies who are directly engaged in improving its unfavorable aspects.

Private enterprise has found the technique of established advisory committees very profitable. Government agencies have on many occasions found interdepartmental boards to be likewise effective, not only in rendering better service but in reducing administrative costs considerably.

I, therefore, propose with the following amendment the creation of an advisory committee that will advise the Secretary of Labor periodically on the best procedures to follow in the solution of this complex problem.

#### AMENDMENT 7

At the end of the bill it is proposed to add the following section:

"Sec. 511. Section 2 (3) of the National Labor Relations-Management Act of 1947 is amended by striking out the following: 'as an agricultural laborer, or.'"

The position of agricultural labor today is approximately the same as that of industrial labor prior to World War I. Wages were low; working conditions were worse, and the owners of industry were importing thousands of European workers for exploitation in the mines, mills, and factories. At that time there was no protection for the right of industrial workers to organize and bargain collectively with their employers. The Labor Relations Act makes it possible for industrial

workers to bargain with their employers, and today unions perform a great service to both employee and employer.

However, the authors of the original national labor relations law, the Wagner Act, saw fit to exclude from its benefits and responsibilities employees in large scale commercialized agriculture. This exclusion was carried over into the present Labor Management Relation Act.

In presenting this amendment I wish to correct an injustice of long standing and to bring to employees of the 125,000 large scale farms which are in reality "factories in the fields" the benefits of a law which is applied to all other types of workers in America. There are 1,000,000 workers employed on these large-scale farm operations. The large scale farm operators are in competition with our small family size farmers who are the backbone of American agriculture.

#### AMENDMENT 8

On page 3, line 23, it is proposed to strike out "\$20" and insert "\$200."

In supplying farm labor necessary for the production of food and fiber crops in the defense emergency one of the prime considerations is the cost of recruitment and transportation. Our domestic labor supply could be better distributed if workers could be transported from one area to another under a cooperative arrangement between the Government and the employers of such workers. S. 984 provides that employers shall pay the Government \$20 for each worker imported into the United States. That figure is based on the actual cost of transportation from recruitment centers in Mexico to the port of entry on the Mexican border. What about the employers of such labor in the Pacific Northwest or the sugar-beet fields of Michigan? What about the 150,000 Puerto Rican workers who are available for employment in the continental United States? The actual cost of transportation of Puerto Ricans to New Jersey is about \$120 round trip. This provision either means that employers will be subsidized from the Public Treasury or there will be no labor sent to points within a few hundred miles of our southern border. I, therefore, propose an amendment which would require employers to reimburse the Government the actual costs of such transportation and subsistence not to exceed \$200.

#### AMENDMENT 9

On page 7, line 15, it is proposed to strike out "1952" and insert in lieu thereof "1951."

Proponents of this legislation have repeatedly stated that this is primarily an emergency or stop-gap measure to enable our Government to renew its existing agreement with the Republic of Mexico for the importation of Mexican nationals for farm labor.

While this particular measure was being considered by various members of the Senate, the report of the President's Commission on Migratory Labor was issued. This long overdue study, thorough and practical in its approach to the problem, points very clearly to the need for extensive revision of present policies and administrative procedures to effectively solve this blight of our private enterprise system.

Sound and effective legislation cannot be realized in the short space of time which the proponents of this measure had at their disposal. We know from personal experience that any measure conceived and nurtured in the short span of weeks cannot long solve one of the most pressing national problems.

Congress should immediately begin extensive hearings to solve this farm-labor problem on a permanent and sound basis. Therefore I offer the following amendment to limit the life of this legislation to December 31, 1951.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD several telegrams I have received indicating opposition to the pending bill.

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

SANTA FE, N. MEX., May 1, 1951.  
United States Senator CHAVEZ,  
United States Senate,  
Washington, D. C.:

Would appreciate your amending Ellender bill. We favor establishment better working conditions for all agricultural workers and better organization.

Archbishop EDWIN V. BYRNE.

CORPUS CHRISTI, TEX., May 1, 1951.  
DENNIS CHAVEZ,  
Care White House,  
Washington, D. C.:

Oppose cheap foreign labor. Undermines local labor. Only big boys profit at expense of displaced local Latin-Americans.

Dr. J. A. GARCIA.

SAN ANTONIO, TEX., April 30, 1951.  
Senator CHAVEZ,  
United States Senate,  
Washington, D. C.:

Lulacs of San Antonio endorse your stand opposing authorization of imported Mexican labor. Texas labor cheapen by importing aliens.

LULAC COUNCIL OF SAN ANTONIO.

TACOS, N. MEX., April 30, 1951.  
Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,  
United States Senate,  
Washington, D. C.:

We are not in favor of Senate bill 984 as originally introduced. Please endeavor to amend same.

CORONADO PHARMACY.

ESTANCIA, N. MEX.  
Senator CHAVEZ,  
Washington, D. C.:

Dear SENATOR: We are opposed to the Ellender bill. Thank you for your stand on this bill.

J. C. SANCHEZ.

TACOS, N. MEX., April 30, 1951.  
Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,  
Washington, D. C.:

Please endeavor to amend Senate bill 984. Present bill is detrimental to our laboring people in New Mexico.

MARCELINO MARTINEZ.  
J. P. RAEL QUESTA.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I call up my amendment designated "M," and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, it is proposed to strike out lines 7 to 12, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

(2) to establish and operate reception centers in the continental United States for the purpose of receiving and housing such workers while arrangements are being made for their employment in, or departure from, the continental United States: *Provided*, That such reception centers shall be distributed geographically so as to provide, as far as practicable, equality of costs and opportunity of obtaining such workers in the areas where the Secretary finds need therefor to exist.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, first I wish the RECORD to show that my col-

league [Mr. MORSE], the Senators from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON and Mr. CAIN], the Senators from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK and Mr. WELKER], and the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] associate themselves with me as cosponsors of the amendment.

Mr. President, the hour grows late. I do not believe it is necessary to make an extended statement with respect to the amendment. The senior Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] has heretofore discussed the matter in some detail. My colleague has also discussed it, as have other Senators. Under the circumstances, I wish to assure my colleagues that I shall take very little time in presenting the amendment to the Senate.

First, I invite attention to statements made by the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, when he presented the bill for the committee. He indicated that my proposal had been before the committee, but that there was no particular support for it, and therefore the committee did not give it full consideration. I do not quite understand that suggestion, in the light of the hearings themselves.

Let me say that the amendment would provide for the recruitment of Mexican nationals in Mexico and for their transportation to reception centers in the United States, not simply across the border from Mexico, but within the continental United States, at such points as in the opinion of the Secretary of Labor need for such workers shall be shown to exist, and at such points as in the opinion of the Secretary of Labor would serve to equalize the costs of the labor and its availability to American agriculture throughout the 48 States. The number of reception centers is a matter for the sound discretion of the Secretary of Labor. Their location rests within the discretion of the Secretary of Labor.

The reason for the amendment rests in the vast distances within continental United States from any point along the border between the United States and Mexico. It rests in the fact that the need for the proposed legislation arises from the circumstance that, in the present emergency, labor ordinarily available to agriculture in various sections of the United States is not available because it has been drained off by war enterprises. It rests in the fact that industrial wages are higher than agricultural wages. It rests in the fact that the Department of Agriculture, which was created as the representative of agriculture in the United States, and which speaks with authority to agriculture, has called upon agriculture in this year for extraordinary agricultural production. That extraordinary production is an additional call on agricultural labor, which would be insufficient to meet the needs of agriculture even were there no increase in production.

This subject was before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I call attention to the fact that the committee had before it, from the Pacific Northwest, Mr. Ernest Falk, manager of the Northwest Horticultural Council, who discussed this very question in detail. In his testimony he indicated that the cost

of Mexican labor in the Pacific Northwest to the farmer would be \$2 per man per day in excess of the cost of local agricultural labor in the area. Undoubtedly the same ratio would prevail in other areas of the United States. That added cost must be borne by agriculture. Agriculture cannot afford that type of discrimination and continue to produce.

In addition to the statement of Mr. Falk before the committee, Mr. Fred Bailey, legislative consultant of the National Grange, appeared before the committee and called attention time and again to the inequities of the situation which would prevail if under the terms of the bill foreign labor were brought only to the Rio Grande and there had to be taken over by the prospective employers. The total transportation costs to and from the border reception center would be borne by agriculture.

Mr. Bailey advised the committee that it was the policy and position of the Grange that equity should be done in this matter. He suggested the type of thing which is embodied in the amendment which we of the Pacific Northwest present today.

Among other things, Mr. Bailey said to the committee—and I quote from page 53 of the hearings:

We hope that the committee will weigh carefully our suggestion for the establishment of recruiting centers for foreign workers at a limited number of interior points, with an equitable apportionment of costs.

That statement was made again and again, and I shall not burden the Senate by repeating it.

Mr. Clarence J. McCormick, Under Secretary of Agriculture, appeared before the committee and also went into this subject in detail. He called attention to the increased production requested of the farmers by their Government through the Department of Agriculture.

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

Mr. CORDON. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Oregon has been presenting the case very well. I wonder if he knows that the Labor Department indicated a desire to establish a great many roadside camps for migratory farm labor throughout the country. This led to considerable apprehension on the part of the committee that we would have such a series of tourist camps for migratory labor that they might spend a good deal of the time traveling, if they could be accommodated at cost every 200 or 300 miles. I wonder if the Senator had considered limiting the number of reception centers so that there would be no danger of the Labor Department undertaking to establish an elaborate system of tourist camps for migratory labor all over the United States. I do not think we need more than three or four reception centers. But if we were to provide from six to ten, I think that would safeguard the situation.

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

Mr. CORDON. I am happy to yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. I understand that it will require some time to complete consideration of the distinguished Senator's amendment. The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] has stated that he wishes to speak at some length on the amendment. Does the Senator wish to proceed, or would he rather suspend until tomorrow?

Mr. CORDON. I am happy to yield to the desire of the majority leader. I ask unanimous consent, if we do suspend now, that I may have the floor when the Senate reconvenes tomorrow, inasmuch as I have begun my discussion. I assure the Senator that I shall not take very long.

Mr. McFARLAND. I have no objection to that.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the Senator from Oregon retaining the floor tomorrow?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I should like to comply with the Senator's request but I think I have cooperated to a great extent by withdrawing my amendments after taking a terrible beating. I do not see why we cannot go along and pass the bill. It is a good bill.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the amendment of the Senator from Oregon is under consideration. He is arguing it now. All that the majority leader is asking is that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow, and that the Senator from Oregon be permitted to continue the explanation of his amendment. This is not a request for a limitation of debate, or for a vote at a certain time.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I think the Senator's amendment is so good that I would be willing to vote on it now, or continue to work on it. I am for it.

Mr. McFARLAND. I think it would require some time, and involve an evening session. Not having given notice of an evening session, I do not feel that we should do that.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. What is the pleasure of the Senate?

#### PROPOSED APPOINTMENT OF JOINT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE UNITED STATES POLICIES IN THE FAR EAST

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I should like to make another inquiry. The distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] submitted Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 25 on April 17, 1951. I had thought that before this time the Senate would have finished consideration of the pending bill and could adjourn so that there could be a morning hour, and the resolution could be considered and acted upon. It would do no good to adjourn until tomorrow unless we would obtain a unanimous-consent agreement to vote on his resolution before 2 o'clock.

If I may have the attention of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], he may be interested in what I am about to say. In order to find out whether it would be possible to dispose of the concurrent resolution before the hour of 2 o'clock, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate vote on Senate Concurrent Resolution 25 at 2 o'clock tomorrow.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President—

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, may I ask what the resolution is?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Suppose the majority leader tells us about it.

Mr. McFARLAND. It is a resolution providing for the appointment of a joint committee to investigate United States policies in the Far East.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I would like to comply with that suggestion, but I remind the Senate that the unfinished business, which is a bill affecting American labor, is important. So I shall object.

Mr. McFARLAND. Then I see no purpose in adjourning, I may say to the distinguished Senator from Michigan, because without a unanimous-consent agreement I am sure we could not finish consideration of the concurrent resolution in the 2 hours time, and we would only waste the 2 hours. So it will be my purpose to move that the Senate take a recess.

Mr. FERGUSON. I will press for an adjournment at a later time. If there is objection, of course, we cannot proceed.

Mr. McFARLAND. I will say to the distinguished Senator that I had thought we would finish action on the unfinished business on yesterday, or by tonight, and that we could then take up the concurrent resolution submitted by the Senator from Michigan. I was not trying to keep him from having it taken up for consideration. I want the Senator to understand that.

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

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I wonder if the distinguished Senator from New Mexico would withhold his objection. I think the majority leader made the situation plain, and I have no doubt the Senator from New Mexico understood him. Unless the concurrent resolution is brought up by tomorrow and voted upon time will run against it. It was the desire of the distinguished Senator from Michigan that the committees that were to hear the witnesses on the question of our national-defense policy and our policies in the Far East, should be of a bipartisan nature, composed of an equal number of Democrats and Republicans, named from the Armed Services Committee, the Foreign Relations Committee, and the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I should like to suggest that I believe we can complete action on the pending bill as well as the concurrent resolution submitted by the Senator from Michigan if we continue in session tonight.

Mr. McFARLAND. We can pursue that tomorrow.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Why pursue it tomorrow?

Mr. McFARLAND. Unanimous consent has already been obtained for two committees to proceed. We will see what can be done by tomorrow.

#### SUPPLYING OF AGRICULTURAL WORKERS FROM MEXICO

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 984) to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, it appears to me that my good friend the majority leader wants to expedite busi-

ness. We all want to expedite business. There is only one controversial amendment pending in connection with the bill, and that is the amendment of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON]. Why can we not conclude this bill tonight? I am quite sure that the Senator from Louisiana will agree that we should endeavor to complete action on the bill tonight, and then proceed with the other business.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I understand that 30 amendments have been sent to the desk. Only two amendments have been disposed of, and the only amendments which have been withdrawn are those which were submitted by the distinguished Senator from New Mexico. If the only amendment to be considered tonight is that of the distinguished Senator from Oregon, of course, we could get through with the bill this evening. But let us not forget that there are 17 more amendments at the desk. I believe the distinguished senior Senator from New Mexico had 10 of the 25 amendments that were submitted.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes, I had 10.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I recall, 30 were submitted. If the Senator from New Mexico has withdrawn his 10, and two have been acted upon, that would leave 18 to be considered, including the one which is now under discussion.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I will tell my good friend that the only controversial amendment is that of the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I appreciate the cooperation of the Senator from New Mexico. He could have taken time to present each and every one of his amendments. He has cooperated in expediting action upon the bill.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the majority leader feel that it would be agreeable to have the Senate convene at 11 o'clock tomorrow, thus saving an hour in that way, and consider the concurrent resolution until 1 o'clock and then vote on it?

Mr. McFARLAND. I have a committee hearing I must attend in the morning. It has been my experience, furthermore, that we do not gain much by meeting at 11 o'clock.

Mr. CHAVEZ. There is not a Senator present who does not understand the amendment of the Senator from Oregon. Why can we not at least vote on that amendment and get through with it. I am sure that would result in limiting the debate on the other amendments. Why can we not do that? Every Senator is for it.

Mr. CORDON. The Senator from Oregon is perfectly willing to have a vote on his amendment this evening and is perfectly willing to cut short his statement so a vote on the amendment can be had soon. However, I believe the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] desires to debate the amendment from the other viewpoint. If that is the case debate will probably continue until some time in the evening. That would be my

guess. I am in the hands of the Senate. It is wholly immaterial to me whether the Senate remains in session to discuss the amendment or does not.

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

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The question is simple. The Senator from Louisiana, who is sponsoring the bill, wants the centers, or the concentrations—I call them concentrations because that is what they are; they are not reception centers; they are concentration centers—to be on the Mexican border. The amendment of the Senator from Oregon would provide for such centers elsewhere in addition to those on the Mexican border. So the question is a simple one. If Senators want them to be on the Mexican border only they will vote against the amendment of the Senator from Oregon. If Senators want them to be located throughout the country so they might help, for example, the beet growers in Michigan, and the growers of string beans and tomatoes in the State of my good friend from Delaware, then Senators will vote for the amendment of the Senator from Oregon. If Senators want the concentration centers to be only on the Mexican border, they can vote in line with the proposal of the Senator from Louisiana. If they want them to be located all over the United States, as they should be, they can vote for the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I am happy to have this informal discussion going on, without yielding to Senators. I ask unanimous consent that I may yield for further discussion, so we may reach a decision on this point.

Mr. McFARLAND. I thought the Senator was going to yield for the purpose of recessing. I do not think it is fair to Senators to keep them here after 6:30 or 7 o'clock unless I have given notice in advance that we would have a night session. I have not held Senators here until a later hour without giving notice. I sometimes remain myself in order to accommodate Senators who want to make speeches sometimes as late as 7:30 or 8:30 o'clock. We remain in session as long as we have now remained more often than not. But unless notice has been given in advance I do not think it is fair to hold the Senate in session later than this.

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

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, first I want to pay tribute to the senior Senator from New Mexico for the fine fight he has made on the bill. I know he perhaps feels discouraged at the reception which his initial amendment received, but I think the vote on that amendment does not measure the true opinion of the Senate on the other amendments which he offered. In particular I regret that he withdrew the amendment providing penalties for violation of the immigration laws in bringing wetbacks into the United States. I think perhaps the penalties which he proposed may have been too severe, since there was provision both for a maximum fine of \$2,000 and

for imprisonment for a term not to exceed 5 years. But in the form of alternative penalties of somewhat lesser amount it would seem to me that the amendment would commend itself to the Senate. So, I hope very much that the Senator from New Mexico will reconsider his determination to withdraw the amendment, and will now be willing to offer it so that we may debate and vote upon it tomorrow.

I wish to say that I think the Senator from New Mexico has rendered a public service of the first magnitude, and all of us honor him for the very brave fight he has made during this week. If he will reconsider offering the amendment, with perhaps a slight change in the penalties, it can be voted on tomorrow.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, it would not be in order to offer the amendment at this time, because another amendment is pending. Whatever Senators wish to do about it can be done tomorrow, but it is useless for me to give notice that we are about to end the session for today, if some Senators then attempt to have us remain here.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Then let me ask unanimous consent to present the amendment and that it lie on the table and be printed. Then, if overnight the Senator from New Mexico decides he would like to sponsor the amendment, which was originally his, I would ask that he be permitted to put his name on the amendment in the morning.

Mr. McFARLAND. Does the Senator merely wish to offer the amendment and have it printed and lie on the table?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

#### EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. O'MAHONEY, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

Oren E. Long, of Hawaii, to be Governor of the Territory of Hawaii, vice Ingram M. Stainback, resigned.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the calendar.

#### NEW REPORTS

##### DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Daniel K. Edwards, of North Carolina, to be Assistant Secretary of Defense.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

##### UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Richard T. Rives, of Alabama, to be United States circuit judge for the fifth circuit.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

That completes the Executive Calendar.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of these confirmations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

#### RECESS

Mr. McFARLAND. I now move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 31 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 2, 1951, at 12 o'clock meridian.

#### CONFIRMATION

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 1 (legislative day of April 17), 1951:

##### DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Daniel K. Edwards, of North Carolina, to be Assistant Secretary of Defense.

##### UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

Richard T. Rives, of Alabama, to be United States circuit judge, fifth circuit.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, MAY 1, 1951

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Infinite and eternal God, who art the light of all that is true, the strength of all that is good, and the inspiration of all that is beautiful, may our souls in these moments of prayer be kindled with a greater passion for righteousness and justice.

Establish and confirm within us the virtues of integrity and fidelity and may no temptation or sinister influence undermine our character and cause us to break faith with Thee and our fellowmen and our own better self.

We pray that our minds and hearts may be impervious to all those ambitions and aspirations for personal aggrandizement and glory which are alien to the noble ideals and principles of our blessed Lord.

Grant that daily our conduct may authenticate and bear witness to the reality of His spirit and may the day be hastened when His lofty idealism shall become regnant in the life of all mankind. May Thy name be glorified. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Woodruff, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had adopted the following resolution (S. Res. 134):

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the

death of Hon. FRANK BUCHANAN, late a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania.

Resolved, That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the Presiding Officer to join the committee appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, the Senate do now take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

#### KOREAN CASUALTIES

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker: In his address at Soldiers Field in Chicago on Thursday, April 26, General MacArthur referred to the Korean casualties as "staggering." That he should discuss that phase of the war does not surprise me. I was informed in 1946 by a prominent Washington physician, who, during World War II was a medical officer attached to the general's staff throughout the greater part of the Far East campaign, that General MacArthur's chief concern at all times was to reduce and minimize casualties, and that so insistent was he on maintaining that policy that he invariably changed and modified his military tactics that that end might be accomplished.

When the general appears before the congressional committees in the near future he most certainly should be requested to elaborate on this subject. I am sure the committees will be intensely interested and the Congress itself will want the full facts. Although generals may be replaced, human lives cannot. If the objectives we seek to accomplish can be achieved by a modification of State Department policies in Korea and the lives of American soldiers can be spared thereby, it is folly indeed, if not criminal, to pursue our present course. Congress should be apprised of all the facts now.

#### THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, Delegate to the United Nations, Warren R. Austin, is so right in his recent statement that "There is no free ride to international security." While I realize that the mentioning of contributions or lack of contributions on the part of our allies in the United Nations is a delicate subject, nevertheless, it is apparent that there must be some "dragging of the feet."

To be sure, many members of the United Nations have other commitments than those in Korea, but none could be more important. Unless and until there