

general, with date of rank from October 1, 1947.

Lt. Gen. Benjamin Wiley Chidlaw, [XXXX] (major general, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States, to be commanding general, Air Defense Command, with rank of lieutenant general, with date of rank from October 1, 1947.

Maj. Gen. Thomas Dresser White, [XXXX] United States Air Force, to be Deputy Chief of Staff, Operations, United States Air Force, with rank of lieutenant general, with date of rank from date of appointment.

Maj. Gen. Orval Ray Cook, [XXXX] United States Air Force, to be Deputy Chief of Staff, Materiel, United States Air Force, with rank of lieutenant general, with date of rank from date of appointment.

Maj. Gen. Charles Bertoddy Stone III, [XXXX] United States Air Force, to be Deputy Chief of Staff, Comptroller, United States Air Force, with rank of lieutenant general, with date of rank from date of appointment.

Lt. Gen. Kenneth Bonner Wolfe, [XXXX] Deputy Chief of Staff, Materiel, United States Air Force (major general, U. S. Air Force), to be placed on the retired list in the grade of lieutenant general under the provisions of subsection 504 (d) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the Air Force of the United States under the provisions of section 515, Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. Thomas Herbert Chapman, [XXXX] United States Air Force.

Brig. Gen. William Maurice Morgan, [XXXX] United States Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Raymond Coleman Maude, [XXXX] United States Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Joseph Vincent DePaul Dillon, [XXXX] (colonel, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Brig. Gen. John Halliday McCormick, [XXXX] (colonel, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Frederick Rodgers Dent, Jr., [XXXX] (colonel, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Julius Kahn Lacey, [XXXX] (colonel, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Brig. Gen. William Dole Eckert, [XXXX] (colonel, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

To be brigadier generals

Col. Earl Maxwell, [XXXX] United States Air Force (medical).

Col. Wilfrid Henry Hardy, [XXXX] United States Air Force.

Col. Walter Williams Wise, Jr., [XXXX] United States Air Force.

Col. Joseph Cyril Augustin Denniston, [XXXX] United States Air Force.

Col. Elmer Blair Garland, [XXXX] United States Air Force.

Col. Matthew Kemp Deichelmann, [XXXX] United States Air Force.

Col. William Tell Hefley, [XXXX] United States Air Force.

Col. Donald Bertrand Smith, [XXXX] United States Air Force.

Col. Ernest Keeling Warburton, [XXXX] United States Air Force.

Col. Thomas Ludwell Bryan, Jr., [XXXX] United States Air Force.

Col. Daniel Campbell Doubleday, [XXXX] United States Air Force.

Col. George Elston Price, [XXXX] United States Air Force.

Col. Floyd Bernard Wood, [XXXX] United States Air Force.

Col. Wiley Duncan Ganey, [XXXX] United States Air Force.

Col. Gordon Aylesworth Blake, [XXXX] United States Air Force.

Col. Henry Keppler Mooney, [XXXX] United States Air Force.

Col. Lee Bird Washbourne, [XXXX] United States Air Force.

Col. John Raymond Gilchrist, [XXXX] United States Air Force.

Col. Clinton Dermott Vincent, [XXXX] United States Air Force.

Col. Lloyd Pauahi Hopwood, [XXXX] United States Air Force.

Col. William Milton Gross, [XXXX] United States Air Force.

The following-named persons for appointment in the United States Air Force, in the grades indicated, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force under the provisions of section 506, Public Law 381, Eightieth Congress (Officer Personnel Act of 1947), and title II, Public Law 365, Eightieth Congress (Army-Navy-Public Health Service Medical Officer Procurement Act of 1947):

To be captains, USAF (medical)

Roy B. Coffey, [XXXX]

Richard W. Bells, [XXXX]

Donald M. Haskins, [XXXX]

George J. Murphy, [XXXX]

Guy L. Rutledge, Jr., [XXXX]

Fred S. Schwarz, [XXXX]

Craig R. Sigman, [XXXX]

Robert W. Youngblood, Jr., [XXXX]

To be first lieutenants, USAF (medical)

Robert H. Adams, [XXXX]

George R. Anderson, [XXXX]

McAlpin H. Arnold, [XXXX]

Harry R. Claypool, [XXXX]

Robert T. P. de Treville, [XXXX]

Walter W. Dewey, [XXXX]

Charles W. Does, [XXXX]

Alonzo M. Donnell, Jr., [XXXX]

Louis A. Fraysse III, [XXXX]

Benjamin W. Gilliotte, [XXXX]

Raphael S. Good, [XXXX]

John E. Graf, [XXXX]

William K. Graves, [XXXX]

R. D. Gregory, Jr., [XXXX]

James P. Hensen, [XXXX]

Alvin S. Natanson, [XXXX]

Bertram L. Pear, [XXXX]

Chester R. F. Poole, [XXXX]

George E. Reynolds, [XXXX]

Gerard B. Schroering, Jr., [XXXX]

Bland H. Schwarting, [XXXX]

Franklyn C. Spiro, [XXXX]

Thomas P. Talley, [XXXX]

Andrew L. Tucker, [XXXX]

Allen S. Weed, [XXXX]

Gregory J. Zann, [XXXX]

To be first lieutenants, USAF (dental)

William E. Ayres, [XXXX]

Edward E. Dickson, [XXXX]

Barnes R. Kendrick, [XXXX]

Ray E. Parsons, [XXXX]

Hubert W. Woodward, [XXXX]

Subject to physical qualification and subject to designation as distinguished military graduates, the following-named distinguished military students of the Senior Division, Reserve Officers' Training Corps, for appointment in the United States Air Force, in the grade of second lieutenant, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force under the provisions of section 506, Public Law 381, Eightieth Congress (Officer Personnel Act of 1947):

Wilbur O. Aikin, Jr. Edgar L. Drain, [XXXX]

Burt S. Bailey, [XXXX]

James E. Banks, Arthur A. Fagen, Jr. [XXXX]

Wendall C. Bauman, Harry E. George, Jr. [XXXX]

Cecil L. Brewer, Elmer H. Green, Jr. [XXXX]

Murray L. Brockman, Charles R. Hoffman, Jr. [XXXX]

John A. Brown, Jr. Jesse A. Key [XXXX]

George M. Browning, Robert H. Krumpke [XXXX]

Jr. Wilbur S. Light [XXXX]

Richard P. Cline, John W. Lloyd [XXXX]

Jack P. Davey, Jr. Eugene L. Main [XXXX]

George W. Mallick, Russell E. Schmitt [XXXX]
 Frank S. McCracken, Stanley G. Southworth, Jr. [XXXX]
 Richard H. McFarland, [XXXX]
 James F. Patton, Herbert R. Swing, Jr. [XXXX]
 James L. Quinn, Richard R. Tumlinson [XXXX]
 John T. Schiffer, [XXXX]
 William A. Warner [XXXX]

The following-named graduate, United States Naval Academy, class of 1951, for appointment in the United States Air Force, in the grade of second lieutenant, with date of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force under the provisions of section 506, Public Law 381, Eightieth Congress (Officer Personnel Act of 1947):

Melto Goumas, [XXXX]

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 26 (legislative day of June 21), 1951:

INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND AND INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT

John W. Snyder, of Missouri, to be United States Governor of the International Monetary Fund, and United States Governor of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development for a term of 5 years.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Robert R. Rose, Jr., of Wyoming, to be Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

Bryce R. Holt to be United States attorney for the middle district of North Carolina.

Howard Caplan to be United States attorney for the northern district of West Virginia.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JUNE 26, 1951

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Wales E. Smith, pastor of the First Christian Church, Santa Monica, Calif., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, who hast given us this good land for our heritage, kindly, we pray Thee, in the hearts of men, the true love of peace, and guide with Thy pure and perfect wisdom those who take counsel for the nations of the earth. We beseech Thee with Thy favor, to behold and bless Thy servants, the Representatives of these United States. Endue with the spirit of wisdom all these to whom, in Thy name, we entrust the authority of government, that there may be justice and well-being at home and abroad. We pray for a true and just peace in Korea, and for all time to come, throughout the world.

Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 1726) entitled "An act to provide for the organization of the Air Force and the Department of the Air Force, and for other purposes" disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses

thereon, and appoints Mr. HUNT, Mr. BYRD, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. SALTONSTALL, and Mr. KNOWLAND to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H. R. 2321) entitled "An act to protect consumers and others against misbranding, false advertising, and false invoicing of fur products and furs" disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. MCFARLAND, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. BREWSTER, and Mr. CAPEHART to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H. R. 4200) entitled "An act to make certain revisions in titles I through IV of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, as amended, and for other purposes" disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. STENNIS, Mr. BYRD, and Mr. FLANDERS to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 87]

| | | |
|--------------|----------------|--------------|
| Adair | Furcolo | Morano |
| Allen, Ill. | Gillette | Murphy |
| Allen, La. | Hall, | Murray, Wis. |
| Boggs, La. | Edwin Arthur | O'Konski |
| Breen | Harden | Philbin |
| Burton | Harvey | Potter |
| Byrne, N. Y. | Hays, Ark. | Powell |
| Camp | Irving | Preston |
| Carnahan | Johnson | Ramsay |
| Chatham | Kelley, Pa. | Redden |
| Cole, Kans. | Kilday | Riehlman |
| Cotton | Larcade | Sutton |
| Cox | LeCompte | Trimble |
| Dawson | Lind | Velde |
| D'Ewart | Lucas | Vorys |
| Dingel | McGrath | Watts |
| Durham | Mack, Ill. | Whitaker |
| Ewins | Magee | Whitten |
| Flood | Merrow | Wickersham |
| Frazier | Miller, Calif. | Woodruff |

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and seventy-three Members are present, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

REAFFIRMING FRIENDSHIP OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE FOR ALL OTHER PEOPLES

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on Senate Concurrent Resolution 11, reaffirming the friendship of the American people for all the peoples of the world, including the people of the Soviet Union, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 632)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 11) entitled "Concurrent resolution reaffirming the friendship of the American people for all the peoples of the world, including the peoples of the Soviet Union," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the House and agree to the same.

A. A. RIBICOFF,
THURMOND CHATHAM,
BROOKS HAYS,
JOHN M. VORYS,
FRANCES P. BOLTON,

Managers on the Part of the House.

TOM CONNALLY,
BRIEN McMAHON,
ALEXANDER WILEY,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 11) reaffirming the friendship of the American people for all the peoples of the world, including the peoples of the Soviet Union, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the committee of conference and recommended in the accompanying conference report.

The House struck out all of the Senate concurrent resolution after the resolve clause and the preamble and inserted substitute amendments. The committee of conference has agreed upon the House amendments. The resolution, as agreed upon by the members of the committee of conference, reads:

"Whereas the goal of the American people is now, and ever has been, a just and lasting peace; and

"Whereas the deepest wish of our Nation is to join with all other nations in preserving the dignity of man, and in observing those moral principles which alone lend meaning to his existence; and

"Whereas, in proof of this, the United States has offered to share all that is good in atomic energy, asking in return only safeguards against the evil in the atom; and

"Whereas the Congress reaffirms its policy as expressed in law to continue to exert maximum efforts to obtain agreements to provide the United Nations with armed forces as contemplated in the Charter and agreements to achieve universal control of weapons of mass destruction and universal regulation and reduction of armaments, including armed forces, under adequate safeguards to protect complying nations against violation and evasion; and

"Whereas this Nation has likewise given of its substance and resources to help those peoples ravaged by war and poverty; and

"Whereas terrible danger to all free peoples compels the United States to undertake a vast program of armaments expenditures; and

"Whereas we rearm only with reluctance and would prefer to devote our energies to peaceful pursuits: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States reaffirms the historic and abiding friendship of the American people for all other peoples, and declares—

"That the American people deeply regret the artificial barriers which separate them from the peoples of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and which keep the Soviet peoples from learning of the desire of the American people to live in friendship with all other peoples, and to work with them in advancing the ideal of human brotherhood; and

"That the American people believe the Soviet Government could advance the cause of peace immeasurably by removing those artificial barriers, thus permitting the free exchange of information between our peoples; and

"That the American people and their Government desire neither war with the Soviet Union nor the terrible consequences of such a war; and

"That, although they are firmly determined to defend their freedom and security, the American people welcome all honorable efforts to resolve the differences standing between the United States Government and the Soviet government, and invite the peoples of the Soviet Union to cooperate in a spirit of friendship in this endeavor; and

"That the Congress request the President of the United States to call upon the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to acquaint the peoples of the Soviet Union with the contents of this resolution."

This resolution was initiated solely by the legislative branch of our Government. It sets forth in simple language an attitude that has characterized American policy since the inception of our Government. As a nation we have condemned tyrannous and oppressive governments; for those who have suffered under them we have always felt a deep sympathy. We have never engaged in a policy of damning those whose voices cannot be heard because of their master's voice.

We know that the Soviet philosophy is an aggressive one. The Politburo uses every opportunity to attack peace-loving nations by word and even by arms through its satellites. These activities, bordering so close to war, give us tremendous concern.

This resolution is not belligerent in word or spirit. It seeks to explain in explicit language the underlying attitudes that determine American foreign policy. If the artificial barriers between the Soviet-dominated peoples and the outside world could be lowered, if not leveled, and these ideas imparted to them, the committee is confident that present tensions could be immeasurably reduced.

As the elected representatives of the American people, we feel a particular responsibility in these critical days to do everything that will further the cause of peace. At the same time we wish to make known our sentiment that we do not seek peace at the expense of freedom and security.

This resolution seeks to convey these thoughts to all peoples, including those of the Soviet Union.

The purpose of this resolution is to ask the Soviet Government to lift the iron curtain so as to inform the Soviet people of the peaceful purposes of the American people and the American Government. Under our American system of freedom of expression, the position of the Soviet Union is always made available to the American people. At the same time, the Soviet Government which has complete control of its press and radio refuses to publish the truth about the peaceful aims and purposes of American foreign policy.

This is indeed the iron curtain in operation. It is without a rival as the world's greatest threat to peace.

The resolution touches the Soviet Government in its most vulnerable spot by inviting its peoples "to cooperate in a spirit of friendship" in an endeavor to resolve the differences between the United States Government and the Soviet Government.

Dictators fear nothing more than the unleashed wrath of their subjects. Any endeavor to separate the people from the rulers challenges the illusory popular base on which dictatorship rests. The Soviet Government is no exception to this age-old concept of tyranny.

An English-language broadcast from Moscow accused the resolution's sponsors of "resorting to demagogical and hypocritical maneuvers and subterfuge, posing as men of peaceful aspirations whose only desire is to achieve peace and international cooperation."

The resolution's sponsors were accused of "obviously trying to pull a fast one when they speak of settling differences between the American people and the Soviet Government."

The request to the President to make the contents of the resolution known to the peoples of the Soviet Union drew heavy fire from the broadcaster.

"The authors of the resolution seek to contrast the Soviet Government with the Soviet people. The absurdity and duplicity of such an assertion is only too obvious. The Soviet Government is serving only the interests of the people. It enjoys the complete support and confidence of the people. The Soviet Government is firmly and persistently fighting for peace because it is thereby expressing the aspirations and defending the vital interests of the Soviet people."

Soviet reaction to the resolution is striking proof that the Soviet authorities fear an appeal to the rank and file of their citizens. It may well mark the first step in furthering a body of public opinion within the Soviet state that may check, if not counter, the Kremlin's policies.

The resolution challenges the Soviet Government by urging it to take a positive step toward the advancement of peace, namely, by removing the artificial barriers which block the free exchange of information between the peoples of the two countries.

A. A. RIBICOFF,
THURMOND CHATHAM,
BROOKS HAYS,
JOHN M. VORYS,
FRANCES P. BOLTON,

Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the conference report on the resolution before us today is a simple and effective one. This resolution expresses the friendship and good will of the American people for all the peoples of the earth. It also reaffirms the deep and sincere desire of the American people to do everything in their power to bring about a just and lasting peace.

This resolution further asks the Soviet Government to lift the iron curtain so that the people of the Soviet Union can be informed of the peaceful purposes of the American people of the American Government. Under our system of freedom of expression, the position of the Soviet Union is always made available to the American people. At the same time, the Soviet Government, which has complete control of its press and radio, refuses to publish the truth about the peaceful aims and purposes of American foreign policy.

The resolution invites the peoples of the Soviet Union to cooperate in a spirit of friendship in this endeavor.

This resolution was introduced on February 8, 1951, simultaneously in the House and the other body. It was adopted unanimously in the other body. The resolution received most careful study by the Committee of Foreign Affairs and numerous changes were made at the suggestion of various members of that committee. It was reported unanimously from the Committee on Foreign Affairs and came to the floor on June 4, 1951. Unfortunately, on that day, there was an agreement between the leadership that there would be no roll-call votes. When the resolution was before the House for passage, a division was asked for by a Member and the resolution was adopted on a 36 to 7 vote.

The proponents of this measure were deeply disturbed over the fact that only 10 percent of the House was recorded in favor of the high principles contained in this resolution. The psychological value of the resolution was therefore undercut. It is most difficult to explain to the peoples of the world the parliamentary situation which led to such a small vote.

The damage to our good faith had to be restored. The Senate and the House resolutions differing were then sent to conference. The Senate conferees adopted verbatim the House version. The conference report was then adopted unanimously by the Senate. The conference report is now before this body. A roll call will be asked so that this House can tell in overwhelming numbers that it, too, stands for a just and lasting peace and friendship for all the world's peoples and inviting the Russian people to work with the American people to advance the cause of peace. To be effective, this resolution should be passed as near to unanimity as possible.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BENDER. The gentleman stressed that this is a statement of our policy. I do not interpret this as a statement of foreign policy at all. It is merely a statement of our hopes and aspirations and our desire for world peace.

Mr. RIBICOFF. That is correct.

Mr. BENDER. And expressing our general attitude as a Christian nation toward our fellow nations. It is not an endorsement of any specific foreign policy.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Our western civilization is based on the Judeo-Christian principles. As a matter of fact, this particular resolution comes out of this Congress, and it is an expression of this Congress itself as to its desire. I believe it is a definite contribution that we can make toward our foreign policy. These are the ultimate aims of the Congress and the people of the United States.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COLMER. In the other body we had no dissenting votes cast.

Mr. RIBICOFF. No dissenting votes whatsoever.

Mr. COLMER. Then it would be very appropriate and commendatory if this body could also go on record by a record vote, as the gentleman points out, without a dissenting vote.

Mr. RIBICOFF. That is correct.

Mr. COLMER. While some of us realize the conditions that exist over there and realize that this is possibly a pious hope, I think it would be a splendid thing for the Congress to go on record without a dissenting vote.

Mr. RIBICOFF. I thank the gentleman.

I want to point out that the effect of this is incalculable. In the final analysis, as General MacArthur and General Wedemeyer stated, the great mass of people all over the world want peace. The Soviet Union, in their cold war, have dropped most of their propaganda and stress peace, so they say. They have stolen this word "peace," and you notice every time the Soviet Union takes a position it finds the front pages in the newspapers and on the radio of the United States of America, because we have freedom of the press, as witness Malik's statement last Sunday, and yet when we express our point of view, the Politburo keep it out. Thus the people behind the iron curtain do not realize that we are a peaceful nation and that our deep desire is a just and lasting peace for the entire world.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I am wholeheartedly in favor of this conference report. It ought to pass unanimously.

On a recent inspection trip some of us made to Europe I was struck by a remark I heard a high American official make. He was one of the leading architects of our foreign policy during and after the last war. He said the single biggest mistake made by our Government in World War II was the Casablanca decision requiring so-called unconditional surrender by the Germans. He said it was the biggest mistake because it made no differentiation between the Nazi Government and the German people, and it gave no hope to the German people, millions of whom were opposed to Hitler and would have worked harder than anybody else in the world to overthrow him from within while we were fighting his regime from without. Without some indication that we were their friends as much as we were Hitler's enemies, they had little choice except to fight and support him. That led to the unnecessary loss of a great many American lives and left a vacuum in Germany with an inevitable struggle between Russia and the West over who is to fill the vacuum.

This resolution is evidence that we have learned something from that experience. We do not want to make the same kind of mistake again. It is designed to begin the process of hammering away relentlessly in every possible way to pierce the iron curtain and get through to the people who are enslaved behind it that the American people do differentiate sharply between their tyrannical Communist governments and the people themselves. The governments are our enemy. They are the enemy of all free

peoples. The peoples of those countries are our friends. There is every reason, in my judgment, why we should make the maximum effort to make clear to those people that we have no attitude toward them whatsoever except one of complete good will and a desire to encourage them in their efforts to regain their freedom.

In the long run we can have no world peace and no relaxation in our own country until the tyrannies that exist under the domination of the Kremlin are overthrown. How can they be overthrown? Only from the outside or from the inside. Surely we do not want to have to do it from the outside. That is the way that would cost most in American money and American lives, and leave us with a burdensome problem after the overthrow.

Surely to the extent that we can encourage and strengthen resistance from the inside we are saving American lives and money and helping build friendly forces that can take over the countries after liberation. Therefore we must do everything possible to give hope to these people who in many places have been reduced to despair.

We are facing a resourceful enemy that uses two main weapons. One is arms and the other is ideas. Sometimes you hear people say, "Don't worry about the Soviet arms. Our better idea will ultimately win. You cannot stop an idea with a bullet." That is true, but it is also true that you cannot stop a bullet with an idea. We cannot overcome their bullets with our ideas, or their ideas with our bullets. We have to have better arms to overcome their arms and better ideas to overcome their ideas. I am not so worried today about the strength of our arms as I was a year or two ago. America and its allies are rapidly rebuilding military strength. Our greatest weakness now is in the field of ideas. Our society is built on the better idea but we are not using it effectively, we are not selling it.

Therefore, this resolution is a part of our efforts to strengthen ourselves in the vital field of defeating bad ideas with good ideas, overcoming falsehood with the truth, while at the same time we are strengthening our arms in order to be able to resist any attacks by them.

I cannot imagine why anybody who wants to save American lives or American dollars or American freedom would vote against this resolution. It cannot conceivably do any harm and it can conceivably do a great deal of good.

One of the evidences of that is reported on page 4 of the conference report. Just look at this quotation from the Soviet press. It is the best proof that the passage of the original resolution some weeks ago struck home in a vital spot. The Soviet press said:

The authors of the resolution seek to contrast the Soviet Government with the Soviet people. The absurdity and duplicity of such an assertion is only too obvious. The Soviet Government is serving only the interests of the people. It enjoys the complete support and confidence of the people. The Soviet Government is firmly and persistently fighting for peace because it is thereby expressing the aspirations and defending the vital interests of the Soviet people.

Do you suppose they would have bothered to go to all that trouble to deny the implications in this resolution if it were just an innocuous, pious gesture, as someone has suggested? On the contrary, it shows that the resolution is a powerful shaft and that it struck them in the spot where they are weakest, namely, that they do not have the support of their people.

Their squirming denial demonstrates the wisdom and good strategy of a policy of sound ideological warfare in this struggle with a relentless enemy. So if we want to win the over-all struggle with a minimum of cost in lives from our own homes and money from our own pockets, it seems to me we must vote unanimously for this conference report. We must do everything we can to weaken the enemy's home front as well as to strengthen ourselves and our allies.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEARNEY. Simply as a matter of personal information, can the gentleman tell me why the nations behind the iron curtain were not mentioned in the resolution by name?

Mr. JUDD. It does not mention them by name, but you will note it says it is "the deepest wish of our Nation to join with all other nations in preserving the dignity of man." It "reaffirms the historic and abiding friendship of the American people for all other peoples." It begins with the major premise: The people of the United States are friendly toward all peoples. Among "all peoples" are the Russian people. Therefore we are friendly toward them. Then we direct our attack at the Russian Government because the real enemy is not the people of Russia or the people or the government of Czechoslovakia or of Poland or of North Korea; the real enemy is the government sitting in the Kremlin. Why should we not pin the rose where it belongs, on the one that is responsible for putting up the iron curtain: It is the one we want to expose and ultimately compel to remove the iron curtain.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. REECE].

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, this resolution is an expression of friendship on the part of the American people for the peoples of all nations. It does not specify any particular people in the resolution. If we can convey to the people of Russia or of any other nation that has a totalitarian government that we are a friend of all people, regardless of the type of government they have, it would be helpful, I think, in building up a counterforce to what is going on in those countries at this time.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Is the friendship of the American people suspect all over the world?

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. I do not think it is.

Mr. GROSS. Then why this resolution?

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. This expression is pointed not to the people of any one nation, but to the peoples of all nations. Certainly it can do no harm. We are not suspect so far as the people are concerned, but there are certain governments that are making an effort to make us suspect and that is what we want to overcome. This expression should be helpful.

Mr. GROSS. Then why not beam this resolution at those governments?

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. It is the hope that our Government will have some means of making this expression of friendship known to the people of Russia.

Mr. GROSS. You say all of the people all over the world. Another question: What other parliament, or what other legislative body in the world is adopting a resolution expressing its friendship for the United States? Do you know of any?

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. I yield.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Of course I think the United States should take the lead in this. It is our hope that after this body expresses its friendship, and the President of the United States notifies the Soviet Government, other legislative bodies throughout the world will adopt similar resolutions. It is no answer to say "Why are we the first?" I think we ought to be the first to make such an expression at this time because the United States is the leader of the free world.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. The gentleman is quite correct. We are the leaders and we are making an expression of friendship which certainly can do no harm. An expression of friendship will do good if that expression is forcefully carried to the peoples of the other nations. That is the purpose of the resolution.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. Having gone through the terrible aftermath of reconstruction in the South, I want to ask the gentleman from Tennessee if he does not think the best thing we could do would be to stop this carpetbag regime with which we are now punishing the German people and try to make peace with them. We are going to need them a darn sight worse than we are going to need Russia, if this thing keeps on.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. I think the expression of friendship ought to be forcefully carried to the people.

Mr. RANKIN. You cannot make peace with people by carrying on a carpetbag administration, and by hanging German soldiers, doctors, and civilians 5 or 6 years after the close of the war. We know what happened after the War Between the States. The people of the South have never got over it. It has

kept us divided for almost a century. The thing we need most today is for the real Americans of both sections to get together and save this country.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. I sympathize with the gentleman's feelings, but had we had more expressions of this kind at that time we would have had a little easier time of it during the reconstruction period.

Mr. RANKIN. The long, drawn-out friction between the North and South was not about the war, but it was over the evil blunders of reconstruction. Yet we are doing the same thing in Germany today, in a worse form, if possible, than was perpetrated against the people of the South.

We should make peace with the German people. We may need them.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. I hope that that condition will be overcome.

Mr. WOOD of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. I yield.

Mr. WOOD of Idaho. Do you not think we ought to find out the constitutional authority for this resolution, wherein the effort to treat with other countries is entirely 100 percent through the present State Department, which has been taken over from the American people and the American Congress?

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. This resolution expresses the hope that the President will find some manner of sending an expression to the German people.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has again expired.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I believe at this time the Congress would like to have a statement on the floor as to the answer of the Secretary of State to my question before the Foreign Affairs Committee this morning.

The Secretary of State has stated that he will not enter into negotiations with the North Koreans or with Communist China until he has assurances that each of those nations will conform to the Geneva Convention on American and Allied Prisoners. That will mean good news to the relatives and the families of the soldiers of this country who have been taken prisoner. There will be no talk of peace unless these opponents tell us who the prisoners are, where they are located, their mailing addresses, and identify them, and show us that they took care of the wounded; and, in addition, let our packages and medical supplies go through to them. The Secretary of State secondly, in answer to my question whether Formosa would be used as a makeweight or a bargaining element in making peace in Korea, has again assured us for the administration that Formosa will not be used as any bargaining element in any peace negotiations in Korea, and that the freedom of the free people of Formosa will be respected.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Can the gentleman tell us if he has any assurance from either the President or the State Department whether or not in this cease-fire talk there will be any assurance to the other peoples of the world that those who have been declared the aggressors, both by our Government and the United Nations, will somehow be apprehended and brought to the bar of international justice and punished for their aggression, or whether we are going to sit down and dicker on the thirty-eighth parallel.

Mr. FULTON. As I have no such assurance, I would yield to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS], chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, to answer the gentleman's question, on behalf of the administration.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. DOYLE].

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I vigorously support the conference report reaffirming the friendship of the American people for all peoples of the world, including the peoples of the Soviet Union, and urge every Member of this distinguished legislative body to approve the same by his or her vote on the roll call.

I supported the House resolution when it was before us previously, and now that the United States Senate has unanimously approved the text thereof and it is referred back to this House for conference consideration, I find pleasure and satisfaction in again having opportunity to vigorously support the worthy objectives as stated on the part of the managers of the House and embodied in the conference report.

Do not the first two paragraphs of this report state what is in the heart and mind and soul of all patriotic thinking Americans?

First:

Whereas the goal of the American people is now, and ever has been, a just and lasting peace; and

Second:

Whereas the deepest wish of our Nation is to join with all other nations in preserving the dignity of man, and in observing those moral principles which alone lend meaning to his existence; and then each and every subsequent statement in the report, so clearly and ably made to us by our own managers on the part of the House, is likewise crystal clear in revealing to all peoples of the world, the intent and purpose of the American people to be friends with all freedom-loving peoples of the world. Nor does it put the soft pedal on any aggressive communistic philosophy in the Soviet Union, for it, among other things, states:

We know that the Soviet philosophy is an aggressive one. The Politburo uses every opportunity to attack peace-loving nations by word and even by arms through its satellites. These activities, bordering so close to war, give us tremendous concern.

Previous speakers today have urged to your attention that the battle of ideas is not less important than the battle of bullets and that both are sometimes necessary. I state that the battle of ideas is perpetually necessary, and I pray God that the time may not be too far dis-

tant when it shall be unnecessary to have any battle of bullets. But, until that happy day arrives, we must be prepared, if needs be, to enforce peace by virtue of our military strength and resourcefulness.

Inasmuch as previous remarks by Members this day are strongly in accord with my own convictions in the area of the importance of promulgating to other peoples of the world our concept of life as rapidly as possible, I am reminded that on May 23 on the floor of this House I, amongst other things, stated:

We can help spank spreading communism by spreading the practice of American idealism. Yes, Mr. Chairman, I have an abiding and enduring faith that the American idealism which speaks out for human dignity and for human rights can be made more than a match for aggressive communism. I read history which tells me that the surest way a false idea or ideology can be whipped is to match it with an idea or ideal which has enduring value in the hearts and minds and souls of men. The destiny of our Nation ultimately will be determined by our applied ideals and ideas far more than by power and bombs.

So it is, by the express terms of this conference report on which we are voting in a few minutes, again clearly stated by the Congress of the United States—by both Houses thereof—that we not only oppose the Soviet philosophy of aggressive communism, but that we have something tangible and feasible which can be possessed by the common people of the world.

In other words, the raising of the human being to the level of personal dignity with the freedoms which are ours, for an idea which will promulgate human liberty of our own national security and the security of the nations of the world. This is the way we live, and we must let the peoples of all other nations know this at the earliest possible moment. This resolution will be a powerful factor in this regard. Peace is the normal way of human life. Americans are peace loving and abiding. This resolution, given life, will help toward world peace, peace with honor and assurance of it lasting, for when the people of the world cement together for peace, dictatorial government will not destroy it.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KERSTEN].

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, a victim in the depths of his torture is not much inspired or consoled by expressions of sympathy from one standing by when those expressions are coupled with meekness toward the torturer.

The people of the Soviet Union are the foremost victims of a satanic tyranny—their own Communist regime. Since it came into power in 1917, this regime has murdered over 40,000,000 of its own citizens. The body of the Soviet citizenry is presently being tortured on the rack of the police state.

This resolution insofar as it expresses sympathy for the peoples of the Soviet Union is one step in the right direction.

But the greater part of the realities of the situation are left untouched.

There is a very large area in our relations with the peoples of the Soviet Union and with the regime that now enslaves them which has not been covered. I have attempted to cover that additional area by Resolution No. 89, introduced by me on April 3, 1951, to which I call to the committee's attention and I ask that the committee give it early consideration. I have also introduced Resolution No. 4, pertaining to the enslavement of non-Russian peoples within the Soviet Union; Resolution No. 119, pertaining to the enslavement of the Hungarian people; Resolution No. 120, pertaining to the enslavement of the Polish people; Resolution No. 121, pertaining to the enslavement of the Bulgarian people; and Resolution No. 123, pertaining to the enslavement of the Rumanian people.

I also call the committee's attention to these additional measures.

The resolutions introduced by me go considerably further into the relationship between the American people and the Russian people than does the resolution we are now debating. They also go into fields untouched by the instant resolution: Namely, the specific relationship between the Soviet Government and the various classes of Soviet society, the basic rights of the Soviet citizens as human beings, specific measures that might be taken to help the peoples of the Soviet Union toward their liberation.

I was deeply impressed by the speech of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Judd]. He referred to the necessity of assisting these unfortunate people in overthrowing their government. I commend him for his forthright statement. I believe that that is the great and urgent necessity in the relationship between the free world and the slave world. The world cannot continue to exist half free and half slave.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.].

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield? Will the gentleman yield me 1 minute to answer the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ARMSTRONG], because I had passed the question to the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee to be answered? The question has been asked and it has not been answered.

Mr. RIBICOFF. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. And I now yield for answer to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS], chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, to the gentleman's question.

Mr. RICHARDS. I did not hear the gentleman's question.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. The question I asked, in substance, was whether we can have assurance, as these cease-fire talks are contemplated, that there will be some agreement with those who have been declared aggressors because of their military action against free and peaceful peoples, namely, the North Koreans and the Chinese Red Communists regime, that those aggressors will be apprehended and brought to the bar of international justice for punishment, or whether we are going to sit and dicker

with them at the thirty-eighth parallel; that we should have some assurance that we are going ahead and fulfill the desire of peaceful peoples that they be punished.

Mr. RICHARDS. I am sure the gentleman knows I cannot give him any assurance on the question he has raised.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KEARNS].

Mr. KEARNS. I should like to inquire of the members of the committee if this resolution would in any way commit us to this one-world plan?

Mr. FULTON. I do not believe this resolution would commit us to a one-world plan. It is merely an expression of friendliness to all the peoples of the world.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.].

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. I yield.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, I hope very much this resolution will pass unanimously in this House because I think it is of very great value overseas.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. I am sorry; I have only 3 minutes; I cannot yield.

Mr. Speaker, I may say that I support the resolution.

I do not think, in supporting this resolution, that it is necessary for any Member of this House to disavow his detestation of aggressive, armed Soviet Communist expansionism as now enforced from the top by its leaders. But the desire for peace runs strong and penetrates high and low in Soviet Russia. I want to tell you a story.

Once upon a time not so very long ago I had the very rare and unusual experience of a private conversation outside the United States with a Russian commissar. I said to him: "My country is strong, and proud, and great, and is prepared to defend itself against aggression. I know that your country is strong, and proud, and great, and equally prepared to defend itself. I hope that within your country there will grow up a concern for a peaceful way of life among all the peoples of the world, a concern I am sure exists on the part of the people of your country, and I know it exists on the part of our American people."

He looked down for a minute, then he looked around to see whether anyone else was within earshot. Then he said, "Mr. Scott, do you like vodka?"

I had always thought vodka was something I could well do without, but I thought, too, that protocol demanded an answer and a friendly answer, so I told him "Yes," I appreciated the offer, and the implication behind the offer. He said, "Tomorrow at 10 o'clock there will be in your room the finest bottle of vodka in this city."

The next day at 10 o'clock that bottle was there. It has not been consumed, Mr. Speaker, but I keep it as a memento of something very revealing. What? The fact that that Russian commissar

was trying to say to me that even as high as he was in the hierarchy, the will and the desire for a peaceful way of life existed among the people behind the iron curtain as it existed with him, and just as it exists in this country.

I believe that truth is a flaming sword, that if wielded with courage and intelligence its sharp edge will cut through error, rumor, distrust, suspicion, that if the Russian people know the truth it is the only hope they have of achieving freedom, that only the truth will give to them the incentive to find the ways and the methods to join the ranks of the free peoples, and that also is even more true of the satellite nations behind the iron curtain. I will therefore support this resolution of good will and of friendship, this message of spiritual force from a free and peaceful people to all those who live in darkness and hunger for the truth.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REAMS] for a consent request.

Mr. REAMS. Mr. Speaker, I support this resolution enthusiastically. It is an expression of the American people for an abiding friendship with the people of the Soviet Union. May I briefly summarize what it means to me:

We, the people, speaking through the Congress of the United States, reaffirm our historic friendship for all other people. We regret the artificial barrier that separates us from the Soviet people and keeps them from learning of our desire to live in friendship and to work with them in advancing the ideal of human brotherhood.

We believe that the Soviet Government could immeasurably advance the cause of peace if this barrier, which we call the iron curtain, was removed. With a free exchange of ideas and information between us, you could then see that neither we nor our Government wants war or its terrible consequences.

We will defend ourselves if we are forced to, because freedom means much to us. But we welcome your help in peacefully resolving any differences between your Government and ours.

We invite you the Russian people to work with us toward the realization of a just and lasting friendship between our Governments and the people of our respective lands.

Those are the ideas which we express when we vote for this resolution. But let us not underestimate its value because it is couched in such simple words and is so plain in its meaning. Great movements have always appeared over the horizon of history garbed so plainly that they have not been recognized by the sophisticated.

People have resisted the invasion of marching armies but not the power of an idea whose time has arrived. The simple ideas expressed in this resolution when implanted in the minds of the Russian people may be more effective than all or weapons of defense—as necessary as armaments seem to you and to me today. They may be the rearmament program for which we strive.

I hope Mr. Speaker, this resolution may have the unanimous vote of this House.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RANKIN. This resolution does not commit us to the United Nations, does it?

Mr. RIBICOFF. This is a resolution reaffirming the desire of Congress and the American people for a just and lasting peace. It also confirms our inherent friendship for all the peoples of the world.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, let us understand what this resolution is. The Russian people are not only kept enslaved by a dictatorship, but they are kept enslaved by fear constantly dinned into their ears over the radio and from various sources that somehow or other the "imperialists," and that is always pictured by the Communist propagandists to include the United States, will attack and enslave them. It is pointed out to them by the same poisonous propaganda that after World War I there was an allied force which actually went into Russia and occupied some of its territory without in any way explaining the situation of that time. The resolution before us is an effort to assure the Russian people as to their own security and as to their personal safety; and as such, it is tremendously valuable because it is so true. The United States wants to win in this situation with the weapons of peace and it can do so only if it gets across the truth of its peaceful intentions; this we must do with the peoples of the free world, but also with the Russian and satellite peoples. This resolution is an opportunity for doing so. I hope the resolution will pass unanimously.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON].

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, Senate Concurrent Resolution 11 as now before the House in the form of a favorable conference report has my entire approval. The underlying purpose of the resolution is to give assurance to the peoples of all nations of the friendship of our Nation, expressed through its duly elected representatives in House and Senate.

The resolution clearly sets forth in unmistakable terms that our Nation has no desire other than to promote peace and good will among the nations of the world. It deprecates conditions that preclude the people of some nations from understanding our true and sincere objectives. It is fervently hoped that this expression of good will upon the part of the Congress of the United States will go far in giving assurance to all people that peace and security for all people is the basic policy of the Government of the United States. At no time has the Nation sought territorial gains or enhancement of its material resources. We have already in two world wars, and, in the Korean incident, given evidence of a willingness to sacrifice and die in the cause of liberty and to protect the weak against the

strong, to the end that justice might prevail as between all peoples and nations.

America is a peace-loving Nation. Never in all the history of our Nation can it be said that this Nation has provoked war, but, on the contrary, time and again, our strength and influence have prevented war. The desire for peace is the aspiration of our people.

Nowhere in all the world is there a more pronounced and outstanding desire for universal peace than in America. Nowhere has there been a more ready and willing response to every effort that has been made to substitute peaceful means for the settlement of international differences rather than resort to military force. As a people we are justifiably proud of the fact that our Nation, above all others, has led in every movement to establish principles upon which international peace might be promoted. The peace of the world, made permanent and secure, is the sincerest desire of our people—an aspiration of the very heart and soul of America. It was for this that America shed her blood in two world wars and in Korea. What finer or more sacred contribution to the cause of peace could there be?

As America in the past has sought to foster and maintain peace and good will among the nations of the world, so we can with confidence look into the future with the fullest assurance, knowing full well that peace and not war will continue to be the aspiration of the heart and soul of America.

This resolution, to which I give my full support, is in my opinion an outstanding document in that it sets forth in clear and strong language the attitude of our Nation, and, makes plain that which is now and always has been our policy since the inception of our Government.

It is my fervent hope and prayer that the passage of this resolution will make plain to the peoples of the world the true spirit of brotherhood that dominates this Nation in all its undertakings to advance the cause of peace and justice in the world.

The resolution reads as follows:

Whereas the goal of the American people is now, and ever has been, a just and lasting peace; and

Whereas the deepest wish of our Nation is to join with all other nations in preserving the dignity of man, and in observing those moral principles which alone lend meaning to his existence; and

Whereas, in proof of this, the United States has offered to share all that is good in atomic energy, asking in return only safeguards against the evil in the atom; and

Whereas the Congress reaffirms its policy as expressed in law "to continue to exert maximum efforts to obtain agreements to provide the United Nations with armed forces as contemplated in the Charter and agreements to achieve universal control of weapons and mass destruction and universal regulation and reduction of armaments, including armed forces, under adequate safeguards to protect complying nations against violation and evasion"; and

Whereas this Nation has likewise given of its substance and resources to help those peoples ravaged by war and poverty; and

Whereas terrible danger to all free peoples compels the United States to undertake a vast program of armaments expenditures; and

Whereas we rearm only with reluctance and would prefer to devote our energies to peaceful pursuits: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States reaffirms the historic and abiding friendship of the American people for all other peoples, and declares—

That the American people deeply regret the artificial barriers which separate them from the peoples of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and which keep the Soviet peoples from learning of the desire of the American people to live in friendship with all other peoples, and to work with them in advancing the ideal of human brotherhood; and

That the American people believe the Soviet Government could advance the cause of peace immeasurably by removing those artificial barriers, thus permitting the free exchange of information between our peoples; and

That the American people and their Government desire neither war with the Soviet Union nor the terrible consequences of such a war; and

That, although they are firmly determined to defend their freedom and security, the American people welcome all honorable efforts to resolve the differences standing between the United States Government and the Soviet Government and invite the peoples of the Soviet Union to cooperate in a spirit of friendship in this endeavor; and

That the Congress request the President of the United States to call upon the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to acquaint the peoples of the Soviet Union with the contents of this resolution.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS].

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I hope this conference report will be adopted without a negative vote. As has been said, it passed the Senate unanimously and it was passed by the Foreign Affairs Committee unanimously. This is the next step to be taken.

Mr. Speaker, the thing for the Members of this body to primarily remember in the consideration of this measure is that it commits the Congress and the American people to the program of no organization. It commits us to nothing except friendship to all the peoples of the earth.

This resolution was not proposed by the State Department or any other department of our Government. It comes from the people of America through the Congress of the United States, made up of their chosen representatives.

As the gentleman from Minnesota so aptly said a few moments ago, a select committee of this Congress, composed of members of the Appropriations Committee, the Committee on Armed Services, and the Committee on Foreign Affairs, has just returned from Europe after 10 or 12 days of the hardest study and work I think any committee ever made abroad. One of the glaring weaknesses we found abroad in this so-called warfare against communism was in the field of the battle of ideas. As has been said, we are coming along pretty good in the field of the military and in the field of economic cooperation, but in the field of dissemina-

tion of ideals and ideas we are sadly deficient.

This is a statement from the people of the United States to people everywhere saying that no matter what you may think of our Government or what we may think of yours, so far as your people and our people are concerned we have a common desire for peace and a friendly spirit for each other.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Was there a roll call in the Senate on the passage of this measure?

Mr. RICHARDS. No; there was not a roll call. I hope there will not be a vote against this conference report.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KERSTEN].

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs a question, and I compliment him for his expression regarding the feeling of the two peoples, the American people and the Russian people. But apart from that, can the gentleman tell me as to his idea, or does he believe any agreement that we may make with the Soviet regime would be effective, and, if so, might not such an agreement be against the Russian people?

Mr. RICHARDS. I have not any faith at all in any agreement we have made or may make with the Soviet regime; therefore, our only sensible approach is to the people of Russia and not to the Government of Russia.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I am happy to hear the gentleman say that.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN].

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman from South Carolina explain this particular section:

Whereas, in proof of this, the United States has offered to share all that is good in atomic energy, asking in return only safeguards against the evil in the atom—

And so forth.

Mr. RICHARDS. That is correct.

Mr. GAVIN. What does the gentleman mean by "share"?

Mr. RICHARDS. The United States has announced to the people of all the world on more than one occasion that we consider atomic energy a force that should be used for the benefit of all the peoples of the earth and not as a force of destruction. This resolution reasserts that principle.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the reason that the conference report is before us now is due to practical conditions. A few weeks ago this resolution came up under suspension of the rules, as I remember. On that day there was no

controversial legislation and many Members were engaged in their office work or in conferences, or performing their duties with different agencies of Government in connection with their constituents, and the result was that there were few Members on the floor at the time. You and I know that the vote on that occasion represented the will of the House as a whole. But, we found out, due to the fact that there were few Members present on that occasion, that the Communists abroad used that for propaganda purposes against us and against the very purposes of the resolution. Therefore a very practical situation presented itself to us as the result of which the resolution as it passed the House, in different form in detail than it passed the Senate, was sent to conference, to come back for a separate vote at a time when the full will of the House might be expressed on this particular resolution.

There will be a roll call on the resolution because, again, from a practical angle, that is advisable and wise. The contents of the resolution certainly represent the hopes and the aspirations and the policies of our Nation. I think it represents the hopes and the aspirations of every decent-minded person. No harm can certainly come out of its adoption and an awful lot of good might come out of its adoption.

I think the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Judd], as well as other speakers, but the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Judd], in particular, gave to the House the benefit of his profound knowledge on this particular resolution when he said that it is in "the field of ideas" that we have got to take the affirmative. I thoroughly agree with the gentleman. When he talks about "the field of ideas" he is also talking about the minds of people, because in the challenge that confronts the world today there is a difference in philosophy, that is, our philosophy against the ideology of atheistic communism, and that comes within the purview of "the field of ideas," or what might otherwise be termed, but meaning the same thing, "the battle of the mind."

Behind the iron curtain and throughout this world in nations dominated by dictators, whether vicious or benevolent, but addressing myself to the totalitarian type, there are countless millions of persons who are hoping for their day of deliverance. There are countless millions of human beings who want liberty. That is something which we all obtain from God Himself through the natural law. The people dominated by totalitarian regimes inherit the same desire through the natural law that we have inherited.

One of the great inheritances by and through the natural law is the desire of every man and woman for some degree of freedom. Behind the iron curtain in those countries dominated by Communist regimes are countless millions of persons who have the desire for freedom and who are hoping and praying for the day of their deliverance. This resolution might make some contribution in that respect.

In all honesty, I cannot see why any Member would vote against the resolution. I hope no Member will. But in any event, if any do, I hope the vote on the part of the House will be overwhelming, conveying as it will behind the iron curtain—it will trickle through to those people—the sentiments of the people of the United States for peace, for friendship, and for freedom, not only for ourselves but for the people of those lands where it is effectively denied at the present time.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. We are being called upon to pass this friendship resolution. We passed a resolution not so long ago branding China as an aggressor. Does the gentleman suppose that when the next police action is started we will get a resolution before the House of Representatives to approve or disapprove that police action?

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman is asking a question which has no relevance to the matter before the House.

Mr. GROSS. It has every relevance to it.

Mr. McCORMACK. In my opinion, the gentleman's question has no relevance to the matter before the House. I say that with all respect for the gentleman's views. I am talking on this particular friendship resolution. It is one that every one of us could well vote for, and I hope there will be no vote against it.

Mr. Speaker, throughout its proud history, this Chamber has echoed the convictions of those whom we represent. There are issues upon which the American people are divided. That division is reflected here, and the will of the majority prevails. That is true democracy in action.

But there are many profound convictions shared by an overwhelming majority of the people of our Nation. These convictions are rightfully a powerful force in shaping the destiny of civilization. When, in the exercise of our duties, we give voice to these convictions—then, we have contributed toward the universal understanding which must be the foundation of any just and enduring peace.

We now have an opportunity to make such a contribution. There is before the House a concurrent resolution expressing once more the deep friendship of the American people for all other peoples.

It is especially fitting that we reaffirm this abiding feeling for all peoples, at this time. We live in a world threatened by tyranny. The enemies of freedom have enslaved millions, and conspire to extend their sway through new aggressions.

The heart of this conspiracy lies among the rulers of the Soviet Union, and its strength lies in the iron grip which the conspirators have fastened upon the bodies and minds of the peoples of the Soviet Union.

By artificial barriers, the conspirators have denied these great peoples all contact with the free world. They have

launched a "hate America" campaign of unexampled virulence. The Soviet peoples are told they have no friends, save their masters. They are told that the American people are their enemies, and that they must stand ready, at their masters' bidding, to destroy America.

This monstrous lie is vital to the Communist bid for world domination. If it is not destroyed, the future of civilization is dark and forbidding. Destroy it—and mankind can resume the march toward peace, and freedom, and justice, and decency.

I say to you that it is our duty to destroy this lie; to make every effort to let the Soviet peoples know that Americans are their friends, not their enemies; that we seek only to work with all men "in advancing the ideal of human brotherhood."

This is the purpose of the concurrent resolution now before the House. In simple language, it states the feelings of the American people.

It reaffirms their friendship for their fellow men.

It expresses the conviction that the Soviet Government has done a disservice to peace by isolating the Soviet peoples from their friends.

It states forcefully and directly that the American people abhor war and its terrible consequences.

It sets forth again our eagerness for just and honorable settlement of differences between nations; and invites the cooperation of the Soviet peoples toward this end.

And finally, the resolution asks that the President call upon the Soviet Government to acquaint Soviet peoples with these abiding convictions of the American people.

This is a challenge to the Soviet rulers. It says to them: "Let your people know the truth."

We must acknowledge that they may reject the challenge. They may seek to keep this message from those for whom it is intended.

If they do this—if they reject the challenge—they will have admitted their guilt, and their lies.

But they proclaim themselves the champions of peace. Their deeds belie them, but let us give them one more opportunity. If we adopt this resolution, we say to the men in the Kremlin: "If you seek peace, let there be an end to these lies. Let the peoples of the Soviet Union know the truth about the American people. Then, let them judge for themselves."

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that this resolution was not debated thoroughly, and the House given all the facts involved.

It is my intention to vote "present." I do not like to be put in the attitude of voting against an alleged expression of "friendship," and I certainly do not want to be put in the position of underwriting

by my vote some of the expressions contained in this resolution.

In the first place, I am disturbed over this expression:

The United States has offered to share all that is good in atomic energy, asking in return only safeguards against the evil in the atom.

Just how much attention communism would pay to the last portion of that statement is certainly problematical. After we had shared "all that is good in atomic energy," how do we know what use would be made of it?

We had better build up our own defenses, including the strongest air force on earth, with an ample supply of atomic bombs, an adequate Navy, and a radar perimeter covering the entire Western Hemisphere. Then, I dare say, no nation will dare attack us, because they know that to do so would probably mean their destruction.

But one of the most dangerous provisions of this resolution is this one:

Whereas the Congress reaffirms its policy as expressed in law "to continue to exert maximum efforts to obtain agreements to provide the United Nations with armed forces as contemplated in the Charter and agreements to achieve universal control of weapons of mass destruction and universal regulation and reduction of armaments, including armed forces, under adequate safeguards to protect complying nations against violation and evasion."

In other words, this resolution underwrites the United Nations and would make of it a supergovernment to control the weapons of destruction, even in the United States.

Everyone knows that this United Nations is teeming with Communists who are bent on the destruction of this Government, the wiping out of Christianity, and destroying the American way of life.

They have already attempted to repeal some of our local laws, such as alien land laws, and are now trying to interfere with our marriage laws and our school laws in the various States. In that way, they are stirring up race trouble throughout the country and subjecting the people of the South to a degree of irritation, if not persecution, they have not experienced since the dark days of reconstruction.

The sooner we get out of this United Nations, and get that group of spies out of this country, the better it will be for these United States.

As I said, I do not want to be put into the awkward position of voting against "peaceful relations" with the peoples of other countries throughout the world, but I cannot vote for a resolution containing provisions that I fear would not contribute to the welfare or the safety of my country.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I know of no substantial reason why this resolution is before the House of Representatives unless it is admitted by proponents

that the friendship of the American people toward other people of the world is suspect.

And still unanswered is my question as to whether legislative bodies in other nations of the world have or contemplate adopting resolutions professing friendship for the people of the United States.

In the minds of other people, the world over, we will be measured by our deeds, not by what we say. We will judge foreign governments and their people likewise.

Members of the House have a right to expect, as I suggested to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], that if resolutions dealing with foreign relations are to be decided by a record vote, there should also be record votes approving or rejecting police actions such as President Truman launched in Korea.

There is no reluctance on the part of the House leadership in bringing to the floor a resolution branding the Chinese as aggressors or this one professing friendship for everyone. But the House was denied even the slightest consideration of an action that threw the Nation into one of its most sanguinary wars—an action that has affected every home in America.

In my opinion the pending resolution will accomplish no good and it may do no particular harm.

For that reason I will neither support nor oppose it. I will vote "present."

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, during the last 6 years since the end of World War II we have been trying to achieve permanent peace by direct negotiation. In this we have failed time and again. This resolution is now a part of a plan of appealing directly to the peoples themselves who live behind the iron curtain. If we are to keep the friendship of those peoples, it is necessary that our position be not only clearly stated but also understood. By this resolution we are trying to get the thoughts of this body about peace to the ordinary man at the street level. If there is any vulnerable spot in the Soviet Union, I believe that we are striking at it in this resolution. Our battle is the free exchange of ideas and I agree with the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Judd] when he states our position as "fighting ideas with other better ideas."

At the present time the Soviet Union is carrying on a campaign and is using the word "peace" on every occasion. I presume that if that word is used often enough some people would come to believe it regardless of the manner in which it was used or by whom it was spoken.

I believe that we are on the right track by showing that the two legislative bodies in this country are directly behind the idea of spreading the truth about our stand toward other peoples of the world. There is nothing to be feared so much as for us to be misrepresented or to be misunderstood. This resolution is just one more striking example of our attempt to tell the truth to other peoples of our peaceful intentions toward them.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

Mr. RIBICOFF. On that, Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 351, nays 6, answered "present" 8, not voting 67, as follows:

[Roll No. 88]

YEAS—350

| | | |
|------------------|----------------|---------------|
| Aandahl | Dague | Jenkins |
| Abbutt | Davis, Ga. | Jensen |
| Abernethy | Davis, Tenn. | Johnson |
| Addonizio | Davis, Wis. | Jonas |
| Albert | Deane | Jones, Ala. |
| Allen, Calif. | DeGraffenried | Jones, Mo. |
| Andersen, | Delaney | Jones, |
| H. Carl | Dempsey | Hamilton C. |
| Anderson, Calif. | Denny | Jones, |
| Andresen, | Denton | Woodrow W. |
| August H. | Devereux | Judd |
| Andrews | Dollinger | Karsten, Mo. |
| Anfuso | Dolliver | Kean |
| Angell | Donohue | Kearney |
| Arends | Donovan | Keating |
| Armstrong | Dorn | Kelly, N. Y. |
| Aspinall | Doughton | Kennedy |
| Auchincloss | Doyle | Keogh |
| Ayres | Eaton | Kerr |
| Bailey | Eberharter | Kersten, Wis. |
| Baker | Elliott | Kilburn |
| Bakewell | Ellsworth | King |
| Barden | Elston | Kirwan |
| Baring | Engle | Klein |
| Barrett | Fallon | Kluczynski |
| Bates, Ky. | Feighan | Lane |
| Bates, Mass. | Fellows | Lanham |
| Battle | Fenton | Lantaff |
| Beall | Fernandez | Latham |
| Beamer | Fine | Lesinski |
| Beckworth | Fisher | Lovre |
| Belcher | Fogarty | Lucas |
| Bender | Forand | Lyle |
| Bennett, Fla. | Ford | McCarthy |
| Bennett, Mich. | Forrester | McConnell |
| Bentsen | Fugate | McCormack |
| Berry | Fulton | McCulloch |
| Bettis | Gamble | McGregor |
| Bishop | Garmatz | McGuire |
| Blackney | Gary | McKinnon |
| Boggs, Del. | Gathings | McMullen |
| Bolling | Gavin | McVey |
| Bolton | George | Machrowicz |
| Bonner | Golden | Mack, Wash. |
| Bosone | Goodwin | Madden |
| Bow | Gordon | Mahon |
| Boykin | Gore | Mansfield |
| Bramblett | Gossett | Marshall |
| Bray | Graham | Martin, Iowa |
| Brehm | Granahan | Martin, Mass. |
| Brooks | Grant | Mason |
| Brown, Ga. | Green | Meader |
| Brown, Ohio | Greenwood | Miller, Md. |
| Brownson | Gregory | Miller, Nebr. |
| Bryson | Gwin | Mills |
| Budge | Hagen | Mitchell |
| Burdick | Hale | Morgan |
| Burleson | Hall, | Morris |
| Burnside | Leonard W. | Morrison |
| Busbey | Halleck | Morton |
| Bush | Hand | Multer |
| Butler | Hardy | Mumma |
| Byrnes, Wis. | Harris | Murdock |
| Canfield | Harrison, Va. | Murray, Tenn. |
| Cannon | Harrison, Wyo. | Nelson |
| Carlyle | Hart | Nicholson |
| Case | Havener | Norblad |
| Celler | Hays, Ohio | Norrell |
| Chatham | Hedrick | O'Brien, Ill. |
| Chelf | Heffernan | O'Hara |
| Chenoweth | Heller | O'Neill |
| Chiperfield | Herlong | Ostertag |
| Chudoff | Herter | Passman |
| Church | Heselton | Patman |
| Clemente | Hess | Patten |
| Clevenger | Hill | Patterson |
| Cole, Kans. | Hinshaw | Perkins |
| Cole, N. Y. | Hoeven | Phillips |
| Colmer | Hoffman, Ill. | Pickett |
| Combs | Holifield | Poage |
| Cooley | Holmes | Polk |
| Cooper | Hope | Potter |
| Corbett | Horan | Price |
| Cotton | Howell | Priest |
| Coudert | Hull | Prouty |
| Crawford | Hunter | Quinn |
| Crosser | Jackson, Wash. | Rabaut |
| Crumpacker | James | Radwan |
| Cunningham | Jarman | Rains |
| Curtis, Mo. | Javits | Reams |
| Curtis, Nebr. | Jenison | Reece, Tenn. |

| | | |
|---------------|----------------|-----------------|
| Reed, Ill. | Sheehan | Van Pelt |
| Rees, Kans. | Shelley | Van Zandt |
| Regan | Sheppard | Vaughn |
| Rhodes | Short | Vinson |
| Ribicoff | Sieminski | Vursell |
| Richards | Simpson, Ill. | Walter |
| Riley | Sittler | Weichel |
| Rivers | Smith, Miss. | Weich |
| Roberts | Smith, Va. | Wharton |
| Robeson | Smith, Wis. | Wheeler |
| Rodino | Spence | Whitaker |
| Rogers, Colo. | Springer | Widnall |
| Rogers, Fla. | Staggers | Wier |
| Rogers, Mass. | Stanley | Wigglesworth |
| Rogers, Tex. | Steed | Williams, Miss. |
| Rooney | Stefan | Williams, N. Y. |
| Roosevelt | Stigler | Willis |
| Sabath | Stockman | Wilson, Ind. |
| Sadiak | Taber | Wilson, Tex. |
| Sasser | Tackett | Winstead |
| Saylor | Talle | Withrow |
| Scott, Hardie | Taylor | Wolcott |
| Scott, | Teague | Wolverton |
| Hugh D., Jr. | Thomas | Wood, Ga. |
| Scrivner | Thompson, | Yates |
| Scudder | Mich. | Yorty |
| Seest | Thompson, Tex. | Zablocki |
| Seely-Brown | Thornberry | |
| Shafer | Towe | |

NAYS—6

| | | |
|----------------|--------------|-------------|
| Hoffman, Mich. | Schwabe | Werdel |
| Reed, N. Y. | Smith, Kans. | Wood, Idaho |

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—8

| | | |
|----------|-----------------|------------|
| Buffett | Jackson, Calif. | Rankin |
| Gross | Kearns | St. George |
| Hillings | Poulson | |

NOT VOTING—68

| | | |
|--------------|----------------|----------------|
| Adair | Hall, | Murray, Wis. |
| Allen, Ill. | Edwin Arthur | O'Brien, Mich. |
| Allen, La. | Harden | O'Konski |
| Blatnik | Harvey | O'Toole |
| Boggs, La. | Hays, Ark. | Phillbin |
| Breen | Hébert | Powell |
| Buckley | Irving | Preston |
| Burton | Kelley, Pa. | Ramsay |
| Byrne, N. Y. | Kilday | Redden |
| Camp | Larcade | Riehlman |
| Carnahan | LeCompte | Sikes |
| Cox | Lind | Simpson, Pa. |
| Dawson | McDonough | Sutton |
| D'Ewart | McGrath | Tollefson |
| Dingell | McMillan | Trimble |
| Dondero | Mack, Ill. | Vail |
| Durham | Magee | Velde |
| Evins | Merrow | Vorys |
| Flood | Miller, Calif. | Watts |
| Frazier | Miller, N. Y. | Whitten |
| Furcolo | Morano | Wickersham |
| Gillette | Moulder | Woodruff |
| Granger | Murphy | |

So the conference report was agreed to. The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Boggs of Louisiana with Mr. Gillette.
 Mr. Irving with Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania.
 Mr. Hébert with Mr. Miller of New York.
 Mr. Sikes with Mr. Adair.
 Mr. Trimble with Mr. Velde.
 Mr. Lind with Mr. Harvey.
 Mr. Magee with Mr. Riehlman.
 Mr. Murphy with Mr. D'Ewart.
 Mr. Evins with Mr. O'Konski.
 Mr. Carnahan with Mr. LeCompte.
 Mr. Kelley of Pennsylvania with Mr. Murray of Wisconsin.
 Mr. Burton with Mr. McDonough.
 Mr. Buckley with Mr. Merrow.
 Mr. Wickersham with Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall.
 Mr. Miller of California with Mrs. Harden.
 Mr. O'Brien of Michigan with Mr. Tollefson.
 Mr. O'Toole with Mr. Woodruff.
 Mr. Preston with Mr. Allen of Illinois.
 Mr. Granger with Mr. Vail.
 Mr. Dingell with Mr. Dondero.
 Mr. McGrath with Mr. Morano.
 Mr. Furcolo with Mr. Vorys.

Mr. SHEPPARD changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mrs. ST. GEORGE changed her vote from "yea" to "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks at the point in the RECORD just prior to the ordering of the previous question.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION ACT

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 285, Rept. No. 647), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1181) to amend section 207 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 so as to authorize payment of claims arising from the correction of military or naval records. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit.

NAVAL VESSELS

Mr. COLMER (on behalf of Mr. Cox), from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 286, Rept. No. 648), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3463) to authorize the transfer of certain naval vessels. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit.

IMPORTATION OF FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL WORKERS

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 257 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself

into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3283) to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949. That after general debate which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH], and pending that I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY].

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, several months ago I appointed a subcommittee and directed the members of that subcommittee to carefully consider all aspects of the problems involved in the use of Mexican nationals on the farms of our country. The committee was authorized to conduct studies, hold hearings, and to make such investigations as might be deemed necessary. Hearings were held in different parts of the country and the hearings were well-attended by interested parties. Hearings were held here in Washington, and I am certain that all parties interested were accorded an opportunity to be heard and to be present their views. As a result of the studies, investigations, and hearings, the House Committee on Agriculture reported the bill now under consideration. This a very important measure and vitally affects many people. Failure to pass the pending bill might very well likewise vitally affect the production of essential food and fiber.

American agriculture has embarked upon a greatly expanded program. High production goals have been fixed and the farmers of the Nation have been called upon to produce the abundance which will be needed. American agriculture has been called upon again to fill the bread basket of democracy. We can recall with great pride how the American farmer discharged his assignment in World War II. Our farmers performed magnificently and actually amazed the world with their production.

The bill which we are presenting seeks to deal with an unfortunate situation. It is unfortunate that we do not have in America sufficient farm labor to harvest the abundant production of our farm lands. There is no question about a shortage of farm labor. Everyone familiar with the situation is apparently willing to admit that there is a great need for a great number of laborers for the farms of America. Because there may perchance be unemployment in some of our metropolitan centers does not necessarily mean that the unemployed of the cities are available for farm labor. The situation now facing us has actually existed for many years.

In the past, Mexican farm workers, without regard for our immigration laws, have crossed the border and have per-

formed farm work in many States. Our immigration authorities have been unable to cope with the situation. Many of these so-called wetbacks have been exploited by selfish landlords. Some of these wetbacks have remained in America, our immigration laws to the contrary notwithstanding. Some of them, knowing that they were illegally in this country, no doubt feel somewhat as fugitives, and they cannot, therefore, demand fair wages and decent living conditions. We seek by the pending bill not to legalize the entry or the status of wetbacks who are illegally in this country, but we can try to provide machinery which will authorize the entry of Mexican workers under the terms of a contract which is negotiated and agreed upon by the officials of the American Government and officials of the Mexican Government, and it is clearly understood and agreed that Mexican laborers desiring to enter America for farm work will be carefully screened before being admitted. Protection is afforded the workers and the landlords and both Governments and it should certainly bring about a great improvement in the deplorable situation which has existed in the past. This is not a local, district, or State matter. Mexican workers have been used in about 18 States of the Union in the harvesting of crops. Mexicans will not be permitted to enter as contract laborers for the purpose of accepting employment in this country except upon proper certification to the effect that no American is available to perform the services. How then can it possibly be contended that Mexican laborers will take over the jobs of American workers?

I would like to call your attention to the fact that our cotton farmers have been called upon to produce a 16,000,000-bale cotton crop. Almost all of the American cotton crop must be picked by human hands, and cotton pickers in sufficient numbers are not available in the American labor market. Unfortunately, they must be imported or brought in from other places. This situation is not only true in the cotton country; the same problem exists with fruits and vegetables and with a variety of crops.

I shall not attempt to discuss the details of the pending measure but shall leave that assignment to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE], the chairman of the subcommittee. I urge you to give Mr. POAGE your careful attention, as I am certain that he will intelligently discuss all phases of the matter, and I believe that if you understand the provisions of the bill you will agree that the House Committee on Agriculture has done a very good job. If this bill is controversial, I am frankly of the opinion that it is because its purpose and provisions are not fully understood.

Certainly no member of the House Committee on Agriculture would be willing to bring in foreign labor to take jobs away from American citizens. I do not suppose you could find 30 better Americans than the 30 members of the House Committee on Agriculture, and certainly every member of our committee is not only interested in farmers and farm problems but is likewise interested in

American laboring men and in the general welfare of all our people. Certainly no American landlord would prefer to give work to an alien in preference to a citizen, nor is it reasonable to believe that American employers of farm labor would be willing to incur the expense and to assume the risk incident to bringing in foreign labor if local labor were available.

Let us start this discussion by realizing the urgent need for importing Mexicans to do a job which otherwise will not be done.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Are they drafting farm boys in North Carolina?

Mr. COOLEY. Yes, they are drafting farm boys not only in North Carolina but in all the other agricultural States in the Union.

Mr. GROSS. They are in the State of Iowa, that I well know.

Mr. COOLEY. I would just like to say this, without attempting to discuss the details of the measure before you, that I do hope you will listen as it is discussed. I again urge you to listen to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE], the chairman of the subcommittee that conducted the hearings. He understands all of the problems here presented. If you will listen to him as he presents the bill, I think you can vote more intelligently.

I know none of us want to destroy the labor market, none of us want to break down our immigration laws. We have provided in this bill safeguards which we think will enable us to bring in the labor and return the labor. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] was in Mexico at the time of the negotiations between our Government and the Mexican Government regarding the importation of Mexican labor to our Nation. This problem has been handled at a high level, and we are trying to protect the immigration laws. I think that when the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] comes to discuss the details you will understand the bill better.

NARCOTIC PEDDLERS TO TEEN-AGE DRUG ADDICTS AMERICA'S MAJOR CRIMINALS

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced H. R. 4593 which has for its purpose imposing of life sentences on certain major criminal addicts with death sentences in certain cases where these diabolical criminals are convicted of peddling these habit-forming drugs to persons under the age of 21 years and thereby making them slaves of the drug habit.

Traffic in these habit forming narcotic drugs has become a menace to thousands of young people in our schools and there is a determined effort being made throughout the Nation to stamp

out this nefarious practice. I believe that the severe penalties provided in this legislation, which has also been introduced in the Senate, will be a deterrent to these dope peddlers and will help to destroy this inhuman practice.

Harry J. Anslinger, United States Narcotics Commissioner, has described this increasing traffic in an interview appearing in a recent issue of United States News and World Report which I include as part of these remarks:

[From the United States News and World Report of June 29, 1951]

TEEN-AGE DOPE ADDICTS: NEW PROBLEM?—NARCOTICS CHIEF SAYS ONLY BIG CITIES SUFFER

(Juvenile dope addicts are a sign of the times. Their number is increasing rapidly in the big cities. Youngsters start on marijuana, quickly graduate to other narcotics. Smugglers, dope peddlers keep them supplied. In the following recorded interview Harry J. Anslinger, United States Narcotics Commissioner, tells what is behind the dope spree, where it is centered, and how to combat it.)

Question. Is teen-age addiction to narcotics limited to major cities, Mr. Commissioner?

Commissioner ANSLINGER. Yes; it is.

Question. It isn't spread generally throughout the country?

Answer. No. There is little of it in small cities and rural areas.

Question. Then is there actually an epidemic?

Answer. I wouldn't say an epidemic. We have a situation in the metropolitan centers—New York, Philadelphia, Washington, Baltimore, Detroit, Chicago, St. Louis, and New Orleans.

Question. No city on the west coast?

Answer. We haven't seen it there. In Seattle they say, "What's worrying them back East? We haven't seen it."

Question. Has teen-age use of drugs actually increased in the last few years?

Answer. Yes; it has. It happened after the First World War, too, and the rate was much higher then. I hope it is a temporary phenomenon. It is happening in many other countries. Turkey is one. And you see all this bebop partying in London—marijuana parties and all that. In Japan, the first time they had addiction was in 1940. There is a lot of it now.

Question. Do you trace it to the war?

Answer. I think it is just a general breakdown—breaks in family life, lack of parental control, lack of personal responsibility in the home. Repeatedly we said it was coming, as supply spots were opening in Turkey, Italy, and China, and we might as well face it.

Of course, we thought the returning GI would be a problem, but he didn't turn out to be one at all. He came back perfectly clean and he stayed clean. He stayed out of this. It's the kids who never saw a gun. It is hard to figure out the reasons. Family conditions have a lot to do with it.

Question. Is it correct that addiction among young people has doubled or tripled in 1950 and again this year?

Answer. Oh, it has. I think I made that statement. At the Lexington, Ky., hospital for addicts we find that our average age has dropped 10 years, from 36 to 26, in just 2 years' time.

Question. That is because more teen-agers use narcotics?

Answer. Yes. And they are all from metropolitan centers. High-school addiction, as far as we find right now, is confined to New York City.

They say, educate them. But what education can you give children who are not in school? In a weak mind? Education on

narcotics places ideas. I don't think it is a wise thing.

Question. Is there more addiction among boys than girls?

Answer. It's 10 boys to 1 girl. If anything, the proportion of girls is decreasing.

Question. Are the youngsters who use dope mostly from broken, unfortunate families?

Answer. Yes, they are. And so many of them have criminal records before we get to them. That, again, shows that criminals make addicts and addicts make criminals.

Question. What is the relative use of marijuana, cocaine, and heroin among teenagers?

Answer. Hardly any cocaine. They start on marijuana, then graduate to heroin. Marijuana is the dried leaves and flower of the hemp plant. It is put up in cigarettes, "reefers," and smoked.

Question. Is it illegal to smoke marijuana?

Answer. It is illegal to possess it. And you can't smoke marijuana without possessing it.

Question. Is it habit forming? Is it as dangerous as other narcotics?

Answer. It is habit forming but not addiction forming. It is dangerous because it leads to a desire for a greater kick, from narcotics that do make addicts.

Question. What is heroin?

Answer. A narcotic produced from morphine, which in turn is produced from opium. Its production has been forbidden in this country since 1922.

Question. Do young people get these drugs from peddlers on the streets?

Answer. They have to know somebody in the underworld. They associate with underworld characters, with criminals.

Question. Where do the narcotics come from?

Answer. They are smuggled in, largely from Italy, Turkey, and Communist China. Now Communist China is the unreachable source. They put 500,000 tons of opium, a year's supply for the world, on the market through Hong Kong. But nobody has bought it yet. They tried to exchange it for cotton in this country. I said, "Absolutely no."

I might say that that is about half of our problem now. It's half smuggling and half forging of prescriptions and robbing of drug stores. We have about 130 drug-store robberies a month.

Question. Do narcotics cause an addict to commit crimes or does he turn to crimes to get money to buy narcotics?

Answer. Well, it works two ways. You commit the crime to get the money to buy narcotics. Then you see how easy it is to commit crime when you take narcotics, so you keep on going.

You see, in the hospitals they use narcotics for preoperative care, to relieve tension and fear. If you get a bank-robbery job, or a house, and you get it all figured and cased, naturally you're on tension. A good shot of heroin will take all that tension and fear out of you. That's why those fellows use it and why they are dangerous. Our agents are out there where they are using guns and where there is blood and danger. We have casualties. But usually when they play rough, we do, too—probably rougher.

Question. Just how do narcotics affect a person physically?

Answer. You build up a tolerance, then a habit. You've got to have it at regular hours. That sets up a metabolism in your body, which you can't throw off. It throws you off.

If the drug is denied you, after 8 hours you have 18 different withdrawal symptoms which hit your body. There is diarrhea, there's vomiting, there's perspiration, water running out of your eyes and nose and mouth, cramps, you've got the jitters, and your skin is like a cold turkey. Nature does horrible things to you. It says, "Come on. You've had the pleasure, now pay me." And usually the drug addict lives about two-

thirds as long as the average person. He's very susceptible to tuberculosis.

Question. Can a teen-age addict be cured relatively easily?

Answer. We like to have them 4 months.

Question. Would the cure be effective and complete?

Answer. If he doesn't go back to bad associations. We get repeaters. We get about 4 percent readmission in the age group under 21.

Question. Can a youngster, and his family, who wants to get over the drug habit be protected from humiliation and embarrassment?

Answer. The record is entirely secret—the first time. The second time we have to run it through the courts and they go into the hospital as offenders. The first time, they can just come voluntarily to us or the Public Health Service. An addict anywhere in the country can walk into a police station and say, "I want to be cured." Unless he is a repeater, they will turn him over to us to be cured, secretly and without arrest.

Question. Do parents generally need to worry about this increasing use of drugs among young people?

Answer. Not if they look after their children properly. We don't find addicts among children from good homes. People get a bit hysterical about reports of narcotics sales around school children.

Question. Then the increase in sales and addiction among teen-agers is not a grave menace?

Answer. Certainly it is a menace, as far as the situation goes. And we have to clean it up. It is a social danger. There is no question about that.

Question. It is a menace that can be licked?

Answer. It can be stopped.

Question. How?

Answer. I think the situation in St. Louis probably is cured by the fact that Federal Judge Roy W. Harper gave a peddler there 18 years. There is a general exodus.

We have 180 agents. It's like using blotting paper on the ocean. But we catch them—the smugglers, the syndicates, the pushers, the wholesalers, and the users. We can catch them. But we can't keep them in. They serve about 16 months. We put one crowd in jail, then start on another one. By the time we get the second one, the first is out working again. So it's just a merry-go-round.

Question. Can Congress help?

Answer. The merry-go-round probably will stop if the bills are passed to increase the penalties to a minimum of 2, 5, and 10 years for first, second, and third offenses. Senator DRAXSEN is introducing a bill making it life for the sale of narcotics to minors. We are going to support that.

We would like to increase our force. And of course the Customs Bureau should be given additional guards.

Question. You have 180 agents—one for 800,000 people?

Answer. We had 250 at one time.

Question. What is being done internationally to combat the drug traffic?

Answer. The UN Economic and Social Council will consider next month calling an international conference to approve an agreement to limit opium production in Turkey, Yugoslavia, India, and Iran to medical and scientific needs. The agreement was worked out by the UN Commission on Narcotic Drugs—the first agreement we've had on that since the United States enunciated a policy on it in 1909.

Question. Is there anything States and cities should do?

Answer. We are recommending that States provide heavier penalties. Four States have done it—Tennessee, West Virginia, New Jersey, and Maryland.

We recommend that States and cities provide hospital facilities for drug addicts, instead of saying, "Send them to Lexington." We recommend that States increase the force of narcotics enforcement agencies. Pennsylvania and California have the only adequate forces. City police departments should establish narcotics squads. Los Angeles has the only adequate squad.

Question. Hasn't all the hue and cry about enforcement and teen-age addicts developed since the first of the year?

Answer. Yes, but the situation has been with us and we have been aware of it. Bills have been pending in Congress 2 years, but only now are there signs of action. And, of course, we are getting heavier sentences. If they all did like Judge Harper in St. Louis, we wouldn't need a new law.

A thought-provoking discussion of this nefarious practice appeared in the Pathfinder in its issue of June 27, 1951, as follows:

DRUG PEDDLING, THE DIRTIEST CRIME

For once, at least, New York's junior high-school students had a composition topic assigned them which cut through the tough rind of boredom: What I Know About Narcotics.

Their harrowing, first-hand essays—prescribed as part of a \$50,000 State-wide investigation of dope peddling—hammered home the uncomfortable truth: That all too many of the Nation's kids know too much about narcotics. The total number of addicts in the United States is not large—about 60,000. But two facts alarm officials: The roster has grown by 10,000 in only 2 years; and the proportion of addicts under 21 has jumped from 3 percent in 1946 to 18 percent today.

In New York City alone, police believe, at least 6,000 of secondary school-age children have become addicts, while arrests of teenagers are running at 27 times the 1946 rate.

LOST GENERATION?

It takes a lot to shock a New Yorker about New York. But the story back of these bald statistics, told in recorded interviews by the children themselves, had plenty of Goth-amites in a mood for murder. They learned that boys and girls were smoking "reefers," "snorting" heroin, and "going on the needle" within the schools themselves—in the lunch-room or down in the boiler room or up on the roof. Others were trailing their favorite bebop bands to sleazy joints and mixing drugs with downbeats. Still others indulged in all-night sex-and-narcotics binges in "joy palace" apartments.

For beginners, the children testified, the price is often cheap—at first. Initial doses of heroin are sometimes given free by peddlers; marijuana cigarettes can be had for 75 cents apiece. "Naturally," explained one boy bookie, "if they continued the habit, the price would go up to \$3, \$3.50." Addicts (it takes less than a month to clinch the heroin habit) soon find daily bills running up to \$15.

SOLUTION

For such youthful victims of a conspiracy managed by adults, neither pious horror nor easy pity will suffice. As New York's Attorney General Nathaniel Goldstein has stated: "The public is apathetic. If the public gets all the ugly facts, the public will get mad. Then we will get action—that is the chain reaction of law enforcement."

Last week the chain reaction started popping. In New York police raided dope peddlers in three boroughs, arrested 21. Among them: 39-year-old dancer Ralph Kaye, described as Broadway's No. 1 "pusher." In Washington, the House Ways and Means Committee voted minimum penalties of 2, 5, and 10 years imprisonment for all narcotics vendors. And in Lisbon, Portugal, police of

36 countries¹ met to synchronize their war against the smuggling of drugs by air.

IMPORTATION OF FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL WORKERS

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LYLE].

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, in our consideration of the bill H. R. 3283, made in order by this rule, the first question should be that of its benefit to the farmers of this country. If it will not be beneficial to them, then it has no place on the statute books.

There are, however, at least two other factors which must be satisfactorily resolved. One of these is the question of the Mexican Government's attitude, for if the bill is not satisfactory to the Government of Mexico, then it is not properly before us now for it involves the use of Mexican nationals as farm laborers in this country.

The third element, and one I think extremely important, is the effect this measure may have upon the thousands and thousands of American farm laborers. If it is to affect them adversely, then assuredly it should not pass.

There is a definite shortage of farm labor and American farmers have responded readily to the Government's call for a bumper cotton crop. It is one of the largest in the history of our country, and there is a serious question as to whether there will be labor available to pick it.

However, anyone who would take the time could soon ascertain that it is not the desire of the Texas farmers to employ illegal Mexican immigrants. It is simply not good business. They do not make desirable or dependable workers. The farmers of our area much prefer and as a rule use only American citizens, or, if they are not available in sufficient numbers, then Mexican nationals who have been properly and legally admitted.

The Committee on Agriculture deems this measure to be the best that they are able to bring out after exhaustive hearings. I am convinced, after considerable study, that the measure, as reported out by the House committee, could not adversely affect American farm labor.

However, if this bill were amended in the House as it was in the Senate by adding the so-called Douglas amendment, it would do great harm to hundreds of thousands of splendid Americans of Latin descent, it would humiliate and disgrace them, and it would make informers out of reputable citizens. It is an amendment which has been foolishly introduced without regard to the facts and without regard to the people involved.

Many of our fine citizens are of Latin descent. Their ancestors fought for the independence of Texas and for the freedom of this country in three other wars. They have proven their loyalty and allegiance to this country in a manner which

¹ No United States representatives attended. FBI Chief J. Edgar Hoover boycotted the conference after it refused to help trace four Czechs on grounds the men were refugees, not criminals.

makes their citizenship unchallengeable. Yet, they bear Mexican names. They have the characteristics of the people across the border. They speak Spanish fluently. Yet the effect of this amendment would be to compel them to carry at all times, when they sought employment, proof of their citizenship, in effect, a card saying, "I am an American citizen because I was born in this country and because I have fought for this country."

This House could do no greater disservice to thousands of fine people than to adopt the Douglas amendment. I know that it is popular in some sections among people who are not familiar with the problems involved, or who, understanding, do not care that highly discriminatory legislation is being offered under the guise of protecting so-called downtrodden people. It is popular, yes, and will have great appeal to those who do not know its real effect. But I hope that no Member of this House will vote for an amendment for political reasons or votes which may accrue to them by such sponsorship.

There is a shortage of farm labor in Texas and in other parts of the country. But if the House of Representatives does not feel that it can pass the bill as recommended by the Committee on Agriculture, which has thoroughly studied the problem and has the facts, then let it be defeated. Many farmers will find it difficult, if not impossible, to gather their crops, but I am certain that they would prefer that difficulty, that they would prefer to have their crops go to waste, rather than have this House pass ill-advised legislation which would be calculated to cause much harm to fine Americans of Latin descent and would serve only the illusion of helping to uplift humanity. We do not want illegal foreign labor. We want only a workable, practical, sound program by which they may be brought to this country for seasonal employment under terms which are agreeable to both countries. If we cannot have that, we would prefer to have no legislation on the subject at all.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LYLE. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Has there been some kind of agreement with the Mexican Government on this bill?

Mr. LYLE. Yes.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LYLE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. I think the gentleman means he does not wish anybody to hire anybody who comes into this country illegally. The so-called wetback is one who is in this country illegally, who does not satisfy the provisions of the immigration statutes, the public-health statutes, the narcotic statutes, the McCarran law with reference to internal security. You would not expect anybody to come in without regard to those laws?

Mr. LYLE. Of course not.

Mr. CELLER. All that the Senate bill does with reference to those illegal entrants is to provide a penalty for anybody who conceals or hires or transports any

illegal entrant. He shall be guilty of an offense. As it is now, the law is inadequate, under the decision in *United States v. Evans* (33 U. S.). That decision provides that because of lack of penalty the Department of Labor cannot apprehend those who were guilty of bringing in these illegals.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the bill has already been explained by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, the legislative committee which has so thoroughly considered and reported this bill.

I would like to direct the attention of the House to the fact that this bill is not essentially a bill for farmers, or to help farm production. It has a deeper purpose and a deeper significance than that. The real objective of this bill is to attempt to solve, in an orderly way, a problem which has been of great concern and of considerable trouble to the Governments of the United States and Mexico over a great many years. We all know there are thousands and perhaps millions of Mexicans in the United States. They are here to work and help us harvest the crops and plant them and so on. We also know, the report so reveals, that thousands upon thousands of those Mexicans are here illegally. It is a problem which has plagued our Immigration Service and which has plagued the Government of Mexico. Early this year a meeting was held in Mexico City between representatives of our Government and the Mexican Government for the purpose of working out some details and plans for alleviating this situation, to bring about some orderly way of having Mexican farm labor come into the United States and not be in violation of immigration laws, and not be the subject of controversy as between our two Governments. The meeting in Mexico City resulted in a very comprehensive report, a part of which is embodied in the bill reported by the House. The Government of Mexico now tells us, I think with good reason, that unless there is legislation of this kind, which will make this problem of employing Mexican Nationals in the United States a matter of orderly procedure, the present haphazard procedure by which Mexicans are coming into this country will be terminated as of the end of this month.

Now, without this bill which is now before us, if this rule should fail to pass and the legislation is not considered, our present arrangement with Mexico would be terminated. We would have a far greater area of confusion especially along the border states, far greater than we have now under the arrangement existing; so it seems to me that there is much more in this bill than merely a plan, and it is a specific plan, for the importation of Mexican labor for farmers. The bill is much broader than that; it helps two friendly governments solve a problem which has been mutually disturbing down through the years.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. I think it would be well for the House to know, and I wonder if the gentleman can supply the information, as to what portions of the bill the Mexican Government has agreed to and what portions it has disagreed to?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I would have to let that be answered by members of the committee in general debate. The only answer I can make to the gentleman is that the Mexican Government has said that unless appropriate legislation—and we are told by the committee that this is appropriate legislation—that unless such legislation is passed the present arrangement is to be terminated.

The bill is very simple and it is specific. It has for its purpose as stated in the very first section, section 501:

For the purpose of assisting in such production of agricultural commodities and products as the Secretary of Agriculture deems necessary, by supplying agricultural workers from the Republic of Mexico (pursuant to arrangements between the United States and the Republic of Mexico), the Secretary of Labor is authorized—

To recruit workers and so on, and the bill sets up specific procedure.

Section 502 provides:

No workers shall be made available under this title to any employer unless such employer enters into an agreement with the United States—

The whole procedure is spelled out.

Section 504 provides that workers recruited under this title who are not citizens of the United States shall be admitted to the United States subject to the immigration laws, and so on, under conditions to be specified by the Attorney General.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. How many such employables are available in Mexico today?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. That question will have to be asked of some members of the Committee on Agriculture, one of the students of this subject; I cannot answer the gentleman with figures.

Section 505 provides exemption from certain United States laws for Mexican nationals who are brought in under this arrangement. Then the Secretary of Labor is authorized to enter into agreements with Federal and State agencies, and all the way through, the procedure under which these Mexican laborers will be brought in is spelled out, and I assume and believe it is true, spelled out in accordance with, insofar as the provisions of the bill are concerned, the Republic of Mexico.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of this rule and I urge the favorable consideration by the House, not as a hand-out to farmers, because I do not think the bill is that; I do not think the bill has much of that feature in it at all, although there has been in my opinion a great deal of misunderstanding along that line. I think the bill is necessary to further and complete the friendly relations we now have between the Government of Mexico and the Government of the United States.

I think the bill is sound legislation as reported by the House committee. I wish to make a digression at this point. The other body has also acted on this legislation. The Senate bill up to the last section which was added as an amendment in the Senate is very nearly identical with the bill now before us, but the Senate amendment which has been discussed by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LYLE] goes far afield from the purposes of the bill now before us and deals with subjects entirely foreign to the purposes of the bill; it deals with the matter of criminal penalties against anyone, not just farmers, but against anyone who has knowledge of the presence of an alien in the country and who does not report that knowledge.

So I conclude my remarks on the rule with the warning that the bill as reported by the House Committee on Agriculture is, in my opinion, a sound bill and should not be amended with the amendments which appear in the bill passed by the other body.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Oregon has expired.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL].

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I am for the adoption of this rule and will support the bill. It is, in my opinion, absolutely essential to help the farmers who have been asked to increase their production this year to harvest their crops after they have planted them.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct the remainder of my remarks to the agricultural situation, which may be deemed out of order under the strict rules of the House; therefore, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order for the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, a recent report from the Department of Agriculture crop experts has brought forth the greatest argument that can be used against the need of further price controls and consumer subsidies.

The Department of Agriculture reports the average family of four persons will have 592 pounds of meat available in 1951, which is 87 pounds more than was available during the period 1935-40.

That there will be available to the average family in 1951, 196 pounds of eggs compared to 148 pounds in 1935-40. This means 126 dozen eggs during 1951, or one egg a day for every breakfast for each in a family of four.

The Agriculture Department states that the public will have an 88-percent increase in turkey poundage, greater than in the years 1935-40 when we had a surplus.

Butter is reported to be the only staple food in shorter supply than in during prewar years, and oleomargarine is expected to fill this gap.

RECORD-BREAKING CROP YIELDS

Mr. Speaker, a check this morning with the Department of Agriculture gives indication of the abundant food supply for 1951 which, in fact, carries over into 1952.

WHEAT

Mr. Speaker, here is good news. Over a billion bushels of wheat, will be produced in 1951, a bountiful supply for every person in America and some to export to the rest of the world.

PIGS AND PORK

The biggest pig crop for both spring and fall the country has ever known. The spring pig crop for 1951 is 5 percent above the high record of last year, and the fall pig crop shows an increase of 8 percent—premium ham, pig knuckles, ham hock, spare ribs and bacon in abundance for all.

BEEF ROLLS ON

If the roll-back on beef does not prevent millions of grass-fed steers from rolling into the feed lots of the Corn Belt States where each steer will have added to its carcass an extra 200 pounds of prime beef, there should be such a supply of beef as will cause the price to recede as beef production in the Nation is also above normal.

BUMPER CORN CROP

To feed the extra millions of beef cattle, we will be blessed this fall, according to the present outlook of the Department of Agriculture, with a corn crop that will exceed a billion bushels, probably the largest on record.

Potatoes, like hidden taxes under this administration, cannot be reduced to a shortage or eradicated. This underground tuber against which the people and the Congress have declared war throughout the years continued to produce to the extent that acres of them were left underground, millions of bushels were dehydrated or fed to animals, and millions of bushels were destroyed by the bureaucratic application of kerosene.

They thrived on begrudged subsidies. Regardless of the fight of the people and the restricted measures affecting its production by the Congress, which has been effective in reducing potato production, our good earth will turn out this year 350,000,000 bushels, enough to supply the need of everyone.

CONTROLS NOT NEEDED

With the production of fruit and foods of every other kind supplementing these basic agricultural products, it seems foolish indeed to ask that any agricultural products be brought under price controls, or that present controls on agricultural products should be continued.

Greater production of agricultural products, yes, and manufactured goods of every kind as well, is the only real cure that will stop inflation.

If this Congress and the administration will assure the farmer of this Nation that no controls will be placed on any of his production, and he is urged to produce to the limit, his greater production will not only make a greater contribution to the financial strength of the Nation, but will make a greater contribution than can be made in any other way to prevent inflation and reduce the high cost of living through greater production.

Let us eradicate the cause of inflation rather than perpetrate it by treating only its symptoms.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VURSELL. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. I would like to ask the gentleman if he believes in farm subsidies?

Mr. VURSELL. Only to a certain extent; where they are absolutely necessary.

Mr. BAILEY. All right. Is the gentleman aware that this legislation that he puts his approval on contains both direct and hidden subsidies?

Mr. VURSELL. I would not consider this a subsidy.

Mr. BAILEY. I will take it upon myself to prove it when my time comes.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SADLAK].

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, I am wholeheartedly in favor of this rule and shall support it. The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture has stressed the incisive work and effort put forth by the subcommittee headed by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE]. I feel it is proper that an opportunity be afforded by passage of this rule to have the benefit of the explanation, the investigation, the negotiations with the officials of Mexico and the reasons why the bill H. R. 3283 merits favorable consideration on the basis that the need of farm workers, in this instance, is an emergency measure.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, down through the years it has been, as the honorable Speaker of this House often refers, my high privilege to work at this type of work which is performed by the workers who are covered by this bill. By that I mean to say that in past years I have had the high privilege of chopping cotton and picking cotton and planting cotton and working in the grain fields, and following the threshing machines from the Southwest to the Northwest, working in sugar-beet fields, and performing other types of work such as is performed by the people who are covered in this bill, and I speak from experience.

Mixed up in this international game which we are playing today, with rumors of wars, and with the international contributions that we are making, I wish to say to my friend from West Virginia that if the people of this country want food it is going to be necessary to have a source of supply of workers to produce that food. You have two real sources of raw labor left in the Western Hemisphere applicable to the United States, and that labor is located in old Mexico and Puerto Rico. We do not have any substantial supply of migratory workers any place else except in those two areas. Old Mexico is a foreign republic, and this bill deals with contractual relations between the United States Government and old Mexico. Puerto Rico is a Territorial pos-

session of the United States. Puerto Ricans are citizens, and therefore you have an entirely dissimilar relationship between the people of Puerto Rico and the people of the United States and the Puerto Rican government and the United States Government than you have between old Mexico and the United States. So, when my friend from West Virginia refers to this bill carrying subsidies direct and indirect, it might pay him to give some consideration to what a subsidy consists of. This bill is designed to provide a supply of labor from old Mexico.

In reading the provisions of the bill I find that someone has given a lot of good thought to it because this language is more or less technical. For instance, suppose you as an individual farmer go into old Mexico and try to recruit labor to come into the United States to work your farm lands. Suppose five, ten, twenty-five, or a million other farmers go down into old Mexico and try to bring in workers. You can imagine what a perfect mess we would soon involve ourselves in under such a procedure.

Here the Government of the United States proposes to establish and operate reception centers at or near the places of actual entry of such workers into the continental United States. After those workers are centralized at those centers within the United States, American farmers can go to those centers and pick up their supply of labor, provided the farmers can qualify under this bill.

I think that is one of the most constructive steps this country has ever made since the supply of raw labor disappeared here in the United States. Why did it disappear? Because of our developing economy and the absence of migrants from the Old World, or Western Europe. For years we brought them in by the hundreds of thousands, and there was a constant supply of raw labor coming into this country from Western Europe and from the Near East. In recent years that supply of labor has been discontinued.

In my district in Michigan we have literally hundreds of top-level citizens who came into that part of the country as raw labor recruits, as sugar-beet workers, for instance. They have acquired ownership of very fine farms. Their sons and daughters have been educated at the Michigan State College at Lansing and the university at Ann Arbor. They have gone out into the professions and into the banks and into the hospitals, acting as nurses, doctors, and surgeons. Who were these people? They were raw migrants who came to this country from Europe and found the opportunity here. In my State we have citizens of old Mexico who have done likewise.

Mr. Speaker, I am for the rule and for the bill.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS].

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, in years gone by I used to take a great deal of interest in immigration matters, but of late I do not claim to be anything like an expert. However, I should like to call

the attention of those who are responsible for this legislation to section 509 on page 6 of the House bill.

I have known and everyone else has known for many years that much of the common labor, especially west of the Mississippi River and on the railroads and the farms, and more especially the transient labor, has been Mexican labor. A good portion of these are known as wetbacks. They have come across without any legal entry papers. They come and go as they please. The immigration authorities have on many occasions never been too strict about getting them out, because they knew it would cost them considerable money to get them out, and they knew they would be right back in again.

If this law is to be applied strictly to agricultural labor, that is one thing. I would not be at all in favor of the amendment someone has told me about that Senator DOUGLAS has introduced, because that would work a terrific hardship on the farmers of the West.

We know that farmers generally would be apt to employ any Mexican who would appear to be physically able to do his work, and would not go into any details about how this laborer came into the country, but the Douglas amendment would make him liable for a severe penalty. But getting down now to my objection with reference to section 509 on page 6, it is this: I want to call your attention to it because if I am wrong of course I will be glad to be corrected. It says:

Nothing in this act shall be construed as limiting the authority of the Attorney General, pursuant to the general immigration laws—

That means all the immigration laws—to permit the importation of aliens of any nationality for agricultural employment as defined in section 508.

You surely do not propose through this bill to allow the admission of immigrants of every nationality. Basically in this bill you are contracting for Mexican immigrants and only Mexican immigrants. Then why do you want to give authority to the Attorney General to open all the immigration gates and let everybody in who wants to come in from other countries?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I happen to be responsible for that provision in the bill. The Attorney General now has the authority to make rules and regulations with reference to the importation of alien workers in agriculture.

Mr. JENKINS. Does he have that authority outside of the authority under the displaced persons laws?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. He has had this authority right along and has exercised it.

Mr. JENKINS. I want to understand this correctly now. You say the Attorney General has the authority now to prescribe regulations whereby aliens of any nationality can come in if they

want to work in agricultural employment?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That is true, and that authority has been exercised largely in respect to agricultural workers from the Western Hemisphere. It is true that this agreement only has to do with Mexico, and some of us felt that the agreement should extend further than that. But it was the opinion of the committee and also of others responsible for the legislation that this agreement should be limited to Mexico.

Mr. JENKINS. If that is the case—if the gentleman from Minnesota, who everybody knows is an expert on all agricultural matters—approves of language, and he can guarantee to me that it will be held down strictly within the limitations that he has indicated, then I would have no objection. You can see my position. If you parse that language out, literally you are giving to the Attorney General, pursuant to the general immigration laws, permission to bring in aliens from any country, and then, of course, I would not be for it.

But if you are going to hold it down to mean that under it you bring in immigrants for agricultural purposes only, and bringing them in under the law which controls now, then I have no more to say.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. He has that authority in section 508, which was referred to on line 17. We did not want some other agency of the Government to make some other regulations which might contravene the definition as prescribed by the Attorney General.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. I think there is a bit of confusion here in that the power will still remain for him to authorize the bringing in of foreigners from other countries. The only thing is that when they come in from Mexico they would have to come in under the terms of this act. The House should know that much of the impetus behind the passage of this bill came from the Mexican Government because they insisted on having certain safeguards for their people which are not being given to them now.

Mr. JENKINS. I am sorry about this contractual business. That does not fool me at all. I know we have to make ourselves responsible. Mexico will not do any more than she has to do, and many of our farmers will be called upon probably to pay money that they do not know they are contracting to pay. I do not think this is a very fine thing for our farmers, but I am not going to oppose it because we have this Mexican help all throughout the West now, anyhow, and we might as well use them; and just as the gentleman from Minnesota says, if these other people can come in from these other countries in the Western Hemisphere, with the regulations of the Attorney General applied to them, it might not be so bad.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman from Ohio is one of the outstanding food experts of this country and he knows that we must have labor to produce food.

Mr. JENKINS. You have to have people who know how to do agricultural work and you must have confidence in them.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Independent of what the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN] has said, the bill reads:

Nothing in this act shall be construed as limiting the authority of the Attorney General.

As I understand, this language in itself says in substance the Attorney General has this authority, under the present law—the general immigration law. So I would like to have the point cleared up on the basis of the language contained herein.

Mr. JENKINS. I think the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN] has been sincere and, as he always is, and I am willing to take his interpretation of the language of this section.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. POLK].

Mr. POLK. Mr. Speaker, I am not seriously opposed to the rule. I am deeply concerned about some of the provisions of the bill which this rule makes in order.

Like the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS], I am concerned about immigration and the entry of illegal aliens into the United States.

The bill as reported from the Committee on Agriculture, in my judgment, opens wide the doors to the continued illegal entrance of so-called wetbacks from Mexico. For a number of years this has been a very serious problem in the Southwest and is becoming a serious problem for a great part of the United States. We know that these Mexican wetbacks go as far north as Chicago. They become a serious social problem wherever they congregate in large numbers. They come in as illegal entrants. This bill as reported from the committee, as I said before, tends to give legislative sanction to this illegal entry.

At the proper time it is my purpose to offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute, which will contain the provisions of the bill which passed the Senate. The Senate bill, I believe, is a much better bill than the bill reported by the Committee on Agriculture of the House.

I hold in my hand a letter which I received from the president of the United Latin-Americans of America, Inc., an organization with headquarters in San Francisco. With your permission, I would like to read a portion of that letter:

The following resolution was introduced and adopted unanimously by our members at our general-assembly meeting April 20,

1951, and we urge you to give it your most serious consideration:

"RESOLUTION

"Whereas hundreds of thousands of Spanish-Americans, mostly in Texas, California, and Arizona, have been displaced from their jobs by the importation of illegal labor known as wetbacks, specially in the agricultural fields and urban work.

"These people are Americans who have been in this country for two or three generations. Now they are confronted with disaster, having to leave their homes and belongings because they no longer can make a living. They cannot compete with the miserable wages that are paid to the poor wetback, who has been exploited and compelled to work for pay so low as to be tantamount to peonage. These conditions are intolerable as mentioned in the *Look* magazine, edition of March 27, and also mentioned in the *New York Times*.

Resolved, That a congressional investigation start immediately to bring justice and prosecute the individuals and corporations responsible for the violation of the minimum wage and immigration laws.

"ALFRED A. ESPINOR,
"President."

A few months ago the *New York Times* carried a series of articles by Mr. Gladwin Hill, who spent some considerable length of time along the Mexican border. He made a statement which I think is very significant with reference to these illegal entrants into our country. He said that by this procedure Communists and subversive elements could come in very easily; in fact, he made the statement that Josef Stalin by using a very slight disguise could walk across the border without detection.

There are about 1,600 miles of this Mexican border and about 900 employees to police the border. And that brings up another point. In that area they have what is known as the high law and the low law. They refer to the border patrolmen and the Texas Rangers, whenever they enter into the picture as the high law; but the low law is the term by which they refer to local police officers in the communities. The low law are very often interested in helping the so-called wetbacks get across the border. Because of local pressures local law-enforcement officers make little effort to enforce our immigration laws, and leave the entire problem to the immigration service.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I think it is essential to clear up one or two misunderstandings that have crept into this debate thus far. This bill permits the entrance of a vast number of Mexicans, most of whom I will say will be illegal entrants who would unduly interfere with American labor. The CIO, the A. F. of L., and the railroad brotherhoods are opposed to this bill. I read from the report of the President's Committee on Migratory Labor:

The Commission received evidence that in 1950 domestic workers had been removed from employment from cotton picking in order to accommodate contract Mexican aliens.

The inducements to wetbacks this bill affords will greatly aggravate the situation.

I have before me a communication from the Department of Labor in which it is stated that during the freeze in late January, in early July in certain counties in Texas in the Rio Grande Valley, approximately 10,000 American agricultural workers were unemployed; 45,000 to 50,000 were on relief, and despite that fact between 1,200 and 2,000 Mexicans were working on farms.

Again, between March 12 and 25, 8,191 wetbacks were picked up. Those are illegals who come into the country. Five thousand and sixty-two were employed, while many American workers were on relief and out of work, seeking work. My complaint is not lodged so much against legal entrants as against the illegals, the wetbacks.

What I am primarily interested in is the failure of this bill to provide adequate safeguards against the coming in of the wetbacks. A wetback is one who is illegally in this country. There is no provision in this bill with reference to proper safeguards concerning the public health, and the testimony is replete with evidence to the effect that these illegal Mexican workers coming in here are afflicted with tuberculosis, dysentery, and in some cases leprosy. I understand that we need workers to handle the crops, particularly the additional crops, needed for defense, but when we have these disease-ridden workers handling our food, as they do in the Imperial Valley in California, as they do in New Mexico, Arizona, and Texas, handling the food that we all eat, and when we further consider that this bill does not set up proper safeguards involving public health, we must do something about it. This bill does nothing about it. It actually would encourage wetbacks to come across the border—encourage more disease-ridden Mexicans to handle our raw food. Furthermore, what about internal security? We can pass all the internal security acts we wish, but when we have inadequate border control, and we have an invasion—that is what it is called, an invasion—of Mexican illegals coming into the country, thousands of them undoubtedly imbued with communistic ideas, we run into difficulty. Evidence has been brought to bear on the fact that they come in with communistic literature. There are no safeguards in this bill to protect our internal security. The wetbacks can come in—in fact are encouraged to do so. They are not examined either for health or screened for security purposes.

Let me read to you line 1, page 2 of the pending bill: "to recruit such workers, including any such workers temporarily in the United States."

It does not say that one can recruit such worker whether the worker is here illegally or legally. The legality is immaterial. Are they here? That is all that is necessary. Then they can be hired with no questions asked. No inquiry is made how they got here. That puts the stamp or legality upon those who are in this country illegally. If they are here temporarily they can be employed and recruited.

That must give us pause. It is dangerous to do that. How about the narcotic carriers? The narcotic carriers

can come in without hindrance. The illegal wetback is not examined for narcotics. There is nothing in the provisions of this bill that exclude or that will put proper safeguards against those who would carry heroin, marijuana, and opium into this country. That is a grave danger that I am addressing myself to. At the proper time I shall offer amendments.

How shall the American farmers expand agriculture production to the degree required by our defense program and obtain a sufficient labor supply to harvest these needed crops; and, secondly, should the greed of a few agricultural producers be permitted to endanger the health and the internal security of our Nation?

It now appears that the defense agricultural program will result in the American farmers cultivating approximately 28,000,000 acres for the production of 16,500,000 bales of cotton. The production of foods also is being tremendously expanded. It is the opinion of the manpower experts in our Government that the complete utilization of all agricultural workers in this country will not permit us to harvest these crops. An additional 200,000 to 225,000 agricultural workers may be needed during 1951.

If it is evident that additional agricultural workers are essential to our defense effort, the Department of Labor must be in a position to obtain these workers from friendly foreign countries. The present international agreement between our Government and the Government of Mexico will be terminated by the Mexican Government on July 1, 1951, because it has permitted unscrupulous employers to defraud and mistreat Mexican nationals. The Mexican Government has notified us officially that no additional agricultural workers will be furnished to American farmers unless Congress authorizes the United States Department of Labor to regulate the flow of workers to the United States and to guarantee that Mexican nationals will be paid all amounts due them by American farmers.

The Mexican Government also is concerned about the use of wetbacks—Mexicans entering the United States illegally—by American farmers. It is demanding that no Mexican Nationals be furnished to any employer who also hires wetbacks, and has urged our Government representatives to prohibit entirely the employment of Mexicans entering the United States illegally.

The Mexican border extends for approximately 2,000 miles, and the Immigration and Naturalization Service has a Border Patrol force on duty which consists of only 700 officers. Annual and sick leave, holidays, and the 5-day week reduce this force by approximately 39 percent, leaving only 427 officers available for daily duty. When this group is divided by 3, to get a 24-hour daily coverage, and again by 2, because these officers invariably work in teams of at least 2 men, we find that only 71 Border Patrol teams are available at any one time to cover the entire Mexican border.

Despite its meager force, the Border Patrol back in 1940 apprehended and deported 7,000 wetbacks. Since that

time, however, the flow of wetbacks into this country has reached the proportions of a raging torrent. For 1950 the Border Patrol deported almost 600,000 Mexican illegals. This tremendous increase is the result of two serious blunders. First, certain groups of American farmers are granting employment to wetbacks as freely as they possibly can. They have become so actively engaged in stimulating the desire of Mexicans to enter this country illegally regardless of the consequences to our Nation that the Mexican Government complained very bitterly to representatives of our Government that American employers had come into Mexico and distributed leaflets inviting Mexicans to enter the United States illegally and accept work on American farms. Second, in 1949 representatives of our Government and the Government of Mexico entered into an international agreement which permitted the contracting of Mexican wetbacks for work in American agriculture. When it became known in Mexico that wetbacks were being given legal status and steady employment by American farmers, this country was flooded with wetbacks. The records show that in 1944, when employment of wetbacks was not "legal" fewer than 30,000 wetbacks were apprehended by the Border Patrol. In 1949, however, this figure jumped to more than 300,000; in 1950 it became almost 600,000; and if H. R. 3283, the Poage bill, is passed by the House we can expect the number of apprehensions to exceed 1,000,000.

Because the present small force of border patrol officers cannot possibly apprehend even half of those who enter this country illegally, it is reasonable to believe that another million wetbacks have eluded them and are remaining in this country breaking down labor standards and spreading communicable diseases.

Reference to the breaking down of labor standards by Mexican wetbacks is not merely inflammatory language, but is very realistic. For example, the records of the Texas State Employment Commission have estimated that in Texas alone 80,000 to 100,000 American citizens annually are driven from their homes to enter the migratory ranks of labor because they cannot stay at home and complete with illegal labor. A Government survey revealed that most wetbacks are being paid from 20 cents to 25 cents per hour.

It is also important to know that these wetbacks do not always remain in agriculture. There are no well-supported statistics on this phase of the subject, but Border Patrol officers have apprehended wetbacks as far north as the State of Michigan, where they were employed in various industries. Some of the Members of the House no doubt are aware that it is estimated that as many as 30,000 are in the Chicago area.

An illustration of the danger to American health standards is revealed by the records of the Public Health Services. According to C. R. Kroeger, health officer of Imperial County, Calif., the more than 1,000,000 wetbacks now illegally entering this country annually will infect more than 6,000 Americans with

tuberculosis. Other surveys have revealed that these Mexicans have 12 times as much whooping cough as Americans, that the death rate among babies is 5 to 1 against the Mexicans, and that they have 4 to 6 times as much dysentery and malaria as the average for the United States.

Through examinations by Public Health Service officers, it has been discovered that Mexican wetbacks are, found as I said before, to have a substantial incidence of tuberculosis, syphilis, and other highly communicable diseases. Even a few cases of leprosy have been observed.

I repeat, because these wetbacks handle food which is shipped all over the United States, it is reasonable to believe that the greed of a few American farmers is being permitted to endanger the health of the whole country.

If the facts relating to labor standards and health conditions are startling, the truth about the dangers to our internal security are appalling. Because the border patrol is so busy apprehending, processing, and deporting wetbacks it is unable to do the work for which it was originally designed; that is, protect our borders from subversive elements.

One border patrol officer reported that he and his partner discovered a single group of more than 400 wetbacks crossing the border. Another pair of officers apprehended more than 150 wetbacks at a river crossing one night. The volume of the flow of wetbacks into this country has so completely broken down effective control of our borders that it has created a highway through which this country can be invaded by subversive elements. Although most of the wetbacks are innocent agricultural workers, it would be a simple matter for highly subversive individuals to intermingle with groups of wetbacks as they entered this country. In fact Communist literature has been found on some wetbacks when they were apprehended. It is also well established that much opium and marijuana have been smuggled into this country by people who had joined innocent-looking groups of wetback agricultural workers.

The failure of Congress to treat effectively this wetback situation has made a mockery of the Displaced Persons Act and the McCarran Antisubversive Act. How futile it is for Congress to devote time and energy to debate over the admission to this country of a few hundred thousand European aliens while more than a million others freely pour across our borders.

The wetback problem has extended itself all the way to the Canadian border where the border patrol has stripped its forces to no more than 232 officers in order to bolster the Mexican border group. This is being done at a time when distressing numbers of European aliens have been apprehended who have illegally entered this country through our northern border.

If it were possible to rid ourselves of the wetback problem, the border patrol could then effectively give its attention to the type of alien whose entry is a menace to our Government and its institutions. We must strengthen the hand of the Immigration and Naturalization Service

before we pass a Poage bill. That Service should have its forces increased to the point where it can effectively deal with subversive elements and make our borders secure. It also should have the clear statutory authority to enter places of employment to determine if illegal aliens are there, and also by statutory penalties against harboring, concealing, or transporting illegal aliens.

The international agreement, to which I referred earlier, now has been corrected to prohibit the use of wetbacks by those employers who participate in the program of importation of Mexican workers for American agriculture. Now they are here solely because American agriculture claims it is impossible to harvest crops without Mexican labor. The solution to both our problems is through the passage of good legislation creating an orderly program for the importation of Mexican workers and the outlawing of the employment of wetbacks.

In this endeavor we shall have the wholehearted support of the Government of Mexico whose representatives have repeatedly endorsed the entering of this country by Mexican nationals only through the orderly processes established by law and by international agreement. I repeat, this country can be safe only through the adoption by Congress of legislation such as is proposed in S. 984 with the additional amendments which would strengthen the Immigration and Naturalization Service.

Finally, while I was temporarily absent from the Chamber, I regret to note that the gentleman from California [Mr. WERDEL] injected some remarks of a "racist" character into the RECORD. He implied that I supported the so-called Douglas amendment. He wondered what I would say if the punishment involved therein would be directed against an Irishman or a Jew in New York. That is how colleagues reported to me his remarks which I did not hear. If he made that statement, it has rather unfair undertones. I shall not dignify it with any extend answer. It speaks volumes concerning the thinking of the gentleman, volumes that are not very edifying in my opinion.

I want our laws enforced without regard to race, color, or creed. That is the American way.

Frankly, I oppose the Douglas amendment as being too severe. The gentleman from California is woefully uninformed as to my views.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN].

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York seems to think it is necessary to deal with illegal aliens coming into this country in the present bill. Why, we already have laws on our statute books and if properly enforced they will take care of all the illegal aliens who come into the United States. There is no place for such provision in this act.

The gentleman from Ohio referred to the fact that this bill might make possible the coming into the United States of a lot of Communists. There might be a few come in. But if you will look

at the records submitted by the FBI, you will find Mr. Hoover states that we now have 50,000 or more Communists running loose in the United States, in all parts of the country, in every community, who are operating under orders from Russia, ready to sabotage anything we have on a moment's notice. If I had my way about it, I would take all of the Communists in the United States and their fellow travelers, put them on some of these boats we have now in moth balls, and ship them all over to Russia where they really belong. So that we do not need to have any fear about any great number of Communists coming in as a result of this act.

I would rather not have a bill of this kind to import foreign labor to do certain kinds of agricultural work in this country, but it is absolutely necessary because American citizens will not do the stoop labor that is required in producing a tremendous amount of food in this country to take care of the needs of the American people. At this time when we have an inflationary spiral. It seems rather strange some of the gentlemen who are here advocating stricter controls in the United States are opposed to this bill. The only reason they may be doing that is because we will have a greater shortage of food so that there will be tighter controls and a lot of this food will have to go into the black market at higher prices to the people. This bill should be passed in the interest of the general economy of the country and to increase the food supply for the people.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, permit me to say at the outset that I am a restrictionist when it comes to immigration. I want to see our immigration laws tightened rather than liberalized. But we are faced here with a practical situation. This is not a question of immigration; this is a question of whether we are going to have the necessary labor supply in order to harvest the necessary food and the staples that are produced in this coming year. This is nothing new. It is an old practice, but it has a new angle. These people have been coming here for years, doing this work, but here this year we are engaged in a war. The thing we need above everything else in this war to defeat communism is production and more production. That is the way to defeat communism. Here is a bill that tends to do that, and at the same time it is something that would halt inflation.

Frankly, I am at a loss to understand some of my friends to whom I have yielded time here today. They oppose this legislation. They say that American labor is opposed to this legislation, yet American labor is occupying the forefront today in the advocacy of controls in order to keep down the cost of living. Now, the best way to keep down the cost of living is to produce and to produce and to produce. So, it seems to me that some of my friends who label themselves liberals—and with that I find no fault—should be behind this legislation in order to bring about the production to keep down inflation and prevent the necessity for controls.

Incidentally, I agree with them on the question of controls. I think this inflation has got to be beat and I think the best way to beat it and the best way to stop Russia in its one main objective above everything else in breaking down our economy is to produce, as I said.

The question was raised about the health of these people. Why, this bill provides that safeguards shall be made for the health of these people that are brought in here. So far as I know, that is something entirely new and I think it is a very liberal provision in this bill. Let me say again, although I speak as one who comes from a southern State and a cotton-growing State, that this is not a question of cotton. Yes, we have been using Mexicans over here to harvest cotton for many years. This is not a question of harvesting apples in the Northwest. It is not a question of harvesting beets in the West. This is not a question, as was so appropriately stated by the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH], of aiding the farmer. It is a question in this immediate year of 1951 of assisting the people of the United States, the American farmers, laborers, and all other segments of our economy, in defeating inflation and winning this conflict with which we are engaged with Russia.

Mr. Speaker, I think this bill ought to pass. Frankly, it does not affect me personally any more than it affects you or anyone else. It is all a part of the set-up; of the scheme of defeating communism. I do not see how we can afford not to pass this bill.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3283) to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 3283, with Mr. GORE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE].

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I had hoped it would not be necessary to offer a detailed explanation of the purpose of this legislation, but the remarks of the two gentlemen who have spoken in opposition to this bill and to the rule made it clear that there is much misunderstanding as to both the purpose of the bill and its actual content.

The criticism that has been launched at this proposed legislation so far has been confined to suggestions that illegal entrants were coming into the United States from Mexico and that doubtless after this bill was passed there might still be violations of our laws along the Mexican border. I would readily grant that this bill cannot be expected to prevent the violation of other laws, but surely it will in no wise aggravate the situation.

For the 103 years that the United States has had a common border with the Republic of Mexico there have been individuals who have crossed that border in both directions without the permission of the governmental authorities. Probably such crossings will continue to be made by certain individuals. Certainly this bill in no wise adds to the ability of anybody to cross the border without detection. Certainly this bill in no wise makes it more likely that there will be illegal entrants in the United States. On the contrary, this bill goes a long way toward making it improbable that we will have the substantial numbers of illegal entrants we have had in the past.

Certainly the only effect this bill will have upon the enforcement of the immigration laws will be to make the enforcement much easier than it has been in the past, because it provides a legal method whereby a Mexican can enter the United States, whereas, if you do not pass this bill, there will be no legal method whereby a Mexican can come in, yet the economic magnet of high wages on the north side of the Rio Grande as opposed to the very low wages and poor living conditions on the south side will continue to draw Mexican workers across that river just as it has during the past 100 years.

If perchance additional legislation in regard to purely immigration matters is needed, the gentleman who so recently addressed you, the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, might well consider bringing in such legislation, but to condemn the Committee on Agriculture because that committee properly exercised a function which is within its jurisdiction and did not seek to extend its jurisdiction into a field over which the Committee on the Judiciary has unquestioned jurisdiction, seems to me to be a little unfair and uncharitable on the part of the chairman of that committee. Why blame us if the chairman of that committee does not bring in the type of immigration legislation that he wants? We are not writing immigration laws. We are amending the Agricultural Labor Act. We are not trying to change or add to or diminish existing immigration laws. In our strict endeavor to try to leave the jurisdiction of other committees to those committees, we wrote a provision in this bill which was questioned here on the floor, which provision simply says that nothing in this bill shall be construed to interfere with the powers that the Attorney General now has. The gentleman from Ohio questioned the propriety of that. We are simply saying all the way through that we are trying to provide adequate agricultural labor for this country. When we have done that the Committee on Agriculture is not concerning itself with social reforms or immigration laws or with the jurisdiction of the Attorney General of the United States. We have sought here to bring to the House legislation which would correct an obvious evil. If members of other committees feel that reforms within the jurisdiction of their respective committees are needed, let those members bring legislation out of their own committees.

Let me review the circumstances that make this legislation necessary: Throughout all these years, as has already been stated, many of our farmers have used Mexican labor. Sometimes it has come into the country legally, and other times it has come in without benefit of law. But it has come into this country. Why does it come? Right now the wages on the Mexican side of the river are possibly 2 pesos a day. A peso is worth less than 20 cents—that is less than 40 cents for a day's work on the south side of the river. In the lowest wage areas on the United States side that same worker can make more than that amount by 1 hour's time.

On the Mexican side of the river the population is pressing against the means of subsistence with such tremendous force that the Mexican worker who wants to provide for his home and family—and my experience with those people is that they have the same love of family and home that you have for your family and home—that man sees the opportunity to cross the Rio Grande and goes to the north and there in a few weeks' or months' time makes more to support his family than he could by working a year at home. He works on the American side. He goes home and takes with him the means whereby he purchases the necessities of life for himself and family. He, his family, and his country profit thereby. And what of the north side of the river? Here we are producing what we hope will be some of the largest crops in history, our vegetable crops and our fruit crops, our beet crops and cotton crops, all need much more stoop labor than is available on the American side.

Last year we grew less than 10,000,000 bales of cotton. This year, if the season remains good, we will harvest between 16,000,000 and 17,000,000 bales of cotton, a 60- to 70-percent increase.

Last year we were barely able to pick that cotton crop with the labor force that was available—and it included a substantial number of Mexicans, both contract Mexican nationals and illegal entrants. Since that time there have been thousands of American boys who have left those farms and gone to work in the industries of the Nation, in the war plants, and in the Armed Forces of the country. Our own labor force is not nearly as large as it was 1 year ago. We were barely able, with a long picking season, to gather 9,750,000 bales of cotton. With sixteen or seventeen million bales this year and a smaller force to gather it, how can we hope to save that fiber without the help of our neighbors to the south? How can we hope to save the fruits and vegetables on the Pacific coast without our neighbors to the south? How can we hope to save the beet crop of America without someone who is willing to get down on his hands and knees and do the stoop labor required to do it?

So we have turned, as always, to Mexico, seeking the needed labor.

We have had an agreement with Mexico whereby Mexican nationals come into this country under contract, but the Mexican Government has said that agreement was not favorable enough to

the Mexican nationals, and they wanted it amended in numerous respects.

I went to the city of Mexico about the 1st of February and the chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture went. We worked with representatives of our State Department and with representatives of the Mexican Government, seeking to secure a new agreement. The Mexicans demanded first that the United States agree to a contract between the Government of the United States and the Mexican workers. They insisted that the United States Government be the employer of every Mexican worker in this country. They said in that way they would know that they would get paid, that they would be properly treated.

We took the position, and I think we were right, that it would be improper for the United States to become a broker in human lives, human labor. We took the position that the United States would not employ Mexican labor and then subcontract it to someone else, like you might sell a herd of cattle. We finally convinced the Mexican officials that the dignity of their citizens required that we reject that proposal of governmental contracting.

Then they said, "We must have some guarantee that the Mexican worker who comes to the United States will be paid; he cannot rely upon the courts." Of course he cannot. How can a worker, who has a few dollars coming to him and who lives in the Guadalajara or Hermosillo come back to the United States to collect \$30 due him for work in Arkansas or in Colorado? Oh, the Federal Court is open to him, but how can he get before it, and how could he stay around and litigate the matter? We realized that he could not. So we agreed with the Mexicans that the United States Government would guarantee that these wages would be paid.

Then we said we wanted that contracting done on the American side of the border, because that is the only way we can get it done with the efficiency and dispatch that we feel is necessary. We felt there was too much delay in going down to Monterey and Hermosillo and Chihuahua to make those contracts. The Mexicans finally agreed, but they said, "You have to guarantee the transportation of our workers up there during the time they are employed." So the United States agreed that we would send our immigration officials and health officials and Department of Justice officials to make a security check down to Hermosillo and Monterey and Chihuahua, and there we will make an examination of the Mexican workers, just as we have heretofore made it on the border when they came in. We will then give clearance to those Mexican workers at those points, and the United States Government will bring them to recruitment centers on the American side of the river or the American side of the American boundary farther west, and there, on the American side, the American farmer will come and, under the terms of this bill, he will be allowed to employ any Mexican he wants, and he can reject any individual Mexican whom he does not want to

employ. The individual Mexican has the same right; if he does not like your looks and thinks you will not be a good boss he has the right to say "I do not want to work for you."

But the American employer who goes and gets those men must then and there pay the United States Government for the expense it has been to bringing them in. We did not propose to have the United States Government subsidize the transportation of workers either within or without the United States; on the contrary, we said in this bill that the employer must reimburse the Government for all of the expenses incident to bringing those individuals in except the ordinary expenses of maintaining the immigration service and other services which would go on whether they brought these contract laborers in or not. We put a limit of \$10 upon these expenses in this bill. This limit is intended to restrain the Government, not to relieve the employer. This action has been criticized. It is claimed that it would constitute a subsidy, because it has been said that the Government would spend more than \$10. Maybe the Government will spend more than \$10, but this limitation will certainly tend to restrain the Government. The Government need not and should not spend more than \$10.

We put the \$10 limit on as a limitation on the Government not for the purpose of giving anybody a subsidy. I hold in my hand a number of affidavits as to the actual cost of bringing Mexicans from Monterey to various points in the United States last year and some of them this spring. Incidentally, I see right here that the cost of bringing and maintaining workers from Hermosillo to Nogales was \$2.10 on May 16, 1951. It cost \$2.15 to transport workers from Monterey to McAllen, Tex., on May 12, and to provide them with two meals; \$3 for first-class transportation and two meals from Monterey to Hidalgo, Tex. These are the actual costs that are current now. That means that a round trip costs less than \$5 at the present time. We figured it would cost the Government more than it would cost an individual—it always does—but we thought that if we should let the Government take twice as much as an individual that that ought to be very liberal and that that was hardly a subsidy to the farmer to make him pay twice what he would normally have to pay as an individual.

No, Mr. Chairman, there is no subsidy in this bill. This bill provides that the man who employs the Mexican will pay all the costs; then it provides that he will pay the current wages in the community, and it provides that he shall not have the opportunity to recruit any Mexican until the Department of Labor—not the State Department as some have suggested, not the Department of Agriculture which might be accused of being biased toward the farmer, not somebody else—but until the United States Department of Labor finds: First, that there are not enough American workers in the community to do the work; and, second, that the importation of Mexican nationals would not impair the wage standard or living conditions of Americans if those Mexican nationals were brought in.

Those things have to be affirmatively found by the United States Department of Labor before any man can get a certificate to bring in a Mexican national. After that has been found and after the American employer has brought the Mexican national in, the American employer has got to pay his transportation, his subsistence while he is bringing him in, provide him with a place to live when he gets there, and then he has to pay him current wages.

Now, do you believe—and I want to submit this to the intelligent businessmen in this House and I want you to hear me and I want you to answer it honestly and fairly in your own conscience—may I ask the membership to search your own conscience and ask yourself can you honestly say that there is any reason to believe that any American farmer would employ Mexican nationals under the terms of this bill if competent American labor were present, ready, and willing to do the work? Remember that American labor will cost exactly the same per day, per hour, or per hundred as the Mexican labor and in order to use Mexican labor the farmer has got to pay in addition the transportation, subsistence and other charges. Do you think they are going to pay a bonus to use this Mexican labor? I do not think so. I do not believe it will be done. We have given the strongest guaranty that can be devised to American farm labor that we are not going to allow any harmful competition with American labor. I think these economic guaranties are far stronger than any political or legislative guaranties that we might write into the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. The chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary made a speech which indicated that the wetback situation might involve a health risk. As we visualize this bill, all of the Mexicans coming in will be screened; they will be healthy; they are supposed to be honest upright farm workers. Is that true?

Mr. POAGE. That is right.

Mr. COOLEY. We are trying to improve the wetback situation?

Mr. POAGE. That is right. I tried to point out that we are proposing under this bill to send American health authorities to Hermosillo and other places down there. The Mexicans got in here before and there was no screening. If he had the most loathsome disease all we could do was to send him out if we could get him out. Now under this bill we will send American authorities down into Mexico, we will go over every one of these individuals, we will give them a physical examination, a health examination, a security examination, and we will do all of that in Mexico. If the worker does not meet our tests he will never get a chance to ride to the border.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman was in Mexico during the period of negotiation

between our Government and the Mexican Government?

Mr. POAGE. Yes; I was.

Mr. COOLEY. This contract was worked out at that level?

Mr. POAGE. That is right.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman is of the opinion this will bring about a situation greatly improving that which has heretofore existed?

Mr. POAGE. There is no question about that. If you do not pass this bill, if you leave us with no contract with Mexico, then you are going to make inevitable some of the things that *Look* magazine, *Collier's*, and the other articles have depicted and tried to play up as being the result of the legal importation of Mexicans but without one scintilla of evidence to support those charges, for in every case when you run those down they came back to the proposition of wetbacks in the United States who have entered this country illegally. If you do not provide a legal method of entrance, the Mexican workers will come in anyway.

Again, let me ask you to search your own conscience. Under this bill these Mexican workers have an opportunity to make a choice between entering the United States under a legal contract, where their rights are preserved, and, on the other hand, of coming in as a wetback, an illegal fugitive from the law. Which choice will they make? I am sure you would come to the conclusion that they will come in under the contract system. We give the Mexican worker that choice under this bill. We give him the opportunity to come in legally. If you defeat this bill and there is no opportunity for a Mexican to come in legally, they are going to be forced to resort to swimming the river. I think that the matter is perfectly clear. This bill greatly improves the condition of the Mexican worker, of the American worker, and of the American farmer who must rely upon some kind of orderly entrance of the Mexicans in order to have a proper distribution of farm labor in those parts of America where we need it and not simply where it is easiest for the Mexican to go.

Mr. COOLEY. Under the situation which has existed, the wetback could very easily be exploited; but under this contract arrangement he is protected in every respect?

Mr. POAGE. Exactly.

Mr. COOLEY. He cannot be exploited by a ruthless or heartless landlord here in this country?

Mr. POAGE. That is exactly the protection this bill provides. We have made provision whereby a Mexican can stand up and make a contract of employment with the assurance that he is dealing within the law and with the protection of the law. This bill attempts to give protection where protection is needed. This bill attempts to provide a workable piece of legislation that will allow us to harvest this year's crop.

This bill has been discussed with the Mexican officials. If it is passed, I am sure that we can extend the agreement with Mexico. If it is not passed or if it is materially amended I fear that we

will have no agreement with Mexico and that this year's crop will be lost.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL].

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I want to discuss first the bill itself, but prior to that I will say a word about the reasons before I discuss what is in the bill.

I might add in the beginning that I know something first hand about migrant labor. For more than 30 years I have lived in a beet sugar producing area. For several of those years I was teaching in the center of one of those communities where we used Mexican labor. I have had Mexican students under me while I was teaching. We like to call them Spanish-Americans or Americans of Spanish descent. They are very good students, always willing to cooperate with the school authorities, and their parents likewise. So, I do not come before this group this afternoon and speak without any personal experience.

Mr. Chairman, I know that we should understand exactly what we are trying to do. The thing that this House needs to do, that this Nation of ours should have done, is the thing that is contained in this bill. Why do we need any outside laborers at all? The answer is evident; the answer is obvious. The farmer is in a different position than any other type of employer. We need this special labor at a certain specific time in the harvesting of the crop. You may need it in the planting season. That may be the time of the shortest and sharpest need of outside or migrant labor. It may not be there. It may be in the bean-picking season. Again, it may not be in the middle of the summer; it may be in the fall during the harvest. Now, we must have this labor during a short period of time and during that particular time we cannot harvest our crop without that help. If it is the planting, we cannot plant the crop without the help.

I might say further that I believe in the last 10 or 15 years we have mechanized at the greatest speed possible that ever occurred in any nation in the history of the world, but you cannot mechanize everything. Some things must still be done by stoop labor. Some work on the farm must still be done by hand labor. Even in the finest dairies in this country they still use the hand to strip and take the last milk out of the cow's udder. I know some do not do it, but that is what they should do, and it is the same with other farm work. We must use hand labor.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON. To illustrate what the gentleman says, take cherries, apricots, and grapes. Thousands and thousands of tons have to be hand picked, and the harvesting season is very short in some of those crops; some only 10 to 15 days.

Mr. HILL. Exactly.

Mr. JOHNSON. And while the farmer and his wife and children can

do all the other work, when the time comes to harvest they require 25 times that amount of help.

Mr. HILL. And that very thing is not understood by a good many of the gentlemen that are going to oppose this bill. In the harvesting of potatoes 10 days may mean the entire loss of the potato crop, yet Members will stand on the floor and pretend you can harvest those potatoes over a period of 3 months.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Can the gentleman tell me whether the Mexicans are good cow milkers, or do they milk goats?

Mr. HILL. With the mechanization we have today, yes, anybody can milk a cow, even someone who never saw one before or someone who does not know which end produces the milk.

I cannot yield further.

I want to mention what the bill provides. First, it provides a way to recruit these Spanish-Americans in Mexico that you have never had before under any organized legislation. It provides the establishment of reception centers and gives a program to direct them in a way that you have not had before. It also provides more in the way of medical care and subsistence than the Spanish-American people have ever had.

There are several other provisions that are not as important as the one I mentioned, but the bill also provides that you may go to this reception center and secure your own employees. It gives the Spanish-American the right to turn down a particular job if he wishes.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and five Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. HILL. Now I should like to discuss how you get these Spanish-American workers. First of all, you must enter into a contract with the Federal Government of the United States. You just do not go down to Mexico and get your help. You make an agreement with the United States Government that you will do certain things, and they are spelled out as plain as they can be in the bill.

Section 503 states that no workers recruited under this title shall be available for employment in any area unless the regional director, Bureau of Employment Security, United States Department of Labor for such area has determined and certified that there are not sufficient laborers in the area to do the work.

There is no use of anyone's getting up on this floor and crying about us in the fruit areas working children. That is out of the picture. I am surprised they have not already mentioned that. Now they have transferred the argument about child labor to wetbacks. So this afternoon you have had a demonstration of those ready to shed tears about bringing in wetbacks. I do not qualify my statement one particle. The evidence is there. I never saw a wetback, to my

knowledge. I will have a little bit more to say about that later. I would not know one if I met him in the beet field. I dare say that probably not a gentleman on this floor can identify one to save his neck from a noose.

So there is a very slim line between a wetback and whatever other words you would like to use. It is nothing in the world but window dressing and camouflage. Let me just digress a moment and tell you what happened in my own area less than a year ago.

These very men they were talking about went out all over the country to find out how badly we were treating these wetbacks. He did not know a thing about them. He came into my territory and called me up, and told me where he had been. What did he do? He brought a photographer with him to take a picture. He waited until we had a flood down there in that dry area where it only rains now and then, and then he said, "Where are those folks kept?" And he sent the picture all over the country, back here to the East, so that you could see all these poor Spanish-Americans wading around in the mud ankle deep. Why, bless their silly hearts, we were so glad when we got that rain. We were praying for it.

Now we have even gone one better than that. Do you know what we have done now? Do you know what we have now? We have rain-makers. He probably could have gotten his picture with less trouble if we had rain-makers last years.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. FISHER. What this bill does, as I understand it, is to create an orderly procedure whereby the Mexican nationals may be processed in old Mexico and thoroughly screened with respect to their health conditions and any possible subversive elements that might be amongst them.

Mr. HILL. That is right.

Mr. FISHER. That is done by the officials of the Department of Justice and the Public Health Service officials and the immigration service, and after all of that is done, then they can cross the Rio Grande into our own processing camps, and after they are so brought across, then they are permitted to work for any individual who might meet the conditions contained in this bill, and in the agreement that we have with the Mexican Government.

Mr. HILL. The Government has the set-up, and the employers can pick out the employees and the employees can pick out the people that they would like to work for.

Mr. FISHER. The passage of this bill would be a death blow to this wetback situation about which we have heard so much today; is that not correct?

Mr. HILL. Yes. There is another thing I want to say, and that is this is a temporary bill. This bill expires on December 31, 1953. What we are trying to do here is to take care of the situation during this war emergency.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. BAILEY. Would the gentleman be kind enough to explain to the Committee why the Committee or the Subcommittee on Agriculture proposed to set aside provisions of the Internal Revenue Code in that these workers will be exempted from the payment of income taxes, and why they propose to set aside provisions of the Social Security Act? I think there is some explanation due the Committee from somebody on this proposal.

Mr. HILL. Exactly. Remember what the question is, and I am glad to have the question, because everyone listening here this afternoon will see what is wrong with this discussion on this bill and with the opposition. How in the world could you put a man under that kind of a tax and under that kind of a plan who comes in to harvest a crop and then goes back to Mexico?

Mr. BAILEY. There is plenty of sense in the question.

Mr. HILL. I refuse to yield any more. I have no time to answer foolish questions.

Mr. BAILEY. Many of them never go back to Mexico.

Mr. HILL. That is no question at all, because it has nothing to do with that. A man comes here for 3 months or 2 months or 30 days and then the gentleman wants to put him under the Social Security Act. The workers recruited under this act are those who are not citizens of the United States, who shall be admitted to the United States under the present immigration laws.

Now, go back and change your immigration laws, if you want what the gentleman says.

There is another element that I want to mention. You are going to have someone propose an amendment that was placed in the bill in the other body. I want to call your attention to that amendment. I am going to jump the gun on that amendment and show you how foolish it is. I want to read it to you and then you do your own thinking. Far be it from me to even give you any advice. I quote:

Any person who shall employ any Mexican alien 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, when such person knows or has reasonable grounds to believe or suspect or by reasonable inquiry could have ascertained that such alien is not lawfully within the United States, or any person who, having employed such an alien without knowing or having reasonable grounds to believe or suspect that such alien is unlawfully within the United States and who could not have obtained such information by reasonable inquiry at the time of giving such employment, shall obtain information during the course of such employment indicating that such alien is not lawfully within the United States and shall fail to report such information promptly to an immigration officer, shall be guilty of a felony, and upon conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine not exceeding \$2,000, or by imprisonment for a term not exceeding 1 year, or both, for each alien in respect to whom any violation of this section occurs.

Let me just whisper this to you. If a man hired 50 of them—I tell you, you cannot define them—and then if he puts them to work and some smart egg from the city of New York, who knows all about farming in the West—and I am not talking about any Member of Congress—comes along—

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. Not until I have finished. If he finds that he has employed 50 wetbacks to pick his bean crop he only would go to the jug for 50 years, that is all, and be fined \$2,000 each. You multiply that by 50, and you will see how foolish that is. You cannot even start to enforce such a law.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. If the gentleman will give me some more time.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I will yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. CELLER. The gentleman had occasion to mention me. Will he yield?

Mr. HILL. I am going to read first from the Farm Bureau publication, and then I will yield if I have time.

The Farm Bureau paper of June 18, 1951, says in talking about this labor bill:

1. The constructive approach to the problem of illegal immigrants is to first provide an orderly, legal means of meeting the economic need on both sides of the border. Until this program has been developed, the punitive approach to the problem will only create confusion and unrest.

2. Farmers in the areas most affected have already expended effort, time, labor, and money to meet the increased production goals of the Department of Agriculture. To establish new "rules of the game" at this time of need for peak agricultural production would inevitably result in losses of production.

3. The bill would throw the major burden of enforcement of immigration law on farmers. It is difficult or impossible to distinguish between United States citizens of Mexican ancestry and Mexican nationals. Over 2,000,000 citizens claim Spanish as their mother tongue. These citizens would be required to carry evidence of citizenship. They would be handicapped in obtaining employment as compared with other citizens.

4. The amendment is not germane to an emergency farm-labor bill.

That is what the great American Farm Bureau, with hundreds and hundreds of thousands of farm members all over the United States, says about this Senate amendment.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. FISHER. The gentleman read from an amendment which has been adopted in the Senate which makes it a penitentiary offense for an American to employ a Mexican alien. Is there anything in that provision that would make it a penitentiary offense for someone in New York, for example, to employ a Pole, or a Russian, or an Italian, or some other illegal entrant in New York?

Mr. HILL. Of course there is not, and there will not be, I may say to the gentleman, for some time any such amendment as the gentleman speaks of.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER].

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill introduced by my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE]. I earnestly urge the House to adopt this bill. It has the support of the American Farm Bureau Federation, also the National Grange.

I should like to point out just a few facts about California, particularly the district I represent, which is the Ninth Congressional District located in the San Joaquin Valley in California. There will be a record crop this year of cotton and canning vegetables according to a report which I received, dated June 22, from the California State Board of Agriculture. The production of cotton this year will be up 60 percent and the production of canning vegetables will be up 35 percent. Last year we had in cultivation in California about 600,000 acres in cotton. I have been informed that this year we will have about 1,250,000 acres of cotton. Other crops, including crops of tree fruits will be of above-average yields.

The demand for farm labor in California will be the greatest in history, but at the same time the supply of farm labor has greatly diminished. The reasons for this are two-fold: One, inductions into the military service; and two, more attractive fields of employment, such as in the defense industries.

The conclusion is obvious that unless we have a supplemental supply of labor from the outside there will be serious crop losses. The situation is very much the same as it was during World War II when at the peak of demand we employed in California, under Public Law No. 45, some 36,600 Mexican nationals. In addition to that we employed 14,500 prisoners of war.

The Mexican Government has announced cancellation effective June 30 of its present agreement with the United States under which Mexican nationals are employed in this country, and unless we have enabling legislation, Mexican agricultural workers will no longer be available for employment in the United States. So I cannot impress upon you too greatly the extremely critical situation with which California agriculture is faced.

Mr. HAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. HUNTER. I yield.

Mr. HAND. I would like to suggest to the gentleman who is making a very clear and interesting statement that all the way across the country, especially in the State of New Jersey we are faced with identically the same conditions, and while we may not have any direct interest in Mexican labor we do have a direct interest in Puerto Rican labor, and we feel that the South and the West may take this from us unless they have an ample supply of their own. We cannot harvest our own crops in New Jersey, which are important to us and important to the war effort, without an additional labor supply. I am perfectly willing, as I am sure the gentleman is, to listen to any proper amendment to safeguard the rights of the workers, but the workers we do need all over the country.

Mr. HUNTER. That is correct.

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and three Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, this labor shortage is not the figment of the farmers' imagination. The situation is acknowledged both by the United States Department of Labor and also by the California Department of Employment.

In a letter written to me by Secretary of Labor Maurice J. Tobin, Secretary Tobin stated:

We anticipate that we will have shortages despite the use of older men and women and youth who are not normally a part of the agricultural labor force in California.

Mr. Tobin further stated:

We have approached the problem on the basis that we take steps to assure a supplementary supply of agricultural labor from Puerto Rico, Hawaii, Mexico, and Canada to be brought in if the need for a supplementary supply of such labor should develop. We wish to make available the labor which will insure production for the national interest.

Mr. O. W. Farney, who is the San Joaquin Valley supervisor for the farm-placement service of the California Department of Employment, advises that in the Ninth Congressional District, which I represent, the demand for farm labor will reach its peak in October, during which an estimated 127,075 agricultural laborers will be needed. This compares with a peak of 78,970 in October 1950. This figure represents total hired labor force in agriculture and excludes farmers and unpaid family workers.

It has been said by those who oppose this bill that this is nothing more than a scheme to get cheap labor for the big farmers. Such a contention is not in line with the facts. In my district, whether a man owns 40 acres of grapes or 1,000 acres of cotton, he is going to need help in getting his crops off. Farmers, big and small, need help in harvesting their crops.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. They have to be paid the prevailing wage?

Mr. HUNTER. Yes.

Domestic labor is protected under this bill. It is not the intent of the farmers in my district to use Mexican labor to beat down the wages of our own American citizens. The bill provides that no workers shall be recruited from Mexico unless the Department of Labor testifies that, first, sufficient domestic workers are not available; and, second, employment of such workers will not adversely affect the wages and working conditions of domestic agricultural workers.

The bill does not involve a raid on the Treasury. Farmers are required to arrange and pay for transportation for workers from the Mexican border to places of employment. In addition, farmers must reimburse the United States Government for charges incurred

by it for the transportation and subsistence of such workers from points in Mexico to reception centers on the border.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUNTER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. It strikes me, in reading the bill, that there might be a difficult problem of administration, and I wondered whether the Secretary of Labor or any other witness gave your committee any estimate of the proposed cost of administering the bill over and above the reimbursement which might come to him from the farmers themselves.

Mr. HUNTER. I am not a member of the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. KEATING. I beg the gentleman's pardon.

Mr. HUNTER. That testimony is not available to me. I would like to make this point though, since the gentleman brought the subject up. If this labor is not made available and serious crop losses result, the loss in income tax to the United States Government and also excise taxes will be far in excess of any cost of administering this program. Take my district, for example. It only comprises four counties. The value of crops in the district in 1950 was about \$550,000,000. It will probably be around \$750,000,000 this year. Say the applicable income-tax rate is 30 percent, and a loss of income of \$100,000,000 is suffered because of crop losses resulting from a lack of farm labor. Then the loss of income-tax revenues from those four counties would be \$30,000,000.

Mr. KEATING. I appreciate the force of the gentleman's argument, but it does seem to me that we ought to be very careful at this time in passing these bills giving wide authority to the head of an executive department to administer a law, because they so frequently come back to us and say, when it comes to appropriation bills, "Now, you in Congress authorized such and such an activity, and the expense of it is a large sum of money," and oftentimes there is very little we can say in reply to that. It seems to me, and I am very open to be convinced otherwise, that the obligations which are placed upon the Secretary of Labor under the provisions of this bill might entail a rather expensive administration.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUNTER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I would like to say to my colleague from New York that the purpose of this legislation is to get labor to produce more food, and by producing more food for the people of the country we lower the price of food, and the end result will be a gain for the American people if there is a little loss in the expense of the administration of the act.

Mr. KEATING. Presumably, under a normal economy, what the gentleman says is true, that the more food you produce the cheaper it will be, but some of

the consumers in my area seem to doubt whether those laws are now operative.

Mr. HUNTER. As for the charges that these Mexican nationals are exploited, mistreated, and underpaid, allow me to point out these facts: In my district, these people are protected in their working conditions and wages by State and local regulations, which the farmers must meet. Not only must the farmers go to the added expense of paying the transportation of Mexican nationals from points within Mexico, but they are also obligated to pay the going rate for farm labor generally in the area. Today in my district the lowest rate being paid for farm labor is 80 cents an hour. The average rate for cotton picking last year was \$3.50 per hundred pounds. That rate, or an even higher one, will prevail this cotton-picking season. That means that the average cotton picker working no more than 8 hours a day will make a minimum of from \$12 to \$16 per day.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUNTER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON. The reason those farmers and all organizational groups agreed to this bill is because they are in such desperate need of getting this labor during the harvesting period; is that not correct?

Mr. HUNTER. That is correct. Ed Hayes, Chief of the Farm Placement Service, said that we will probably have in California a farm-labor shortage of 75,000 this summer and fall. By using domestics from outside of California, by using housewives, by using school students, and by using soldiers during time off to earn extra money, we will still have a shortage of some 50,000, which, as you can see, can result in a very serious crop loss.

There is one more point I want to make in closing, because it has been brought up earlier today. It has been said that this bill will help the Communists and let Communists into the United States. I inquired of the Department of Justice very recently if there was any evidence of Communists infiltrating the farm-labor program from Mexico to the United States. On April 24 I received a letter from the Acting Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, in which he said:

Actually, we know of no instance so far of a Communist agent having succeeded in infiltrating the farm-labor program.

Mr. HAND. Mr. Chairman, supplementing my brief remarks, I wish to read a letter from the New Jersey Farm Bureau:

NEW JERSEY FARM BUREAU,
Trenton, N. J., June 14, 1951.

HON. T. MILLET HAND,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MILLET HAND: The labor situation on farms in our State, as well as in most other States, continues to be very critical. In view of the terrific demands for food at this time, it is imperative that appropriate action be taken by the Congress to insure labor requirements and no action be taken that will in any sense lessen the supply.

Many of our Central and Western States rely upon Mexican labor and this labor has

made possible food production which continues to meet the consuming demands of the people of our country.

In our State, the farm bureau has developed a labor project known as Garden State Service. This organization recruits in Puerto Rico, transports, and cares for workers in New Jersey, for the season from April till November. This is all accomplished through contracts with the department of labor in Puerto Rico, with the approval of the United States Employment Service. We are proud of this job and recently the President's Migrant Labor Commission has complimented the farmers in this area on the program.

Now, if the Mexican labor program is not cleared up there will be terrific demands on our sources of labor from Puerto Rico. Therefore, New Jersey does have a great interest in the Mexican issue.

We do not concur in the Douglas amendment because we cannot support the idea that farmers should become policemen to ascertain if the labor whom he happens to employ is a United States citizen of Latin American ancestry or a Mexican national.

It seems to us that the only constructive approach to the wetback problem is to work out an orderly and legal means for meeting the economic needs of both sides of the border. It is only after a workable approach to the problem has been demonstrated that any rational program can be undertaken.

I write to remind you of the interest of our farmers in this Mexican problem, trusting you will keep us in mind when the House of Representatives acts on this bill.

Sincerely,

HERBERT W. VOORHEES,
President.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. POLK].

Mr. POLK. Mr. Chairman, I assure you that I am just as much interested in helping the farmers of America secure sufficient labor as anyone here present. I am a farmer and have been engaged in agriculture practically my entire life. I live on a farm and I know the problems which we farmers face with reference to labor. However, this problem involves so many other very serious issues that I believe the bill as reported by the Committee on Agriculture is bad legislation.

The problem of migratory labor in the United States has become so serious that several months ago the President of the United States appointed a Commission on Migratory Labor. I hold in my hand a copy of that report. It contains about 188 pages of very enlightening information concerning this very, very serious problem. I regret very much that our Committee on Agriculture did not have before us during the hearings on this farm labor bill the information that is contained in the President's Migratory Labor Commission.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POLK. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. GATHINGS. The President named that Commission on the 3d day of June 1950, before the outbreak in Korea. I do not believe the President of the United States would have named this Commission to go into this problem had he known that war would break out a few days later in Korea.

Mr. POLK. Nevertheless the problem exists. It is a serious problem. I wish all Members of the Committee might have the benefits of this very informative report, because it points out many, many problems and recommends numerous suggestions that should be acted into law with reference to this entire problem.

I cannot agree with those who state there is no danger from communistic infiltration because of the situation which exists on our southern boundary. As I mentioned in the debate on the rule, Mr. Gladwyn Hill, of the New York Times, spent considerable time traveling about 5,000 miles throughout the Southwest, and came very definitely to the conclusion that there is communistic infiltration. It is true that only a few of these Communists have been caught. I believe the immigration service admits they have caught a few. But there is nothing to hinder them from coming in. Under the House bill it is wide open as far as legal entry is concerned. The Senate bill includes the words "legal entry" in at least two instances. Under the Senate bill these migratory workers would have to be in this country subject to legal entry. That is not true in the House bill. It is wide open as far as that particular provision is concerned.

There is another point that is very strongly stated in the President's report, the consequences of the wetback traffic as far as wages are concerned. I should like to read you a few statements.

The report says:

The wetback is a hungry human being. His need of food and clothing is immediate and pressing. He is a fugitive and it is as a fugitive that he lives. Under the constant threat of apprehension and deportation, he cannot protest or appeal no matter how unjustly he is treated. Law operates against him but not for him. Those who capitalize on the legal disability of the wetbacks are numerous and their devices are many and various.

Wage rates reflect graphically and dramatically the impact and consequences of the wetback traffic. In 1947, when daily wages for chopping cotton (thinning the rows of cotton plants) in the Lower Rio Grande Valley were \$2.25 (10 hours), wages were continuously higher at points northward from the border: in the Sandy Lands of Texas, \$3; in the Corpus Christi and Coast Prairie areas, \$4; in the Bolling Plains, \$5; in the High Plains, \$5.25.

When the Commission held hearings in Texas in August 1950, wage rates for picking short staple cotton in the Lower Rio Grande Valley were reported as low as 50 cents per hundredweight and as high as \$1.75 per hundredweight. From the evidence presented, we conclude that the bulk of the cotton in this area was picked in 1950 for approximately \$1.25 per hundredweight. Comparative wage rates for picking cotton elsewhere in Texas were not obtained in the hearings because no other area had yet commenced its cotton harvest. However, the State-wide average 1950 rate for Texas is now reported officially by the United States Department of Agriculture to have been \$2.45 per hundredweight. Thus, the Lower Rio Grande Valley cotton growers got their cotton picked for approximately one-half the wages paid by the average cotton grower of Texas.

Wages for common hand labor in the Lower Rio Grande Valley, according to the testimony, were as low as 15 to 25 cents per hour. To the north and west through El

Paso Valley, we found a marked tendency for wages for similar work to rise.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POLK. I yield.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Do you not believe, though, that the reason those rates are so low is because the work is performed by the wetbacks and that that rate would be raised if they were brought into this country legally under an agreement, and that this agreement would be beneficial not only to this country, but even to those illegal entrants?

Mr. POLK. I would say to the gentleman that he has touched on what I believe is the crux of the whole matter. The recruitment of wetbacks is the main source of Mexican labor. Figures show that at one time in a study which was made in 1947, about 93 out of every 100 farm workers in the area close to the Rio Grande River were illegal wetbacks.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. But do you not think if we had this agreement you would do away with these wetbacks, and also with this agreement you would have a contract with the wetbacks who are here illegally, and you would gain control over them and thus eliminate the situation which you are complaining about, and that with this bill you could eliminate the very thing you are complaining about?

Mr. POLK. If we pass the bill as it passed the Senate, you are correct, because under the bill as it is reported from the House committee there is no reference to illegality or legality—just so they are in this country, they can be recruited.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. They can be recruited, but you will have a contract with them and they will have a contract to work.

Mr. POLK. On the other hand, in the Senate bill it is specifically stated that the men recruited must have come in legally.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. FERNANDEZ].

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I am going to address myself to only one point which will be in controversy and which constitutes the chief difference between the Senate bill and the House bill.

It is my understanding that when this bill is read under the 5-minute rule, an amendment will be offered to substitute the Senate bill for the House bill. The main distinguishing feature of the Senate bill from the House bill is that the Senate bill provides that any person who employs a Mexican alien not legally admitted to this country shall be guilty of a felony and shall be punished by a fine not exceeding \$2,000 or be imprisoned for a term not exceeding 1 year, or both.

I do not question the sincerity and good intentions of those who sponsor that amendment, and I do not minimize in the least the situation which confronts us, but I am taking the floor in the hopes that I may dissuade the proponents of that amendment from offering it in connection with this bill.

In the first place, the result of that amendment if it should become law would be to punish the innocent as well as the guilty. It would deny employment not only to the illegal Mexican alien or wetback but it would result in denying employment also to thousands of native Americans who like myself are of Mexican or Spanish descent, and who like myself have Mexican or Spanish names. It is mainly for this reason that I could never support such an amendment. The farmer would be running too great a risk in employing those native Americans, unless he happens to know them personally, and the result would be that preference, particularly in the rush of getting workers quickly, would be given to Negroes and Mexican aliens with an immigration card, to the exclusion of the native Americans with Spanish or Mexican names.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I yield.

Mr. FISHER. Does the gentleman believe that if he were called upon today to prove that he was an American citizen that he could prove it?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. No; and I may say to the gentleman that if I were to go away from my home community and decide to seek employment I doubt if I could even get a birth certificate, and there are thousands of my fellow Americans in the same shape. That is one of the points I am coming to.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield on that point of the Senate amendment?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. The gentleman has touched an important element in the Senate bill. In order to convict under the Senate bill is it necessary for the farmer or employer to have knowledge that the person is here illegally?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. The trouble is that he would always be subject to being accused and arrested, and then in self-defense he would have to show that he did not know all these things. Farmers have enough to do beside running to court to establish the fact that they are not felons. Consequently, to be safe, they would decline to employ Americans of Mexican or Spanish descent whom they did not know personally.

There are thousands of these in every community in New Mexico, and no doubt in Texas, Colorado, Arizona, and California. Those native Americans are well known in their communities where they and their forefathers have lived for generations, but when they leave their communities or their States to seek employment elsewhere it would be hard for the employer to distinguish them from Mexican aliens. Many of them, if not most of them, would like myself be unable to furnish a birth certificate. Like myself all they could furnish, if that, would be a church record of their baptism. The work season would be over before they could obtain such a record, if they could obtain it at all. It is a well-established American principle that it is better for nine guilty persons to go free than for one innocent person to be punished. Under this law you would be punishing many native

Americans by depriving them of employment merely because they could not promptly and adequately prove that they were American-born.

Furthermore, it would be unfair to the employer. Are the Immigration Service and our Government so inept and so impotent that it is necessary to make farmers act as immigration policemen or risk becoming felons?

The original amendment as offered in the Senate applied equally to the employment of all aliens illegally in this country. Senator BREWSTER, of Maine, immediately pointed out the difficulty they would have in distinguishing Canadian aliens from native American citizens, and so he wanted to know what was meant by the words "reasonable inquiry" in connection with the investigation of prospective laborers on the part of employers. I read from the RECORD:

Mr. BREWSTER. How is he to know that a certain employee is not a native? Would a birth certificate be required? I suppose conditions are different in the South, but up in Maine a great many of us speak the same language. What is the employer supposed to do?

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Immigration and Naturalization Service would be expected to issue cards to those who are legal entrants, and the employer could at least ask to see a man's card. If he did not ask to see the man's card, this would be one circumstance in which he would fail to make reasonable inquiry.

Mr. BREWSTER. If he is a native, of course, he will not have a card.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I understand that.

Mr. BREWSTER. When a native of Maine goes to Illinois, he has no card to show that he is a native of Maine.

Mr. DOUGLAS. There is supposed to be freedom of migration within the country—and fortunately there is.

This provision, of course, applies only to aliens. It is not intended to establish a registration system for persons who are citizens of the United States. However, those who are legal entrants are supposed to carry with them some document to indicate that they are legal entrants. It would be proper to ask a man whether or not he was an immigrant. If so, he could be asked to show his card.

Mr. BREWSTER. If he says that he is not an immigrant, what is the employer supposed to do? Is he supposed to investigate his birth certificate?

Mr. DOUGLAS. There is certainly no obligation to investigate his birth certificate or to ascertain whether he has paid a poll tax or property tax or whether he is upon any voting roll or not. There is certainly no such obligation. But if all the circumstances of appearance and language and lack of identification care and failure to furnish any evidence of residence give rise to a question as to legality of entry, the employer should make some further inquiry.

The amendment was modified and in its present form applies only to Mexican aliens.

The fact that it does apply only to Mexican aliens makes it all the more objectionable because it is discriminatory. Why punish the man who employs a Mexican alien and by implication permits the employment of a Cuban alien, a Chinese alien, or any other alien.

It may be that we are in such a terrible shape with respect to wetback and other illegal immigrants that some such drastic action as this may be necessary. I realize that the very fine Migratory La-

bor Commission appointed by the President recommended some such step. Before that step is taken, however, it should be given careful consideration by the committee which has jurisdiction over immigration matters, and provisions should be worked out whereby native Americans may be protected in their right to employment and not frozen out by such a left-handed approach. This provision has not received the consideration of either the Judiciary Committee or the Committee on Agriculture which handled this bill in the House and in the Senate.

Furthermore, it was not subjected to searching debate in the Senate. It so happens that pursuant to the recommendations of the Migratory Labor Commission, Senator ELLENDER, chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, had introduced a general bill dealing with such matters and which was then pending in the Judiciary Committee. Because he had sponsored such a provision in the other bill, he stated that he was not in position to object to its being offered in this bill except on the grounds of jurisdiction. No real debate on the merits of this provision was had in the Senate.

This provision is without precedent. If we are to depart from the well established procedures in the matter of immigration, I repeat that careful consideration by the appropriate committees should be given to the bill and provisions worked out to protect native Americans and employers alike from the hazards and injustices of such a policy.

Notwithstanding the recommendation of the Migratory Labor Commission, it is questionable that we should ever adopt such a drastic and devious policy. It seems to me to be immoral for a Christian nation to make a felon out of a person who, in Christian charity to say the least, gives a needy human being the opportunity to earn bread and shelter for his children. This country is too great to resort to the necessity of starving good people into submission to get rid of them.

I have in mind the case of a Mexican woman, Maria Paez, who came to a community in New Mexico some 25 or 30 years ago without immigration papers, as did many, many others for years, most of them ignorant of the fact that immigration papers were required. She remained in that community without being disturbed until 3 or 4 years ago when proceedings were undertaken to deport her to Mexico. The only relatives she has and the only people she knows are in that community. I intervened at the request of the pastor in the parish where she lives and at the request of the people who have cared for her when she is sick and given her employment as a domestic when she is well. A few days ago I was notified that proceedings to deport her would be dropped. The immigration officials realized that to uproot this old woman from the community in which she has lived for 30 years, and to dump her in Mexico where she has no friends or relatives would be a crime. This bill now makes it a crime to give her employment. This bill would require that she be starved to death or live on charity. And there are many such Marias in New

Mexico, and to them their neighbors and relatives will have to say, it is unlawful for you to earn your bread and butter.

For these reasons I plead with you not to go off the deep end by adopting this drastic measure in this bill. There are other provisions in the Senate bill which would seem adequate to accomplish the purpose, and to which I have no objection if they are added to the House bill, but it would be criminal in my opinion to adopt this particular provision.

This provision is objectionable on many grounds: First it forces the employer into becoming a "gestapo" for the Immigration Service or risk becoming a felon; second, it will result in denying opportunity for employment to thousands of native Americans of Mexican or Spanish descent; third, it is discriminatory in that it singles out the Mexican alien; fourth, it is immoral and unchristian to starve people into submission; five, it has not received adequate consideration by the two judiciary committees which have jurisdiction, and it was not presented to the Agriculture committees of either the House or Senate. It is unfair to require us to vote on this far-reaching provision.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I yield.

Mr. FISHER. The gentleman has made a commendable, certainly an unanswerable argument against the so-called Douglas amendment which would be vicious and would work untold hardship. In the first place the gentleman has pointed out that thousands of worthy, loyal American citizens of Mexican descent would be deprived of employment because employers would not dare employ them without getting proof of their citizenship, which would be very difficult in most instances.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. There is no question about that. Even Senator HUMPHREY, when he was debating the amendment I have referred to, and by the way he supported it, but he pointed out in the Senate that this great Commission that the President appointed and which recommended that that be done, considered it pretty far reaching. Senator HUMPHREY said:

The President's Commission on Migratory Labor in American Agriculture, which spent a great deal of time investigating this problem—much more time, I may say, than any Member of the Senate has; and I think I am not unkind in making that statement—feels that my amendment is a rather modest, meek, mild proposal. On page 87 of the report of the President's Commission, the proposal in the amendment which has just been adopted—that of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], is referred to as one which goes so far that the Commission is not sure that it should be adopted.

That Commission has done a very fine job. There is no question about it. I think that the two great committees of Congress having to do with this matter, the Judiciary Committees of the Senate and of the House ought to take the work of that Commission and work out some system whereby if it is necessary to make it unlawful to employ wetbacks, as we call them, at least some other provisions ought to be put in along with that to

protect people who are not Mexican nationals but who have Spanish names but who cannot readily prove, as the gentleman so well said, that they are American-born.

Mr. FISHER. The gentleman has also pointed out another flaw which would make the Douglas amendment contrary to every concept of legislating that we have ever undertaken in this country in that it is so obviously discriminatory that it makes it a penitentiary offense for an American citizen to employ an illegal alien who happened to be a Mexican national, but it would be no offense for an employer in New York or Chicago to employ illegal aliens who happened to be Poles, Italians, Russians, and so forth.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. There is no excuse for this kind of action. It is unprecedented, and a radical departure from established principles. It certainly should not be adopted without careful consideration by the committee having jurisdiction of that subject.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Mexico has expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. WERDEL].

Mr. WERDEL. Mr. Chairman, I concur in the very able statements made by the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER] and by the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. FERNANDEZ], who have preceded me. I do not think I will take all of my time, but there are one or two points I desire to mention.

Originally I was opposed somewhat to this bill, even though I represent an agricultural area that does need assistance. I did not like to see permanent legislation of this kind put on the statute books and I did not like to see the possibility for all future time of an individual going to some agency of the Federal Government, getting a certificate of necessity and moving foreign labor into a community without at least consulting with the boards of supervisors and the cities, if necessary, to determine what they thought about this influx. It is they who would be spending taxes to support the community and to police the community. Those agencies should have an opportunity to protect local workers. However, that has been eliminated by the last paragraph of the bill we are now considering. It is temporary legislation. I think that should be borne in mind by all Members of the House who are in doubt about some of the provisions of this bill.

It is a necessary bill if we are going to harvest our crops. The gentleman from New Mexico has anticipated the offering of an amendment here which was put in the Senate bill. May I say that the area that the gentleman from New Mexico and some of the rest of us represent was at one time under Spanish rule. That rule was carried on by very honorable families. There is a carry-over of much Spanish blood. Some of these peoples and those families are still dwelling in rather closed communities of their own.

If the penalty amendment that was put in by the Senate is inserted in this bill it will have the effect of saying to the farmer that, under penalty of being a

felon, "You had better not employ anyone that is Spanish if you can get someone else"; and all of the tens of thousands of families that are in our West, citizens of this country, would thus be discriminated against. It seems rather unusual to me to see a gentleman like the gentleman from New York, who apparently is in support of the Senate amendment, not rise in opposition to an amendment that says: "Any person who shall employ a Mexican—." I wonder what the gentleman would say if some of us would add language: "or Irish or Jew or French or English." What would he say?

I am also disturbed a little bit about the gentleman's concern over the subversives that come into our great West over the border. I have had a little concern about those subversives myself in connection with State investigations, and it has been my experience that they are coming out of what some people think is the capital of world communism—New York.

Certainly the gentleman voted against registration last August for subversives, voted against the conference report, voted against overruling the President's veto when we passed the law which now says if these Mexicans come in under this proposal in this bill they will be under the control of Government agencies who can say, "Mister, we want your registration."

The passage of this bill provides a means whereby honorable Mexican nationals can honorably enter this country and do an honorable job in a mutual effort in an emergency. Certainly it will not stop illegals from crossing the border, but the failure to pass this bill will not stop those illegals either. As it has been pointed out, it will encourage them.

Mr. Chairman, there are many provisions in this bill that merit discussion, but I think the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] is presenting the best bill that can be presented for temporary relief of a condition that is urgent for the harvesting of the crop this year. Time is so short that the defeat of this bill will make it impossible to provide the means whereby necessary Mexican labor can come in under proper supervision. We need an estimated three to four hundred thousand people to harvest the Nation's crop this fall.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY].

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, I think there is some misunderstanding here in regard to the objective of the opposition. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. POLK] and I, of the Committee on Agriculture, together filed a minority report on this legislation. What we proposed was not the defeat of the bill but the improvement of it so that all of the things which have been set out here as desirable objectives today, and many of the things which the President's Commission on Migratory Labor recommended, might be achieved.

I would like to clear up one or two other points before I go on to a presentation of our case. Reference has been made to the position of the liberals in

this particular instance as being somewhat contradictory. As I understood the principal argument, it was this—that the liberals are always for more food—so that if we take a position in opposition to this bill somehow we would be in contradiction. I think that is an oversimplification of the liberal position. You will find, on careful examination of my position—and I am willing to accept the title of "liberal"—that we were never in favor of any action which results in the exploitation of human beings, and what we do have in this situation is one of real exploitation of American citizens, of Mexican wetbacks, who crossed the border, and to a certain extent also, as the record will show, the exploitation of Mexicans brought in under these legal contracts. The motivation for this legislation, I understand, did not come principally from the growers of cotton, from the vegetable growers, and other producers of the far West and of the Southwest, but it arose principally because the Mexican Government was refusing or threatening to refuse to permit its people to come into this country and be exploited. There may be political considerations on the part of the Mexicans, but the point is that the principal motivation—although I am sure there was some consideration given to it—was not a humanitarian motivation from this side of the border seeking to improve the condition of the Mexicans coming into this country, of the wetbacks already in, or of the American migrants, but rather one of meeting the demands which the Mexican Government made.

The question was raised in committee as to whether the terms of this bill should be extended so as to include the people from the Bahama Islands and from Jamaica, who were as you will note, in the bill originally introduced. There are some other producing areas in this country which do use labor from other foreign countries. It was not to the advantage of the growers; and the governments of those countries from which these persons come did not demand the kind of protection that is being demanded by Mexico. So the people who come in from those countries are excluded from coverage under this bill.

I will discuss later in some detail the question of subsidy.

I should like to touch now upon the argument that has been made in regard to jurisdiction. It has been said that our committee is being asked to do something which was beyond its jurisdiction; that here is an immigration matter which should properly have been handled by the Committee on the Judiciary. I think that even a cursory examination of the bill will show that the Committee on Agriculture was not so careful to avoid infringing on the jurisdiction of other committees. The bill contains amendments to the Internal Revenue Code, it contains amendments to the Social Security Act, and also amendments to the immigration laws, as well as to the Wage-Hour Act. The important thing to keep in mind is what we are trying to do in this legislation. At least we who signed the minority report are trying to do some little bit toward

solving a really pressing social and economic problem in the Southwest and in the far West, one which affects every American and which reaches out and affects every State in this country.

We, too, are concerned with providing labor to harvest the crops, but we do not think we need to accept the provisions of this bill to accomplish that purpose.

I should like to make the point that this migratory labor problem is really a most serious problem. The number of migratory laborers in this country is something over 1,000,000. Approximately 500,000 of these are American citizens. Of the other 500,000, about 400,000 are Mexican wetbacks, and about 100,000 on the average are people who are admitted legally from Mexico and a few from other countries. So approximately 1,000,000 people are affected.

The President's Commission makes this report, that the average annual wage of these people, considering all of the housing that they get and all of the other special advantages, amounts to about \$550 a year. That is not all income from agriculture, that is their total income. Their agricultural wage is enhanced by what they can pick up in odd jobs and part-time employment in industry and in the cities, either between crops or during the winter season.

You have heard statements in regard to health conditions among these people. You have been given description of the kind of shelter which they are forced to use as housing.

There is one other important point I think we should not overlook, and that is the abuse of the child-labor law. One Congressman presented a statement before our committee which is, I think, indicative of the kind of thinking that is behind this bill. His general statement was to this effect, that the enforcement of the Wages and Hours Act in regard to child labor whereby certain growers were not permitted to use school children during school hours while school was in session, resulted in a great hardship to certain growers and certain farmers. I am sure it does. The fact that any factory owner has to pay a minimum wage and cannot use child labor at depressed wages is a hardship upon him, if our only consideration is that of the profit he may make. Understand, that in these States they could suspend school, let everybody get out of school to work in the fields, or let those that did not want to work take a vacation. The objective is to keep these schools going so that some children, those who come from families which have sufficient income, can continue to go to school, but the children of the poorer parents can be taken out of school while school is in session and during school hours and be put to work at the stoop labor that has been here described.

The purpose of the minority of the committee in offering the Senate bill as a substitute is threefold: First. In the first place, we feel that something should be done about stopping the movement of the wetbacks. Second. In the second place, we think that adequate protection should be given to Mexican laborers who come in under contract. Third. In the

third place, we hope through these two steps to give some kind of protection to American domestic agricultural workers.

Under the terms of the bill we could not touch them directly. Actually what you have in this bill as presented by the author and in the bill that was passed by the Senate, and in the bill which we are advocating here with certain amendments, is a procedure whereby the Mexican Government is establishing standards for the employment of American agricultural workers. The terms of this bill will give advantages to the Mexicans who come in under contract which are not presently given to the domestic agricultural workers. For example, the bill provides that the Government shall guarantee the wage and the transportation of the people who are brought in under contract from Mexico.

Of course, the argument has been made here that the Mexicans could not very well go into court. What of the Americans? Take any American migrant who is making \$550 a year, and he is not going to make a very strong case in any court in this country. So the Mexicans do have that guaranty.

In addition the bill provides \$150 for burial expenses for Mexican workers. It also provides that the medical expenses of these people shall be paid. Is any such guaranty given to American migrants? Of course not. What is proposed is the establishment of standards for Mexican migrant workers in this country which are far and above the standard for domestic workers. We do not have any standards for American farm workers. As I say, we of the minority would like to get at that problem directly but we cannot do it because this bill is restricted to foreign workers, so the only thing for us to do is establish decent standards for these people so that there may be an economic motivation for the American growers to give fair or at least somewhat equitable terms to the Americans who might apply for these same jobs.

That is the problem in its simplest terms. That is the thing which we of the minority are attempting to do, not by defeating the legislation, but by improving it. We do feel that the terms of the bill as they have been presented do not go far enough, and that this is the time to make some real progress, first, toward discouraging the flow of wetbacks into this country; second, toward establishing decent standards for the contract labor, and so indirectly make some slight progress in the way of providing decent wages and decent living and working conditions for American migratory farm laborers, also.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BENTSEN].

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Chairman, I do not question the intent of my friend from Ohio who says he will offer the Senate felony amendment to the migratory-labor bill, but I do question his knowledge of the southern border of the United States and the effect this proposed amendment will have on its citizens.

There are many reasons why this amendment is completely impractical in its application, but since my time is so limited, I shall confine myself to a brief review of some of its gravest inequities.

First. First and foremost, it is completely discriminatory as it is aimed at a class of people. Many United States citizens of Latin ancestry will be denied employment if this amendment is accepted. Farmers will be afraid to hire them for fear they might be Mexican nationals posing as United States citizens. Faced with a possible year in jail, the farmers simply will not take a chance on hiring a man of Latin ancestry.

This amendment does not apply to those farmers along this country's northern border who hire Canadians or those on the east coast who hire Bahamans and Jamaicans. This amendment should not apply to those farmers any more than it should apply to the farmers on the southern border. When a supporter of this amendment in the other legislative body was asked why he did not apply it to Canadian aliens, he said: "You cannot tell them from United States citizens" which is clear proof he does not understand the southern United States border.

Over 50 percent of my district is made up of United States citizens of Latin ancestry. Over 2,000,000 United States citizens claim and speak Spanish as their native tongue. As a practical matter, it is virtually impossible for the ordinary United States citizen, without the assistance of the FBI to distinguish a Mexican citizen illegally in this country from a United States citizen of Latin ancestry.

While I was a county judge in south Texas, I had men appear before my court to obtain delayed birth certificates. They would testify that they were born in this country and would have two witnesses to corroborate this testimony. In addition, they would offer in evidence a baptismal certificate from the Catholic Church to show they were baptized north of the Rio Grande River. Being satisfied with the evidence, I would grant them their certificate. A month later the FBI would come in and state that the applicant and witness had perjured themselves before my court and that the baptismal certificate was a forgery. The farmer will find himself just as helpless if not more so in determining true citizens.

The Senator who offered a similar amendment stated there was no obligation to investigate the employee's birth certificate, nor to see that he had paid a poll tax or was on the voting rolls. Just what is intended by this dangerous amendment? Does it mean merely because a United States citizen happens to be of Latin ancestry that he has to wear a government dog tag or perhaps acquire a governmental tattoo before it is safe to hire him?

A man or woman of Latin ancestry who is a United States citizen would be one of the major victims of the discrimination contemplated by this dog-tag amendment.

Second. This is a most serious and far-reaching amendment and yet it is offered here without previous study by the Agricultural Committee which has

proposed the bill. It is logically a matter which requires the careful consideration of the Judiciary Committee with its jurisdiction over proposals relating to crime and immigration.

Third. A new statutory offense must be defined in language understood by the common mind. The prohibited act must be described in explicit terms. This is required by the fifth and sixth amendments to the Constitution. But this dog-tag amendment, with its loose terms, is completely vague. It uses the words "reasonable grounds to suspect" but it does not state what constitutes such grounds for the farmer to determine that the employee is an alien who has illegally entered this country. What is the farmer to do? Does the farmer have to call the nearest Federal authority everytime he hires a laborer? If so, who does he call? How does he prove the call? Must he report or inquire by registered mail?

This ill-considered amendment is an outstanding example of what can be offered from the floor without careful consideration by a Congressional committee of all of the possible consequences of such severe and far-reaching legislation.

Fourth. This amendment attempts to shift the burden of enforcement from the Federal officers to the farmer. In all fairness, if it is enacted, we should put the farmers on the Government payroll as enforcement officers and turn our able immigration men out to grass.

Fifth. A further example of how little study and ill-considered is this amendment is the fact that it places a greater penalty on the farmer by making him guilty of a felony than it does on the smuggler who brought the alien in and is only guilty of a misdemeanor—United States Code, chapter 8, page 144.

As a Member who represents a district that would be most seriously affected by this amendment which has little or no bearing on the welfare of the district represented by the author of the amendment, I strongly urge its defeat.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENTSEN. I yield.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I would just like to point out that a great many are employed by industry, such as the railroads, and are not included in this bill.

Mr. BENTSEN. That is quite correct.

Mr. FOAGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURLESON].

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Chairman, I subscribe to the able statement of my colleague from Texas who has just spoken, and I am supporting the measure offered by my colleague from Texas [Mr. FOAGE].

Mr. Chairman, this bill seeks to correct several situations which seriously affect the farmers of this country. In the first place, if the seasons remain favorable during the year, the estimated cotton crop is between sixteen and seventeen million bales. This past year the farmers of my district in Texas had great difficulty in gathering their cotton. They had difficulty in making legal arrangements to secure Mexican cotton pickers and then after pickers were se-

cured, their children under 16 years of age were not permitted to work by reason of the so-called minimum-wage law.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have never voted for a minimum wage provision and was opposed to the measure which contained this feature and which has worked such an injustice and hardship on the Texas farmers. Doubtless it has been most impractical to farmers in other parts of the country.

One of my colleagues from Texas, either Mr. ROGERS or Mr. MAHON, expects to introduce an amendment to this bill, which will make exception to the Fair Labor Standards Act and permit children under 16 years of age, when not legally required by State law to attend school, to engage in agricultural labor. I certainly expect to support the amendment and hope that no point of order is placed against it. If a point of order is made, I hope the Chair will overrule such an objection and find the amendment to be germane to the bill.

Mr. Chairman, there is such a thing as being practical, although it is not too much in evidence at times. For years Mexican labor has picked the cotton in Texas—to a very large extent. They live through the winter on what they are able to make in the crop-gathering season. Now if we want to prevent thousands of Mexicans from making a living, many of whom remain in this country the year around, by not correcting existing law is a good way to do it.

Mr. Chairman, farm labor is extremely short at this time. Cotton picking labor is always short at the time it is needed.

The Government is asking the farmer for greater production of most products, particularly food. Our boys are being drafted and reservists and National Guard men have been called to active duty, which further contributes to a serious situation. Now why should we not pass this bill with the amendment, allowing children under 16 years of age to assist in gathering crops in these critical times and making provision in an orderly way for the farmer to utilize the services of Mexican labor imported from Mexico for that purpose?

Certainly, Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the Senate provision which places the burden on the farmer to determine that the alien laborer has entered this country legally. That is the business of the authorities whose duties are already prescribed by law for this purpose.

Mr. Chairman, I support the bill authored by my colleague from Texas [Mr. FOAGE], and will support the amendment to which I have referred, as a practical, workable, and just arrangement for the American farmer in the harvesting of crops so vitally necessary for the country's welfare.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 8 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas is recognized.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I am interested in this bill from the standpoint of a consumer only. As far as I know there are no Mexican laborers in my district; there will be none if this bill becomes a law.

I hold in my hand a monthly bulletin issued by the Bureau of Agricultural Eco-

nomics entitled "Farm Labor," dated June 11, which reads as follows:

People working on the farms in May totaled a half million less than a year ago and about one and one-half million less than the postwar peak in 1946-47.

That tells the story of the problem that is facing the American farmer today at a time when he has been asked by the Secretary of Agriculture to produce more than he has ever produced.

This bill does not try to solve all the problems of migratory labor, it deals with only one segment of that problem; it does not try to solve our immigration problems except this particular one involving the temporary immigration of farm labor from Mexico. I realize that there is a serious migrant labor problem in this country. The President about a year ago appointed a commission to deal with this subject, a very able commission. It has made a voluminous report, and a number of recommendations. These recommendations should be considered by the Congress. We cannot, however, consider those far-reaching recommendations today or try to incorporate them in the framework of this very modest bill which attempts to deal with only one particular situation, that of Mexican labor.

I want to speak briefly about the provisions of the pending bill. As has already been stated, it was drafted primarily for the purpose of carrying out an agreement which has been made by the Government of the United States with the Government of Mexico. That agreement sets up certain standards which must be maintained here in the United States as far as Mexican labor is concerned and institutes a procedure by which that labor may be brought into this country. If that agreement is to be carried out, it is necessary to have this legislation.

Under the provisions of this bill we set up a procedure whereby the procurement of farm laborers in Mexico will be conducted by the United States Government. That is in contrast with what has been going on in the past few years where the farmers themselves who were to use the labor were compelled to go down into the interior of Mexico to procure these workers. The bill also provides for the establishment of reception centers in the United States to which these workers will be brought and from which they can be sent out to work on farms. It provides for the transportation of these workers from recruitment centers in Mexico to the reception centers on this side of the border and for the transportation of workers from those reception centers back to Mexico at the termination of their employment in this country.

It provides that the United States Government shall assist these workers in making contracts of employment and contains another provision whereby the United States Government guarantees that the employers will perform their contracts.

In order to save itself harmless, the Government of the United States must require from the employer a contract under this bill. Those contract provisions are set out in section 502 of the bill and provide a way by which the

United States Government may be indemnified for any loss which it may suffer because of its guaranty that employers will carry out their contracts with the workers.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself two additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, under the provisions of the bill the employer must agree to pay to the United States in any case in which the worker is not returned to a reception center an amount which is determined by the Secretary of Labor to be equivalent to the normal cost to the employer of returning these workers. He is compelled to reimburse the United States for the expenses incurred in transportation and subsistence of workers from the recruitment centers in Mexico to the reception centers in this country in an amount not to exceed \$10 per worker; in other words the farmer pays substantially all of the expense of bringing these workers from Mexico to his farm and then back to the place of recruitment when the worker returns to Mexico.

The Committee on Agriculture held extensive hearings on this bill. We gave it a great deal of consideration in executive session. We heard a large number of witnesses. We heard all the different viewpoints, and as a result of this very exhaustive consideration we bring you this bill which I feel does what it sets out to do. It is a temporary measure but one which will meet the present situation, it will help alleviate the shortage of certain types of farm workers and will enable our farmers to help meet the obligation which has been put upon them by the Secretary of Agriculture to produce the greatest amount of food and fiber that has ever been produced by the farmers of this country.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GATHINGS].

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Chairman, why is this legislation before this body at this time? On the 30th day of June the contract with the Mexican Government will expire, so it is necessary that we bring in legislation prior to June 30 so that we can have the labor available when needed on the farms of America. In the mid-South area the workers have left our particular section and gone to the larger cities; they have gone into Memphis, to Detroit, to Chicago, and Los Angeles. They have gone where they can get employment in defense industries. Further, many of them have been called into the armed services. So now we do not have enough labor not only to harvest our crops down in the mid-South area, but we do not have enough labor to chop the cotton. At this particular time there are 5,000 Mexican nationals in the State of Arkansas chopping cotton. They are badly needed since our cotton acreage has increased greatly in the current year—the production of cotton requires quite a lot of labor—I have here from the Department of Agriculture a report which says that the people who worked on the farms in May 1951, totaled half a million less than a year ago. So, you can see when we are asked to produce

more food, when we are asked to produce more cotton, 60 percent more cotton in 1951 than in 1950—and we had an awfully hard time to get enough labor to harvest our crop in 1950—that it will be extremely important and necessary that we do have legislation to negotiate with Mexico so that we can recruit the necessary labor to be used in the harvesting of cotton and various food crops that are so highly essential in this emergency.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GATHINGS. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Even with your small crop last year you had to call upon Mexican help to harvest that crop, did you not?

Mr. GATHINGS. Oh, yes. Last year in the gentleman's State of Missouri several thousand workers were imported. We had 21,000 in the State of Arkansas during the harvest season last year.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. And you are going to have a bigger crop this year with less local labor.

Mr. GATHINGS. Yes. We increased the acreage in that section this year.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GATHINGS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman speaks of this as being a bill to help the farmers of the United States. There is not an ounce of help in this bill for the mid-west farmer.

Mr. GATHINGS. Whoever comes and applies for this labor and follows the provisions set out in this bill can go to Mexico and obtain that labor.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] is the chairman of one of the most important committees of this House, the Committee on the Judiciary. He came before this body today bitterly complaining about this legislation. He urged that something ought to be done to curb the illegal entry into this country of Mexican farm workers. As chairman of the important Committee on the Judiciary, the gentleman has full and complete authority to present legislation to curb the illegal entry into this country of Mexicans. It is the gentleman's job to do that.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GATHINGS. I yield to the gentleman, inasmuch as I have called his name.

Mr. CELLER. Does not the gentleman believe this bill should have been referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, since it is primarily an immigration statute? Further, does not the gentleman believe that members of the Committee on the Judiciary should have an opportunity to pass on the provisions of this bill?

Mr. GATHINGS. I do not think so, because of the fact that it amends the Agricultural Act of 1949. It applies to agricultural labor. We are not coming in here trying to regulate the flow across the border of Canada or Mexico. We are not asking for immigration legislation in the least. We are asking this House to pass this legislation so that we can produce the food and fiber necessary for the support of our economy.

Mr. CELLER. I want to see that the crops are harvested; I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. GATHINGS. That is very fine.

The cost is extremely high in order to get this labor to the farms of America. It costs a lot of money to do that.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GATHINGS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON. Is it not a fact that over 10 years ago the Tolan committee made a very exhaustive and constructive study of the migratory problem and it has been resting in the Committee on the Judiciary ever since, with not a thing being done about it?

Mr. GATHINGS. I recall the Tolan investigation. They could have something done about illegal entry of Mexicans or others if they desired to do so.

Mr. JOHNSON. They have taken 10 years to do something, based on a very thorough study.

Mr. GATHINGS. It has been said by the opposition to this bill that there is enough domestic labor available for use on the farms of America. That has been brought out repeatedly.

Mr. McCARTHY. Does the gentleman remember who made that statement on the floor?

Mr. GATHINGS. The opposition has hinged on utilizing available domestic labor.

Mr. McCARTHY. I did not say it, and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. POLK] did not.

Mr. GATHINGS. It was said in the committee by the farm-labor groups. They came in and said, "Let us utilize the labor that is available in America first."

The gentleman filed a minority report. If I remember rightly, in that minority report he brought out the point that he wants to utilize the labor in this country. Does not the gentleman think that if there were a laborer available on his farm or close by where he could bring him to his farm he would not send all the way to the Mexican border, a distance of 1,200 miles from my district, to recruit labor? They go to the expense of sending a man down to the border on a truck and go to all the extra expense of paying the worker's transportation by train or bus up to the border from Monterrey, Hermosillo, or Chihuahua. Hotel expenses and food are provided by the farmer, too.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GATHINGS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS. The gentleman should point out that none of these laborers can be employed until the Department of Labor has certified that there is no other labor available.

Mr. GATHINGS. The gentleman is correct. Until the Secretary of Labor makes such a determination, he could not obtain Mexican national labor. What farmer in America would go to all that expense to bring this labor back and pay the transportation and subsistence expense if he did not need that labor on his farm?

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GATHINGS. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman made the statement that the opposition had contended that American labor was available in sufficient numbers. Then he was challenged on that and asked to say who had made that contention. I am just wondering if those opposing this bill are frank enough to admit that we do not have sufficient labor. Is that the contention of the opposition, or the admission of the opposition?

Mr. McCARTHY. I think I would concur in that statement. I do not wish to stop the bill or stop the bringing in of contract labor. What I am trying to do is stop the bringing in of wetback workers.

Mr. COOLEY. That is an entirely different proposition than the gentleman just mentioned. That is a matter for the Immigration Committee. We are not trying to enforce the immigration laws and we are not amending them. We have no way on earth to make it easier to bring in wetbacks.

Mr. GATHINGS. That is right. The various departments charged with responsibility of this problem of recruitment of foreign labor came before our committee and every one of them recognized the need on the farms of America for this additional labor.

Mr. COOLEY. If there were any way to pass a law now to keep out all wetbacks, I am sure the House would do it, but that is not the proposition before us.

Mr. GATHINGS. We are faced with the proposition whether we are going to have anything to eat on our tables or anything on our backs to wear. I hope the House bill will be approved by this body.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired. All time has expired.

The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Agricultural Act of 1949 is amended by adding at the end thereof a new title to read as follows:

"TITLE V—AGRICULTURAL WORKERS

"SEC. 501. For the purpose of assisting in such production of agricultural commodities and products as the Secretary of Agriculture deems necessary, by supplying agricultural workers from the Republic of Mexico (pursuant to arrangements between the United States and the Republic of Mexico), the Secretary of Labor is authorized—

"(1) to recruit such workers (including any such workers temporarily in the United States);

"(2) to establish and operate reception centers at or near the places of actual entry of such workers into 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;

"(3) to provide transportation for such workers from recruitment centers outside the continental United States to such reception centers and transportation from such reception centers to such recruitment centers after termination of employment;

"(4) to provide such workers with such subsistence, emergency medical care, and burial expenses (not exceeding \$150 burial

expenses in any one case) as may be or become necessary during transportation authorized by paragraph (3) and while such workers are at reception centers;

"(5) to assist such workers and employers in negotiating contracts for agricultural employment (such workers being free to accept or decline agricultural employment with any eligible employer and to choose the type of agricultural employment they desire, and eligible employers being free to offer agricultural employment to any workers of their choice not under contract to other employers);

"(6) to guarantee the performance by employers of provisions of such contracts relating to the payment of wages or the furnishing of transportation.

"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 such amounts, not to exceed \$10 per worker; and

"(3) to pay to the United States, in any case in which a worker is not returned to the reception center in accordance with the contract entered into under section 501 (5), an amount determined by the Secretary of Labor to be equivalent to the normal cost to the employer of returning other workers from the place of employment to such reception center, less any portion thereof required to be paid by other employers.

"SEC. 503. No workers recruited under this title shall be available for employment in any area unless the Regional Director, Bureau of Employment Security, United States Department of Labor 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.

"SEC. 504. Workers recruited under this title who are not citizens of the United States shall be admitted to the United States subject to the immigration laws (or if already in, and otherwise eligible for admission to, the United States may, pursuant to arrangements between the United States and the Republic of Mexico, be permitted to remain therein) for such time and under such conditions as may be specified by the Attorney General but, notwithstanding any other provision of law or regulation, no penalty bond shall be required which imposes liability upon any person for the failure of any such worker to depart from the United States upon termination of employment.

"SEC. 505. (a) Section 210 (a) (1) of the Social Security Act, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subparagraph as follows:

"(C) Service performed by foreign agricultural workers under contracts entered into in accordance with title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended."

"(b) Section 1426 (b) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subparagraph as follows:

"(C) Service performed by foreign agricultural workers under contracts entered into in accordance with title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended."

"(c) Workers recruited under the provisions of this title shall not be subject to the

head tax levied under section 2 of the Immigration Act of 1917 (8 U. S. C., sec. 132).

"Sec. 506. For the purposes of this title, the Secretary of Labor is authorized—

"(1) to enter into agreements with Federal and State agencies; to utilize (pursuant to such agreements) the facilities and services of such agencies; and to allocate or transfer funds or otherwise to pay or reimburse such agencies for expenses in connection therewith;

"(2) to accept and utilize voluntary and uncompensated services; and

"(3) when necessary to supplement the domestic agricultural labor force, to cooperate with the Secretary of State in negotiating and carrying out agreements or arrangements relating to the employment in the United States, subject to the immigration laws, of agricultural workers from the Republic of Mexico.

"SEC. 508. For the purposes of this title—

"(1) The term 'agricultural employment' includes services or activities included within the provisions of section 3 (f) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, or section 1426 (h) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended, horticultural employment, cotton ginning, compressing and storing, crushing of oil seeds, and the packing, canning, freezing, drying, or other processing of perishable or seasonable agricultural products.

"(2) The term 'employer' includes associations or other groups of employers.

"SEC. 509. 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 508, 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.

"SEC. 510. No workers shall be made available under this title for employment after December 31, 1953."

Mr. COOLEY (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the bill be dispensed with.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, is my understanding correct that if the unanimous-consent request is granted, the bill will be open to amendment at any point?

The CHAIRMAN. That is correct.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I intend to offer a preferential motion. Will the granting of the unanimous-consent request have any effect on my preferential motion?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not so understand.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CELLER moves to strike out all after the enacting clause.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman does not submit a preferential motion.

Mr. POLK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. POLK in the nature of a substitute for H. R. 3283: "That the Agriculture Act of 1949 is amended by adding at the end thereof a new title to read as follows:

"TITLE V—AGRICULTURAL WORKERS

"Sec. 501. For the purpose of assisting in such production of agricultural commodities and products as the Secretary of Agriculture deems necessary, by supplying agricultural workers from the Republic of Mexico (pursuant to arrangements between the United States and the Republic of Mexico), the Secretary of Labor is authorized—

"(1) to recruit such workers (including any such workers temporarily in the United States under legal entry);

"(2) to establish and operate reception centers at or near the places of actual entry of such workers into 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;

"(3) to provide transportation for such workers from recruitment centers outside the continental United States to such reception centers and transportation from such reception centers to such recruitment centers after termination of employment;

"(4) to provide such workers with such subsistence, emergency medical care, and burial expenses (not exceeding \$150 burial expenses in any one case) as may be or become necessary during transportation authorized by paragraph (3) and while such workers are at reception centers;

"(5) to assist such workers and employers in negotiating contracts for agricultural employment (such workers being free to accept or decline agricultural employment with any eligible employer and to choose the type of agricultural employment they desire, and eligible employers being free to offer agricultural employment to any workers of their choice not under contract to other employers);

"(6) to guarantee the performance by employers of provisions of such contracts relating to the payment of wages or the furnishing of transportation.

"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; and

"(3) to pay to the United States, in any case in which a worker is not returned to the reception center in accordance with the contract entered into under section 501 (5) 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 from the place of employment to such reception center, less any portion thereof required to be paid by other employers.

"Sec. 503. No workers recruited under this title shall be available for employment in any area unless the Secretary of Labor 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, and (3) reasonable

efforts have been made to attract domestic workers for such employment at wages and standard hours of work comparable to those offered to foreign workers.

"Sec. 504. Workers recruited under this title who are not citizens of the United States shall be admitted to the United States subject to the immigration laws (or if already in, by virtue of legal entry and otherwise eligible for admission to, the United States may, pursuant to arrangements between the United States and the Republic of Mexico, be permitted to remain therein) for such time and under such conditions as may be specified by the Attorney General but, notwithstanding any other provision of law or regulation, no penalty bond shall be required which imposes liability upon any person for the failure of any such worker to depart from the United States upon termination of employment: *Provided*, That no workers shall be made available under this title, nor shall any workers made available under this title be permitted to remain in the employ of, any employer who has in his employ any Mexican alien when such employer knows or has reasonable grounds to believe or suspect or by reasonable inquiry could have ascertained that such Mexican alien is not lawfully within the United States.

"Sec. 505. (a) Section 210 (a) (1) of the Social Security Act, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subparagraph as follows:

"(C) Service performed by foreign agricultural workers under contracts entered into in accordance with title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended."

"(b) Section 1426 (b) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subparagraph as follows:

"(C) Service performed by foreign agricultural workers under contracts entered into in accordance with title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended."

"(c) Workers recruited under the provisions of this title shall not be subject to the head tax levied under section 2 of the Immigration Act of 1917 (8 U. S. C., sec. 132.)

"Sec. 506. For the purposes of this title, the Secretary of Labor is authorized—

"(1) to enter into agreements with Federal and State agencies; to utilize (pursuant to such agreements) the facilities and services of such agencies; and to allocate or transfer funds or otherwise to pay or reimburse such agencies for expenses in connection therewith;

"(2) to accept and utilize voluntary and uncompensated services; and

"(3) when necessary to supplement the domestic agricultural labor force, to cooperate with the Secretary of State in negotiating and carrying out agreements or arrangements relating to the employment in the United States, subject to the immigration laws, of agricultural workers from the Republic of Mexico.

"Sec. 507. For the purposes of this title—

"(1) The term "agricultural employment" includes services or activities included within the provisions of section 3 (f) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, or section 1426 (h) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended.

"(2) The term "employer" 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.

"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.

"Sec. 509. Any person who shall employ any Mexican alien 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, when such person knows or has reasonable grounds to believe or suspect or by reasonable inquiry could have ascertained that such alien is not lawfully within the United States, or any person who, having employed such an alien without knowing or having reasonable grounds to believe or suspect that such alien is unlawfully within the United States and who could not have obtained such information by reasonable inquiry at the time of giving such employment, shall obtain information during the course of such employment indicating that such alien is not lawfully within the United States and shall fail to report such information promptly to an immigration officer, shall be guilty of a felony, and upon conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine not exceeding \$2,000, or by imprisonment for a term not exceeding 1 year, or both, for each alien in respect to whom any violation of this section occurs.

"Sec. 510. No workers will be made available under this title for employment after December 31, 1952."

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment on the ground that it contains matter not germane to the House bill, and I should like to be heard on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be glad to hear the gentleman and requests that the gentleman point out the specific language to which objection is made.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. It is made to section 509 of the substitute which has just been read, appearing on page 7 of the bill S. 984, and reading as follows:

Sec. 509. Any person who shall employ any Mexican alien 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, when such person knows or has reasonable grounds to believe or suspect or by reasonable inquiry could have ascertained that such alien is not lawfully within the United States, or any person who, having employed such an alien without knowing or having reasonable grounds to believe or suspect that such alien is unlawfully within the United States and who could not have obtained such information by reasonable inquiry at the time of giving such employment, shall obtain information during the course of such employment indicating that such alien is not lawfully within the United States and shall fail to report such information promptly to an immigration officer, shall be guilty of a felony, and upon conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine not exceeding \$2,000, or by imprisonment for a term not exceeding 1 year, or both, for each alien in respect to whom any violation of this section occurs.

Mr. Chairman, this section 509 is a general provision, strictly general, entirely general; whereas the House bill,

which is the bill we are considering at this time, is a specific bill having a specific purpose. The purpose is stated in the opening section of the bill, as follows:

For the purpose of assisting in such production of agricultural commodities and products as the Secretary of Agriculture deems necessary—

And so forth. Section 509 of the proposed substitute does not deal in any way with the subject of the pending House bill. Section 509 of the proposed substitute deals only with the matter of finding information as to the illegal entry of alien Mexicans into the United States, and imposes a penalty for failure to supply information concerning such illegal entry. That is the sole purpose and the sole effect of this section 509. It does not refer to the employment of farm labor, and it does not go to the purpose of the bill.

I think it is a fact that one of the principals applying to germaneness is that an amendment must be in accordance with the fundamental purposes of the bill to which the amendment is proposed.

I make a second point of order against the substitute on the ground that it is not germane but is a general provision. Read the language of the bill, Mr. Chairman—section 509. Section 509 of the substitute speaks of any person who employs a Mexican alien not certified by the Secretary of Labor, any person, whether that person be the provider of a restaurant or the operator of a steamship company, railroad, bus line, and so forth, any person who shall employ any Mexican alien not duly admitted by an immigration officer or not lawfully entitled to enter or to reside within the United States.

A restaurant operator in the city of New York would be subject to a \$2,000 fine and 1 year in prison or both if he employed a Mexican alien without taking the trouble to go to the FBI or some other source and find out if that Mexican was in the country with proper credentials.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that that is strictly a general proposition and is offered to this bill which has specific reference to a program of orderly recruitment and dispersal of farm labor—farm labor only; whereas the amendment, Mr. Chairman, applies to any person who shall employ any Mexican alien wherever he may be and whatever he may be doing.

I submit, therefore, on those two counts, first, it is an amendment, a general provision, a general amendment, applied to a specific bill, which, according to the way I read the rules of the House, is not allowable as germane; and, secondly, that the amendment itself does not have anything to do in fact with the purpose and the fundamental intent of the bill.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. I would like to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that the bill before us now amends the Agricultural Act of 1949. I agree with

the gentleman's observations on the point of order. The section he referred to, 509, is general in its application and in effect rewrites the immigration laws of this county insofar as they affect Mexico.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I may say to the gentleman along that same line that there is now pending before this House a very large omnibus immigration bill to which this particular section 509 should be added if it is the will of the House, but it has no place as a penalty provision in an amendment to the Agricultural Act.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard briefly?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be glad to hear the gentleman.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from North Carolina has just said that the bill did not intend to amend the immigration laws and the Record will disclose that in the preceding debate he said the same thing. If the Chair will refer to page 7 of the bill I hold, which is the Senate edition, lines 15 and 16, he will observe the words "or any other law relating to the immigration or expulsion of aliens"—not necessarily Mexican aliens.

This is a broad provision saying that everyone in the United States must know all the immigration laws if he is to operate under this amendment, therefore placing upon the shoulders of all citizens of the United States the responsibility we assigned by legislative action to the immigration service. It is manifestly legislation out of place in this bill.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be glad to hear the gentleman.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to call attention to the fact that if section 509 had been introduced as a separate bill, it would not even have been referred to the Committee on Agriculture. It would have gone to the Immigration Committee.

Now we are faced with a situation of having to pass upon a question which our committee had no right under the rules of the House to even consider and because it happens to be a provision in a Senate bill certainly does not make it germane to the bill now before us.

We are attempting to amend an agricultural bill. If the pending amendment is approved, it will greatly enlarge the scope of the subject with which we are dealing. It should not be held to be germane because there is no provision in this bill which came from the House Committee on Agriculture dealing with the problem of immigration generally. It deals only with agricultural aid. The pending amendment seeks to make it apply to even domestics or to people in all other vocations and avocations of life in this country.

I submit the point of order should be sustained.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I would like to ask the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture this question:

Should this substitute prevail, in his opinion, would it not completely kill this whole proposition?

Mr. COOLEY. There is no question about that. I think it would be the end of the legislation if the amendment prevails. I do not think we would have a bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Ohio desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. POLK. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be glad to hear the gentleman.

Mr. POLK. Mr. Chairman, I call attention to the fact that this bill amends the Social Security Act, and I am speaking now on the bill before the House, H. R. 3283. It also amends the Immigration Act of 1917, and I refer to lines 7, 8, 9, and 10, on page 5. It amends the Internal Revenue Code, and I refer to lines 2, 3 and 4, at the top of page 5. In other words, in several instances the bill which is before the House amends other Federal statutes.

I therefore respectfully submit, Mr. Chairman, that the point of order against 509 of this bill should not be sustained.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

The bill before the Committee is a bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949. The gentleman from Ohio offers an amendment in the nature of a substitute to which a point of order of germaneness is made by the gentleman from Oregon, the particular objection being directed to the last section of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

The Chair feels that it is necessary to be fair and explicit in this matter to spell out in some detail the rule of germaneness and its application to this particular amendment. As the Chair understands the rule of germaneness, its purpose is to provide for and protect the orderly procedure in the Committee of the Whole and in the House. It is to protect the legislative processes, to protect the membership from hasty, ill-considered, and extraneous subject matter being offered to the proposition under consideration. An amendment, to be germane to a bill under consideration, must be akin to and relative to the subject matter of the bill. The Chair does not feel that the provision of a penalty or the provision for civil relief from a law seeking to be enacted would be a matter unakin or unrelated to the bill. However, there is specific matter in the amendment, to wit, "or any other law relating to the immigration or expulsion of aliens" which is to be found in section 509 to which specific objection was made. The Chair has examined the bill before the Committee and is unable to find reference to any other law relating to the immigration or expulsion of aliens.

Therefore, because of the references just cited, the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. POLK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute. May I state that this is the same amendment that has just been ruled out on a point of order with section 509

stricken out, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point and considered as read.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The amendment is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Agricultural Act of 1949 is amended by adding at the end thereof a new title to read as follows:

"TITLE V—AGRICULTURAL WORKERS

"SEC. 501. For the purpose of assisting in such production of agricultural commodities and products as the Secretary of Agriculture deems necessary, by supplying agricultural workers from the Republic of Mexico (pursuant to arrangements between the United States and the Republic of Mexico), the Secretary of Labor is authorized—

"(1) to recruit such workers (including any such workers temporarily in the United States under legal entry);

"(2) to establish and operate reception centers at or near the places of actual entry of such workers into 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;

"(3) to provide transportation for such workers from recruitment centers outside the continental United States to such reception centers and transportation from such reception centers to such recruitment centers after termination of employment;

"(4) to provide such workers with such subsistence, emergency medical care, and burial expenses (not exceeding \$150 burial expenses in any one case) as may be or become necessary during transportation authorized by paragraph (3) and while such workers are at reception centers;

"(5) to assist such workers and employers in negotiating contracts for agricultural employment (such workers being free to accept or decline agricultural employment with any eligible employer and to choose the type of agricultural employment they desire, and eligible employers being free to offer agricultural employment to any workers of their choice not under contract to other employers);

"(6) to guarantee the performance by employers of provisions of such contracts relating to the payment of wages or the furnishing of transportation.

"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; and

"(3) to pay to the United States, in any case in which a worker is not returned to the reception center in accordance with the contract entered into under section 501 (5) 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 from the place of employment to such reception center, less any portion thereof required to be paid by other employers.

"SEC. 503. No workers recruited under this title shall be available for employment in any area unless the Secretary of Labor 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 em-

ployed, and (2) the employment of such workers will not adversely affect the wages and working conditions of domestic agricultural workers similarly employed, and (3) reasonable efforts have been made to attract domestic workers for such employment at wages and standard hours of work comparable to those offered to foreign workers.

"SEC. 504. Workers recruited under this title who are not citizens of the United States shall be admitted to the United States subject to the immigration laws (or if already in, by virtue of legal entry and otherwise eligible for admission to, the United States may, pursuant to arrangements between the United States and the Republic of Mexico, be permitted to remain therein) for such time and under such conditions as may be specified by the Attorney General but, notwithstanding any other provision of law or regulation, no penalty bond shall be required which imposes liability upon any person for the failure of any such worker to depart from the United States upon termination of employment: *Provided*, That no workers shall be made available under this title, nor shall any workers made available under this title be permitted to remain in the employ of, any employer who has in his employ any Mexican alien when such employer knows or has reasonable grounds to believe or suspect or by reasonable inquiry could have ascertained that such Mexican alien is not lawfully within the United States.

"SEC. 505. (a) Section 210 (a) (1) of the Social Security Act, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subparagraph as follows:

"(C) Service performed by foreign agricultural workers under contracts entered into in accordance with title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended."

"(b) Section 1426 (b) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subparagraph as follows:

"(C) Service performed by foreign agricultural workers under contracts entered into in accordance with title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended."

"(c) Workers recruited under the provisions of this title shall not be subject to the head tax levied under section 2 of the Immigration Act of 1917 (8 U. S. C., sec. 132).

"SEC. 506. For the purposes of this title, the Secretary of Labor is authorized—

"(1) to enter into agreements with Federal and State agencies; to utilize (pursuant to such agreements) the facilities and services of such agencies; and to allocate or transfer funds or otherwise to pay or reimburse such agencies for expenses in connection therewith;

"(2) to accept and utilize voluntary and uncompensated services; and

"(3) when necessary to supplement the domestic agricultural labor force, to cooperate with the Secretary of State in negotiating and carrying out agreements or arrangements relating to the employment in the United States, subject to the immigration laws, of agricultural workers from the Republic of Mexico.

"SEC. 507. For the purposes of this title—

"(1) The term 'agricultural employment' includes services or activities included within the provisions of section 3 (f) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, or section 1426 (h) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended.

"(2) The term 'employer' 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.

"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.

"SEC. 510. No workers will be made available under this title for employment after December 31, 1953."

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Did I understand the gentleman to say that the amendment now offered is identical with the one previously offered, with the exception that section 509 is stricken out?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair so understood the gentleman.

Mr. POLK. Mr. Chairman, the Ellender and Poage bills are somewhat similar in substance.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POLK. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HOPE. Will the gentleman state whether or not his substitute now offered is exactly the Senate bill with section 509 stricken out?

Mr. POLK. That is correct.

Mr. Chairman, the Poage bill, however, contains several very undesirable provisions and fails in several important respects to meet the test of adequate legislation in this field, namely to assure that Mexican workers, when needed, are obtained in an orderly manner and under a Government supervised program and to prevent and penalize effectively the illegal traffic in Mexican wetback labor. The Ellender bill, Mr. Chairman, more adequately meets this test.

First, H. R. 3283 would provide for contracting of Mexican workers upon certification for a limited area made by a subordinate official of the Department of Labor instead of the Nation-wide certification of reasonable availability to be made by the Secretary of Labor under S. 984, the Ellender bill. This provision of the Poage bill not only ignores sound principles of Government by giving responsibilities by statute to subordinate departmental officials, such as the regional director of the Bureau of Employment Security, but also indicates a policy of ignoring American farm workers who may be reasonably available for work even though they are outside the immediate area of regional certification.

Second, while the bill authorizes the United States Government to guarantee to Mexican workers amounts due them for wages and transportation under the employment contracts, provisions relating to indemnification by employers' associations are not adequate to protect the Government's interests. A number of employers' associations are not incorporated and have little or no assets. Nevertheless they contract for Mexican workers on behalf of their members. The legislation should provide that workers may be made available to these associations only where the individual

members are liable upon the agreement of the association or where other satisfactory assurances of liability or solvency exist. The Ellender bill corrects this defect of H. R. 3283.

Third, the authority under the Poage bill for obtaining contract Mexican labor extends broadly to many processes which are industrial and not agricultural in nature whereas the Ellender bill is carefully limited to agricultural activities, as such, which, I understand, is the only area of potential need toward which present legislation can be reasonably directed and justified. Here, again, the drawbacks of H. R. 3283 would be corrected by the substitution of the Ellender bill.

Fourth, and this is the most important consideration, Mr. Chairman, the Ellender bill would effectively shut the door to the use of Mexican labor which is illegally in the United States and would provide measures for curbing the influx of wetbacks. Sections 501 and 504 of the Poage bill, on the other hand, provide that Mexican workers already in this country, even if they are here illegally, may be recruited and permitted to remain here if the Mexican Government so agrees. Under the Ellender bill these sections would be corrected so that recruitment would be authorized only in the case of these Mexican workers who have legally entered the United States.

The approval of the Ellender bill as a substitute for H. R. 3283 will provide sound stand-by legislation for obtaining Mexican contract labor to the extent necessary during the present national emergency. It will correct the defects in the machinery provided by H. R. 3283 and, above all, it will create for the first time effective remedies for the gradual control and eventual abolition of the wetback system. Moreover, in achieving substantial agreement with the Senate bill by accepting its bill as a substitute we will expedite the process of conference and adjustment and will insure the prompt enactment of a necessary measure. I cannot underestimate the importance or significance of the provisions of the Ellender bill which are designed to control the wetback situation.

In recent years the United States literally has been invaded by hundreds of thousands of Mexican agricultural workers—known as wetbacks—illegally entering this country in search of employment. No one knows exactly how great this invasion is today. We do know for a fact, however, that it has grown to fantastic proportions. For example, only 7,000 illegal Mexican wetbacks were picked up by the Immigration and Naturalization Service in 1940, whereas 565,000 of these wetbacks were apprehended in the year 1950. There are some reliable estimates that more than 1,000,000 illegal farm laborers from Mexico entered this country in 1950 and I have not any doubt that, while I am standing here today, Mexican braceros—or stoop laborers—are pouring across our southern border displacing American workers, reducing labor standards and spreading communicable diseases.

The record and effects of this illegal invasion have been dramatized so re-

cently in the newspapers and magazines of the Nation that all of you must be somewhat familiar with the story. The report of the President's Commission on Migratory Labor has conservatively stated the facts. The Commission points out:

The wetback is a hungry human being. His need of food and clothing is immediate and pressing. He is a fugitive and it is as a fugitive that he lives. Under the constant threat of apprehension and deportation, he cannot protest or appeal no matter how unjustly he is treated. Law operates against him but not for him. Those who capitalize on the legal disability of the wetbacks are numerous and their devices are many and various.

That the wetback traffic has severely depressed farm wages is unquestionable—the wetback wage tends to become the prevailing wage.

These illegal Mexican workers not only create viciously unfair competition, destroying American labor standards and displacing American workers, but also bring with them problems of death and disease, of housing and sanitation. These workers live in shacks and sheds which no one would wish to put a horse in. They bathe and drink from the irrigation ditches upon the banks of which they live.

There is another very important aspect to this wetback situation. In these precarious times when our country is extending every effort to balk communistic infiltration, the wetback invasion offers a serious threat to our internal security. It is no secret that one of the easiest ways for a Communist spy or saboteur or foreign organizer to enter the United States is across our southern border in the disguise of a Mexican bracero. Wherever we encourage or invite or fail to control this invasion we are jeopardizing our very existence as a nation. It is our clear duty to support the Immigration and Naturalization Service in the already huge task of holding back the hordes of illegal entrants which daily elude our border patrols. Rather than relax our immigration laws, we must tighten them. Above all things we must impose adequate penalties upon those who entice Mexican workers across our border or employ them without concern as to their legal status in this country.

With all of these factors firmly in mind, it is paramount that we act with deliberate speed and unity of purpose. Unity in these times is vital to a successful defense of the Nation. The need for speedy action to provide stand-by legislation is required not only by the prospect of farm-labor shortages which confront us but also by the most recent position taken by the Mexican Government with respect to obtaining Mexican farm workers in an orderly manner under Government supervision. It is my understanding that, because certain employers in the past have failed to meet their obligations under contracts signed with Mexican workers, Mexico has stated that no workers will be furnished after the end of June unless the United States guarantees the fulfillment of the employment contracts with these workers. It is therefore the path of wisdom to

choose a legislative course which provides the speediest method of agreement on effective legislation accomplishing this purpose.

To provide adequate legislation to assure that Mexican workers are, when needed, obtained in an orderly manner and under a Government supervised program the Senate recently passed a bill, S. 984, introduced by the distinguished Senator from Louisiana, Mr. ELLENDER. There is now pending before this House another bill, H. R. 3283, the Poage bill, somewhat similar in substance, containing several very undesirable provisions and failing in several substantive respects to meet the test of adequate legislation in this field.

In my opinion, Mr. Chairman, the Senate bill is far sounder legislation than is H. R. 3283. Time is now of the essence. If we are to have an orderly program for obtaining Mexican workers for the coming harvest, we must proceed with dispatch. We must provide adequate time for the Government agencies to renegotiate an agreement with Mexico. We must provide adequate time for working out the myriad administrative and legal problems incident to undertaking this type of program. We must provide adequate time for the Mexican Government to open recruitment centers in Mexico and for the United States Government to establish reception centers in this country.

Because H. R. 3283 does not meet the test, I propose at the appropriate time to move the substitution of the Senate bill, S. 984, the Ellender bill, for that bill. The Ellender bill is a sound measure providing an orderly basis for obtaining legal contract labor from Mexico to the extent that American workers are not reasonably available. In addition, it will correct the glaring failure of H. R. 3283 to prevent and penalize effectively the illegal traffic in Mexican wetback labor. Let me review, for a moment, the differences between the Senate bill and H. R. 3283.

First, H. R. 3283 would provide for contracting of Mexican workers upon certification for a limited area made by a subordinate official of the Department of Labor instead of the Nation-wide certification of reasonable availability to be made by the Secretary of Labor under S. 984, the Ellender bill. This provision of the Poage bill not only ignores sound principles of government by giving responsibilities by statute to subordinate departmental officials, such as the regional director of the Bureau of Employment Security, but also indicates a policy of ignoring American farm workers who may be reasonably available for work even though they are outside the immediate area of regional certification.

Second, while the bill authorizes the United States Government to guarantee to Mexican workers amounts due them for wages and transportation under the employment contracts, provisions relating to indemnification by employers' associations are not adequate to protect the Government's interests. A number of employers' associations are not incorporated and have little or no assets. Nevertheless they contract for Mexican workers on behalf of their members. The

legislation should provide that workers may be made available to these associations only where the individual members are liable upon the agreement of the association or where other satisfactory assurances of liability or solvency exist. The Ellender bill corrects this defect of H. R. 3283.

Third. The authority under the Poage bill for obtaining contract Mexican labor extends broadly to many processes which are industrial and not agricultural in nature whereas the Ellender bill is carefully limited to agricultural activities, as such, which, I understand, is the only area of potential need toward which present legislation can be reasonably directed and justified. Here, again, the drawbacks of H. R. 3283 would be corrected by the substitution of the Ellender bill.

All of these defects in H. R. 3283, which I have mentioned as being corrected by S. 984, are very important, but of infinite importance is the basic failure of the bill to provide some reasonable control over the entry and employment of wetbacks. Here is what H. R. 3283 provides on this subject. Sections 501 and 504 provide for the recruitment of any Mexican workers and for permission to any such workers to remain in the country if they are already here and Mexico agrees that they may remain here. In other words, Mr. Chairman, this bill not only opens the door to recruitment of wetback labor but also is completely silent on any means for controlling the present wetback situation. By providing for the legalization of wetbacks and giving publicity to this type of provision we would encourage and invite the invasion of this country by a million or more wetbacks seeking employment. Even if we gave employment to one-fourth of them, which is unlikely, the Immigration and Naturalization Service would be required to spend millions of dollars in rounding up and deporting those not employed.

My fears in this direction, Mr. Chairman, are not the result of any illusion. Before World War II, the record shows quite clearly that we neither imported Mexican contract labor nor were faced with any large-scale wetback problem. However, in 1949, we made a colossal blunder when we entered into an international agreement with Mexico which permitted the contracting of wetbacks in this country. The number of apprehensions jumped from less than 30,000 in 1944 to more than 300,000 in 1949. Then in 1950 this figure grew to nearly 600,000. Representatives of both Governments have expressed the opinion that it is obvious that the tremendous increase in illegal entries is the result of the word being spread throughout Mexico that wetbacks are being given legal status in the United States through contract employment. Therefore, it is apparent to me, Mr. Chairman, that if we contract for Mexican labor without dealing directly with the wetback problem, we encourage the entry of wetbacks in ever increasing numbers. On the basis of the figures which I have cited from the Report of the President's Commission on Migratory Labor, I believe that I can predict with certainty that the passage

of H. R. 3283 in its present form will attract even greater numbers of wetbacks seeking employment on our farms and in our factories.

As I have said, the annual invasion is beginning right now. I am informed that while the United States Employment Service has been requested by States some distance from the Mexican border—without ready access to wetback labor—to make certification for the entry of thousands of Mexican contract workers, nevertheless, farmers from the State of Texas, the southern border of which lies upon the Rio Grande River, has placed with the United States Employment Service requests for comparatively few contract Mexicans. The answer is obvious. Farmers from the State of Texas are receiving and using right now so great a number of illegal Mexican wetback laborers that there is little present need in that State for seeking legal contract workers through the orderly process of legal entry after certification by the Government.

Now, Mr. Chairman, let me turn to the Ellender bill. This bill would effectively shut the door to the use of Mexican labor which is illegally in the United States. Sections 501 and 504 of H. R. 3283 would be corrected by the Ellender proposal so that the Secretary of Labor would be authorized to recruit only those Mexican workers legally entering the United States. In this way S. 984 would discourage rather than encourage an invasion of illegal migrants in violation of our immigration laws in the expectation of obtaining employment in this country. Second, the Ellender bill would discourage the use of illegal entrants by preventing employers from obtaining legal contract labor where they also use wetback labor in situations charging them with knowledge that they are employing wetbacks. Third, the Ellender bill would impose effective criminal penalties upon any person employing any Mexican alien illegally in this country where the employer knows or has reasonable grounds to believe, or suspect, or by reasonable inquiry could have ascertained that the alien is not lawfully in the United States. Similar penalties would be imposed for a failure of the employer to report promptly to an immigration officer information obtained during the course of employment indicating that the alien is not legally in the United States.

The enactment of the Ellender bill as a substitute for H. R. 3283 will provide sound stand-by legislation for obtaining Mexican contract labor to the extent necessary during the present national emergency. It will improve the minor defects now present in the machinery provided by H. R. 3283 and, above all, it will create for the first time effective remedies for the gradual control and eventual abolition of the wetback system. Moreover, in achieving substantial agreement with the Senate bill by accepting its bill as a substitute we will expedite the process of conference and adjustment and will insure the prompt enactment of a necessary measure. I cannot underestimate the importance or significance of the provisions of the Ellender bill which are designed to control the wetback situation.

There is one final thought that I wish to express. I anticipate that our failure effectively to control wetbacks as provided by the Ellender bill would, in view of the report of the President's Commission on Migratory Labor, only serve to invite a veto by the President and consequent disruption of our efforts to provide sufficient labor on our farms and in our fields at this time of national emergency.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman from Ohio has removed the most serious objection to the Senate bill, the one that makes it absolutely unworkable, but there are certain other features about the Senate bill which seem to me to be less desirable than the provisions of the House bill.

There has been a question of how much the expenses would be in bringing a Mexican from Mexico to the United States border. The House bill limits that expense to \$10. The Senate bill allows the Government to assess \$20 against the employer.

Remember what that \$20 is for. That \$20 is simply to pay the expenses of bringing that worker from either Monterrey, Chihuahua or Hermosillo to the United States border, providing the cost of meals, and taking care of him on the American side of the border until he is removed by the employer who is going to take him to the place of employment.

I presented to the House a few moments ago a number of affidavits that show that the actual cost as paid by the farmers is running less than \$5, so the House bill provides that the farmer will pay twice as much as the actual cost if the Government spends that much. The Senate bill allows the Government four times that cost. We just think it is a useless waste and an unnecessary burden on the American economy to allow the Government to spend that much.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. No, I cannot yield.

Mr. BAILEY. The gentleman does not know the facts.

Mr. POAGE. I know what each bill provides. I know what it actually costs to bring these workers in. I know that the Government notoriously spends more than is necessary. I also know the Government will spend all we allow. I know the House bill will save money. We feel it is not a sound policy to deliberately waste the money of anybody, and we feel that \$10 is a liberal fee. That is one of the matters in issue.

The other important matter in issue is the question of how much employment can be given to these Mexican nationals. The House bill provides that they may be employed not only on farms but in agricultural processing plants, such as gins, packing sheds, and compresses, in the area where the production is taking place. We feel those activities are so closely related to the immediate agricultural work that to deny the use of Mexican nationals in these operations would in many instances seriously hamper the agricultural activities of the community and

result in the loss of food and fiber throughout the country.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield.

Mr. HOPE. The gentleman from Texas is pointing out some of the differences between the two bills. They are not, as he says, of such great importance as the issue that was raised by section 509. But I do want to make this suggestion for whatever it is worth: This bill would have to go to conference in any event, even if we vote down the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio. The bill would go to conference, and at that time these questions can be settled.

On the other hand, if we adopt the gentleman's amendment with the meager debate which it is possible to have here in Committee of the Whole, I am afraid that a great many people would not know exactly what they are adopting. Does not the gentleman think it would be the wise thing to vote down the gentleman's amendment and then settle these differences in conference?

Mr. POAGE. I think the gentleman from Kansas has expressed it excellently. Let us vote down this amendment. Let us send the bill to conference, and let us decide these questions there, rather than preclude the discussion of these questions in the conference.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the two speeches already made on this amendment really define the basic question.

Mr. Chairman, the House is, I believe, qualified to pass on this legislation. The principal differences remaining now between the Senate bill and the House bill are four: The House bill in its present form permits the legalization of wetbacks, that is, of Mexicans who are already in this country. The effect of that, of course, is to encourage them to cross the border because once they are here, it is much easier to have them approved.

The Mexican Government itself is opposed to that provision.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I do not think the gentleman is correct in stating what the House bill contains.

Mr. McCARTHY. The language in the Senate bill is very clear.

Mr. POAGE. If the gentleman will read the language of the House bill, it says that this can only be done with agreement with the Mexican Government.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, I do not yield to the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, under the House bill wetbacks can be legalized. The point is that the Senate bill is very clear to the effect that any Mexicans who are illegally in this country cannot be legally contracted. So we can pass on from that particular point. The second point relates to the argument which has been made that this bill affects only agricultural laborers. We have a rather clear definition of agricultural workers in the Wages and Hours Act. The Poage bill, the House bill, attempts to extend that definition so as to permit employment of these people in processing plants.

So it takes them out of the field and beyond agriculture. The Senate bill clearly defines the limitation so that these contract workers cannot be used in food packing or processing plants as is allowed by H. R. 3283. The third important difference is that in the Senate bill the definition of an employer is strengthened so as to preclude exemptions which are possible in the House bill and the avoidance of the individual responsibility which is possible under the House bill.

Under the Senate bill employer associations are also defined as being employers. No employer can escape individual responsibility by saying that the association has done this thing. I think that is an important provision.

Finally, the Senate bill provides the certification of need shall be done by the Secretary of Labor rather than by a regional labor officer. This problem of farm labor is not confined to one region of the country only; the decision on supply of labor should not be made in a region, it should be made by the Secretary who has jurisdiction over all the regions. This is only a matter of good procedure. I am sure that the Hoover Commission would sustain me.

The Senate bill also provides that anyone who has an employment contract for Mexicans who is also found to be employing wetbacks shall forfeit his right to contract additional legal Mexicans. This gives statutory recognition to a provision already recognized in the international agreement. Those are the four principal points of difference. I think the House should pass upon them and that the Senate should not be allowed to go to conference to speak for us. We should write our own bill. Otherwise what is the use of passing on the legislation at all? Why not just appoint conferees and give them a blank check and let them bring back what they can get out of the conference?

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment, on the bill and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. SHELLEY. I object.

Mr. CELLER rose.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from New York rise?

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move—

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, was I not recognized?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair inquired for what purpose the gentleman rose; that does not entail recognition.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate close in 10 minutes on the amendment and on the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman restate his motion?

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the pending amendment and the bill close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. And all amendments?

Mr. COOLEY. And all amendments thereto.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. McCORMACK. Is the motion on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto or to the bill?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understood the gentleman to move that all debate on the pending amendment, on the bill and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

Mr. McCORMACK. Has the bill been read?

The CHAIRMAN. The bill has been read.

The question is on the motion of the gentleman from North Carolina.

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt, the Committee divided and there were—ayes 99, noes 87.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. POAGE and Mr. McCARTHY.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 71, noes 97.

So the motion was rejected.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the Polk amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CELLER to the amendment offered by Mr. POLK: Add a new section as follows:

"Sec. —. Any person who shall employ as a farm laborer any Mexican alien 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, when such person knows or has reasonable grounds to believe or suspect or by reasonable inquiry could have ascertained that such alien farm laborer is not lawfully within the United States, or any person who, having employed such an alien without knowing or having reasonable grounds to believe or suspect that such alien farm laborer is unlawfully within the United States and who could not have obtained such information by reasonable inquiry at the time of giving such employment, shall obtain information during the course of such farm labor employment indicating that such alien farm laborer is not lawfully within the United States and shall fail to report such information promptly to an immigration officer, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine not exceeding \$1,000, or by imprisonment for a term not exceeding 1 year, or both, for each farm laborer in respect to whom any violation of this section occurs."

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I call the Chair's attention to the fact that the amendment is almost identical with the amendment appearing in the Senate bill, the substantial difference being only in the matter of degree. It changes the penalty provision, but otherwise it is almost identical with section 509 which was held to be not germane.

I make the point of order that the amendment now before the Committee is not germane to the bill under consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York desire to be heard?

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I have stricken out of the Senate bill and section 509, which was embodied in the Polk amendment, the words "or any other law relating to the immigration or expulsion of aliens." I make my amendment applicable only to alien farm labor. This bill concerns alien farm labor—alien Mexican farm labor—and within the four squares of what is meant by Mexican alien farm labor the words of my amendment to the substitute relate. This is a bill concerning the operations of alien labor, what they shall do and what they shall not do, under the terms and conditions that they may or may not come over the border, and my amendment certainly is consistent with the purposes and aims of the bill in general. A penalty for violation of the terms laid down is germane.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

The Committee has before it a bill to which the gentleman from Ohio has offered an amendment, to which, in turn, the gentleman from New York has offered an amendment providing specific penalties for violation of the provisions of the bill when written into law. The rule of germaneness has been interpreted rather narrowly, but the Chair does not feel that it can declare or hold that the provision of a penalty for the violation of the provisions of the bill is new subject matter or unrelated subject matter.

Therefore, the point of order is overruled.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. GORE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3283) to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, had come to no resolution thereon.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. JACKSON of Washington asked and was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes today, following any special orders heretofore entered.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. EBERHARTER asked and was given permission to address the House today for 5 minutes, following any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to address the House tomorrow for 15 minutes, following any special orders heretofore entered.

T. L. MORROW

Mr. BYRNE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 1424) for the relief of T. L. Morrow, and ask unanimous con-

sent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 583)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1424) for the relief of T. L. Morrow, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate, and agree to the following:

"Restore the matter stricken out by the Senate amendment with the figures in line 6, page 1, namely, \$5,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

PETER W. RODINO, Jr.,
THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ,
EDGAR A. JONAS,

Managers on the Part of the House.

H. M. KILGORE,
ALEXANDER WILEY,
WARREN G. MAGNUSON,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1424) for the relief of T. L. Morrow, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report.

The bill as passed by the House appropriated the sum of \$5,000 to T. L. Morrow of Hattiesburg, Miss., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries sustained by him in a collision with a United States Army vehicle at the intersection of Route 90 and White Road, Biloxi, Miss., on March 3, 1942.

The Senate reduced the amount to \$2,500 and at the conference the sum of \$5,000 was agreed upon.

PETER W. RODINO, Jr.,
THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ,
EDGAR A. JONAS,

Managers on the Part of the House.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHESTER A. MACOMBER

Mr. BYRNE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 1692) for the relief of Chester A. Macomber, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That Chester A. Macomber, of Everett, Mass., is relieved of liability for repayment to the United States of the sum of \$130.63, representing salary paid to him for services rendered as a temporary employee of the Post Office Department for the period from December 13, 1943, to January 5, 1944, during which time he was on terminal leave as a civilian employee of the Department of the Navy.

"SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said Chester A. Macomber the sum of \$130.63, such amount having been withheld from the annuity payable to him under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, on account of the dual employment referred to in the first section of this act: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with the claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. KEATING. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman from New York whether the change in the Senate bill is simply of a technical nature?

Mr. BYRNE of New York. The amendment of the Senate does not change the purpose of the bill. It is merely a safeguard.

Mr. KEATING. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. ALBERT W. LACK

Mr. BYRNE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 3229) for the relief of Mrs. Albert W. Lack, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, strike out lines 9 to 12, inclusive, and insert "such award, pursuant to said act of September 7, 1916, to Mrs. Albert W. Lack, widow of Albert W. Lack, as on the basis of such findings shall appear equitable."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. KEATING. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, do I understand correctly that this is simply changing the name of the beneficiary in this bill?

Mr. BYRNE of New York. No; the Senate amendment was merely to clarify the intent of the bill. It does not change the purpose of the bill as passed by the House.

Mr. KEATING. In what respect does it change the bill? My understanding was that it changed the name of the beneficiary under the bill.

Mr. BYRNE of New York. I do not believe this is the bill the gentleman has in mind.

Mr. KEATING. I should like to know in what respect it does change it.

Mr. BYRNE of New York. The bill itself does not indicate.

Mr. KEATING. I suggest the gentleman withdraw his request until tomorrow.

Mr. BYRNE of New York. Surely, Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my request.

MRS. WALTER J. BICKFORD

Mr. BYRNE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 512) conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Mrs. Walter J. Bickford, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, line 14, after "amended," insert "Enactment of this act shall not be construed as an implication of liability on the part of the United States."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LUCY KONG LEE

Mr. BYRNE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 1800) for the relief of Lucy Kong Lee, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, lines 5 and 6, strike out "Lucy Kong Lee, widow" and insert "the estate." Amend the title so as to read: "An act for the relief of the estate of Chin Hien Lee."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SGT. BENJAMIN H. MARTIN

Mr. BYRNE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 1789) for the relief of Sgt. Benjamin H. Martin, with an amendment of the Senate thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 7, strike out "\$15,000" and insert "\$10,500."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. ARMSTRONG asked and was given permission to address the House

for 45 minutes on Thursday next, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT] is recognized for 30 minutes.

(Mr. BENNETT of Florida asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days to extend their remarks on the subject upon which I will address the House at this time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HERLONG). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

CODE OF ETHICS FOR GOVERNMENT SERVICE

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, today, a concurrent resolution setting forth a proposed code of ethics for Government service has been introduced.

No one Congressman drew this code. It was done by an informal, bipartisan committee, which has been at work on this for several months. At the request of this committee, I have taken the initiative in the introduction of the resolution.

A number of Members of Congress join as sponsors of this legislation. They include: CLIFFORD R. HOPE, JAMES J. MURPHY, HALE BOGGS, BILL LANTAFF, ROBERT J. CORBETT, JAMES T. PATTERSON, LAWRIE BATTLE, FRANK BOYKIN, WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN DORN, KATHARINE ST. GEORGE, GERALD FORD, MARGUERITE STITT CHURCH, JOHN PHILLIPS, FRED E. BUSBEY, WESLEY A. D'EWART, HARLEY O. STAGGERS, ROBERT HALE, THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ, ROBERT T. SECREST, CLEVELAND M. BAILEY, PAUL CUNNINGHAM, CHARLES B. DEANE, EDWARD T. MILLER, HOMER D. ANGELL, WILLIAM L. SPRINGER, FRAZIER REAMS, CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI, JAMES P. S. DEVEREUX, HENDERSON LANHAM, ERNEST GREENWOOD, and A. S. HERLONG.

When the committee which studied this matter first undertook the task, it drew up a preliminary statement concerning the foundations of any possible code of ethics that could be formulated. This statement was as follows:

PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

Government exists for men and not men for government. In a democratic republic such as ours, government is of, for, and by men. He who participates in government—whether as voter, elected office holder, or civil servant—is under a solemn obligation to recognize its great purpose, and to conduct himself accordingly.

The Christian, Jewish, and other religious faiths which share a belief in the sacredness and dignity of man will base their civic conduct on certain fundamental principles, including the following:

1. Individual rights arise from the brotherhood of man under the fatherhood of God. The great freedoms of speech, of the press, or religion are imperatives to be fostered and not disregarded.

2. Individuals are unequal in ability, but equal in their right to be regarded as individuals. Equality of opportunity, the American dream, is a major expression of this truth.

3. The office holder is the servant of the people and not their master. "He that is greatest among you, let him be the servant of all."

4. Public office is a public trust. It carries with it the obligation of personal integrity. Honor and truth in the spoken and written word are basic to responsibility in government.

These are governmental principles that derive from the spiritual faith of our ancestors. They precede any code of concrete conduct. Those who sincerely hold them may be trusted.

No code of conduct can hope to cover specifically the multitude of concrete situations which the complex and vast sphere of contemporary government contains within itself. Yet we believe there is value in identifying certain concrete principles which should guide public officials—in whatever branch or level of government.

In approaching this question of a code of ethics for all Government employees, including elective officials, we did not wish to become theoretical, complicated, or falsely pious in treatment of the subject; for it was our belief that a practical, brief, and understandable code could be worked out that would be of real assistance in the daily workings of government.

We read that many had thought about the idea in the past but never presented a code for enactment. In the May 1922 issue of *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, Prof. R. M. MacIver, of the University of Toronto, wrote:

The false old notion that there was, for that most ancient, and still most imperfectly defined, profession of statesmanship, a peculiar code which liberated it from ordinary ethical standards, has died very hard. In truth there could be no conflicts of ethics and politics, for politics could justify itself only by applying to its own peculiar situations and needs the principles which belong equally to every sphere of life.

We feel that there is a need for a code of ethics in the field of government at this time. And in saying this we do not wish to indulge in confessing the sins of others or even in bemoaning the low state of public morals. There are plenty of people putting in full time in those activities without there being any need for volunteers to fill their ranks at this time.

It would be well for us to remember that on the walls of this Chamber there are the pictures of many legislators of ancient times who found it necessary to mention standards of moral conduct in connection with governmental procedures. Up there is Hammurabi who, in 2250 B. C., considered it fitting to announce that "If a man offer as a bribe grain or money to witnesses, he himself shall bear the sentence of the court in that case"; and in the laws of Moses we read: "And thou shalt take no gift; for a gift blindeth them that have sight, and perverteth the word of the righteous."

In the early days of our own Republic, we find our ancestors establishing strong laws against those who might be found to be corrupt in public office. Bribery is one of the two specific grounds listed

in our Constitution as sufficient foundation for impeachment. In fact, we have on our statute books today many laws regulating the conduct of officials. We have an Administrative Procedures Act, which needs amendments to provide against recently discovered abuses in governmental functions. I have introduced H. R. 4389 for this purpose; and others have introduced other bills to perfect our governmental procedures in an effort to eliminate such abuses.

Yet, with all of our criminal laws and procedural acts and amendments which may be added, there still remains and will remain a need for a simple statement of ethical principles which can be used as a guide in governmental conduct. That is what we hope this proposed code will be. It might be well to mention what we feel that it is not. It is neither literature, religious dogma, criminal law nor political philosophy.

It would seem that even a simple code of ethics, such as we have submitted, might play its part in strengthening the forces of right and in increasing the internal security by adding to the sum of public confidence. In the book *First Book on Jurisprudence* by Sir Frederick Pollock the author says the following words which seem as appropriate today as they did when written:

The need for internal order is as constant as the need for external defense. No society can be stable in which either of these requirements substantially fails to be provided for; and internal order means a great deal more than the protection of individuals against willful revolt or wanton lawlessness.

There are some who have written me concerning this matter expressing extreme pessimism about the value of any code of ethics. One United States Senator wrote me: "I learned years ago that no code of ethics has any effect on those who are not already ethical." Nevertheless, I personally think that the code can have considerable practical value.

I practiced law for a number of years and I can certainly testify that the lawyers' code helped me to turn down requests for improper actions which were occasionally made by persons seeking to employ me as an attorney. Reference to a code of ethics has helped thousands of attorneys to convince clients of the impropriety of contemplated actions. I do not think that there can be any doubt that the lawyers' code has helped to maintain a higher standard in the bar than would otherwise prevail.

Behind almost every politician who has exerted improper influence there is a constituent who has demanded such action. Most politicians resist improper requests, and very few indeed do wrong for financial advantage to themselves. But some do comply, silently cursing their unreasonable constituent and their own weakness and their fear of financial ruin and mostly their fear of political defeat. A code of ethics to show the constituent might provide the slender life line that could keep this brother afloat.

Most politicians are honest; just as most constituents are honest. A code of ethics might help to underline obscure ethical points which both parties

would be happy to comply with, once having had the matter pointed out.

A code of ethics could help the voters to measure candidates at elections. This is true because it sets up standards of ethical behavior in a technical field in which some constituents might otherwise, through lack of experience, fail to appreciate important distinctions.

Moreover, the code of ethics can help governmental employers in evaluating the quality of the service of employees. Federal employees, for instance, may be fired for unsatisfactory work. It would seem that violations of a code of ethics could be the basis of finding an employee unsatisfactory. So it would appear that the code could have a bearing on the continued tenure of not only elected officials but also of civil-service employees.

In an article on codes of ethics, at page 57 of the October 1924 issue of the *International Journal of Ethics*, the author, W. Brooke Graves, says of a code of ethics:

If it does nothing else than direct the thought of men toward ethical matters, the effort is not lost, for when the normal man thinks about matters of this sort he is more likely to try to do better. And the group can only reach a higher ethical standard as its individual members strive for the realization of such a standard.

If it would appear that the above practical applications of such a code are not sufficient to accomplish concrete results, it could be implemented by penalties and procedures; but I do not think that such are essential. I do believe, however, that any code of ethics will need revision from time to time; and I am rather certain that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service will make changes in the present resolution before it is brought to the floor for a vote. I am sure that this code can be improved upon; but it is the best product that I could bring before you with the help of the others who worked with me and who have asked to remain anonymous.

The fact that the proposed code of ethics can be improved upon should not deter us from attempting to improve upon it, and then adopting it. The fact that there will still be transgressions after such a code is approved should not discourage us. If it helps in any case it is justified. A defeatist attitude should not be allowed. Criminal laws have frightened many men away from evil. Religions have inspired many men away from evil. Codes of ethics have done a little of both. I hope that we can all join together in attempting to perfect and establish a code of ethics for Government service that will be worth while.

The resolution to which I have referred reads as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the following code of ethics should be adhered to by all Government employees, including officeholders:

CODE OF ETHICS FOR GOVERNMENT SERVICE

Government employment, whether as an elected officer or not, requires both conscientious vocational labor and righteous personal conduct. It should be characterized by devotion to God and country.

As a desire and purpose to forward the best interests of the United States are an essential part of the loyalty of citizenship, no person who fails to have such desire and purpose should hold Government employment.

A Government employee should:

1. Put loyalty to God and country above loyalty to persons, party, or Government department.
2. Uphold the Constitution, laws, and legal regulations of the United States and of all governments therein and never be a party to their evasion.
3. Give a full day's labor for a full day's pay.
4. Seek to find and employ more efficient and economical ways of getting tasks accomplished.
5. Never discriminate unfairly by the dispensing of special favors or privileges to anyone, whether for remuneration or not; and never accept favors or benefits from persons doing business with the Government.
6. Make no private promises of any kind binding upon the duties of office. (A Government employee has no private word which can be binding on public duty.)
7. Engage in no business with the Government either directly or indirectly.
8. Never use any information coming to him in public functions as a means for making private profit.
9. Expose corruption wherever discovered.
10. Never seek to influence another to violate these principles.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. I yield.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I congratulate the gentleman for what he has done. I have seen him working on this and struggling with it for many months. It was his idea. He was the first to bring it informally to the attention of individual Members of the House. I do not think at any time the gentleman felt—and I think he would say so today—that he would bring in for the first time a perfect Code of Ethics; any more than the code of ethics for the Bar Association for the attorneys, or a code of ethics for doctors, or a code of ethics for any other profession such as engineers, or what have you, was perfect at the first time. Such codes were placed on paper and brought to the light of day.

I believe he has done a great service. I believe out of this will come eventually a code of ethics that we will look upon with pride as something as to which we can say, as public servants: This is what we stand for; this is our guide.

I am glad, indeed, and I thank the gentleman for permitting me to associate myself with him as one of the sponsors of this initial introduction of what will be a code of ethics for people in public life.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. I certainly wish to thank the gentleman from California and to say he has given me great assistance in working this thing out and has given me much encouragement and worked in every possible way to assist me. I entirely agree with him that this code, in its present form, cannot be considered as being perfect. It has been a real inspiration to me to serve with the gentleman from California in trying to work out this code of ethics to the best of our ability.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. This shows real courage. The gentleman has courage in every way and in every other respect. We do honor to him.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. I thank my good friend. She certainly has been a true friend to me in everything that I have attempted to do here. Your great career in Congress has been a challenge to me in what I have tried to do.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. I yield.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I want to add my comment to those which have been made concerning the gentleman from Florida for this very splendid work that he has done. I know he has given a great deal of time and a great deal of thought to it. I also like this code of ethics because it is simple. It is straightforward. It is something we can all understand, and we can all adapt it to our own needs. It is not pompous, it is not preachy, it is not holding up anything or anybody as being better than anything or anyone else. It is simply a straightforward statement of facts. In this modern world it seems to me that such a statement is needed. The gentleman from Florida deserves the greatest credit for having put this into simple form and for having brought it to the attention of the Members of the House of Representatives, and finally for having brought it to the floor. I thank the gentleman for having allowed me to associate myself in some small way with this work. I hope it will go forward. I hope it will prosper and I hope it will improve because I am sure it is something that is necessary and something that can do a great deal of good, not only so far as we are concerned, but also for our Government employees and as a reassurance to all the people of the country, that they may know that their public servants have God-righteousness and God-fearingness in their hearts and minds.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. I certainly am deeply indebted to the gentlewoman for her remarks and her help in this project. Her splendid work in this House sets an example of public service at its best.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from Florida for his noble objective in seeking to improve moral and ethical standards in Government.

Although we cannot legislate high morals and good ethics I believe that the adoption of a code of ethics as proposed by my colleague, would be helpful in bringing light on some of the evils which need to be challenged and eliminated so far as it is humanly possible.

But we must not attempt to disassociate immoral and unethical acts in Government from the lack of ethics and morals in our community and economic life.

Government, whatever it is, generally reflects the understanding, the intelligence, the morality, or the apathy and confusion of the public.

Deceptive propaganda of fronts and lobbies adds to confusion and immorality. For a high standard of morality

and ethics in our communities, in the Government, or in the Congress the Nation's press must adopt higher moral and ethical standards.

Nothing can be more effective in promoting high moral and ethical standards than a press which is not only free but honest and clean.

If the stream of public information is polluted, it will not only affect morality in Government, but the unity of our people, the strength of our Nation, and the welfare of our people.

Mr. Speaker, I hope to discuss this question in greater detail at some future time.

MRS. ALBERT W. LACK

Mr. BYRNE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 3229) for the relief of Mrs. Albert W. Lack, with Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

Since I made my previous request I have taken this up with the gentleman from New York and satisfied him on the point on which he desired information.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, strike out lines 9 to 12, inclusive, and insert "such award, pursuant to said act of September 7, 1916, to Mrs. Albert W. Lack, widow of Albert W. Lack, as on the basis of such findings shall appear equitable."

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, since the matter came up before I had examined the text of this change and find it is simply of a technical nature. It does not in judgment change the meaning of the bill.

I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from California [Mr. JACKSON] is recognized for 30 minutes.

THE COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I dislike to impose upon the House at this late hour, but unfortunately my remarks are in the form of notes and not a manuscript which I could insert in the RECORD else I would gladly do so.

I should like in a few minutes to briefly to discuss the work of the House Committee on Un-American Activities as it shapes up at this time some 6 months after the convening of the first session of the present Congress. We all know that since the creation of the House Committee on Un-American Activities it has been one of the most controversial committees of the Congress; at least one President of the United States has berated it as a "red herring" and as "the un-American committee." The Communist press and the fellow traveler press of the Nation have frothed at its

activities and at an alleged disregard of the rights of witnesses appearing before the committee. At other times the more conservative elements of the American press have taken issue with the conduct of the committee and have, in a manner of speaking, shaken a saddened editorial head at some of those activities. But, Mr. Speaker, through all of the vicissitudes of the existence of the House Committee on Un-American Activities that committee has had one great and priceless asset; it has enjoyed to the fullest extent the confidence of the vast majority of the people of this country. That approval has rendered it possible for this committee to do a very important task, a task which cannot be underestimated in the light of present world conditions.

Much of the credit for the continuing success of the Committee on Un-American Activities must be given its able and conscientious chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WOOD], who in the conduct of his important assignment has been eminently fair, straightforward, and desirous of protecting all of the legitimate rights of the witnesses who have been subpoenaed before the committee. In this task he has been assisted by an able and conscientious staff of investigators and by the chief committee counsel, Mr. Frank Tavenner.

The Communist press to the contrary notwithstanding, it is safe to say that today there is no badgering of witnesses before the committee, and there is no "baiting" of those who appear to give their testimony. All witnesses may be represented by legal counsel in their appearances before the committee and may seek advice on points having to do with possible self-incrimination. Postponements have been granted from time to time to those witnesses whose immediate appearance might cause injury to their health. I quote these instances only to indicate that every reasonable consideration is given to the witness and to his reasonable and legal requests.

In short, the House Committee on Un-American Activities has been making every effort to justify itself in the eyes of the Congress and of the Nation as an important investigative arm of the House of Representatives and of the Congress of the United States. During the present session of the Congress there has been little criticism in public print or from other sources with respect to the conduct of the committee. This statement, of course, excludes the Daily Worker, the Daily People's World, and other publications of a left-wing or Communist character.

Much of the universal acceptance of the present work of the Un-American Activities Committee can, of course, be traced to changed world conditions and to a changed public opinion, both in the United States and abroad, and to a new recognition and a fuller realization of the threat posed to freemen and to free institutions by the international Communist conspiracy. What was once considered by some well-meaning but misdirected people as a "witch hunt" or as "Red baiting" is now generally recognized throughout this country as a proper

activity in the defense of the American people and of our way of life against an organized and secret conspiracy which has sought and presently seeks the overthrow of every constitutional form of government in the world that does not parallel that practiced in the Soviet Union. No thinking man today, Mr. Speaker, underrates the threat of the Communist conspiracy. Frustrated in its efforts to achieve its goal by subversion and treason, we have seen that conspiracy engage in the utilization of the armed force as an implement of foreign policy in Korea. Political developments in Poland, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Bulgaria, Rumania, Albania, China, North Korea, Tibet, and other lands have shown the power of organized minorities working undercover and through subversive channels to disrupt and destroy human liberty and human freedom.

Two of the finest words in the English language have been combined and corrupted to form the ironic phrase "people's republic." Neither "republic" nor "people's" are words to describe organized misery and the concentration camp methods practiced within the Communist system.

Propaganda is one of the most lethal weapons in the hands of Communist leaders. It is a weapon which is wielded skillfully by those leaders. Communism, we know, uses the minds and the talents of individuals to influence the thinking and the mass actions of others. Perhaps no fields of human endeavor have offered quite the fertile field for Communist propaganda as have those activities associated with the arts, sciences and professions. Those fields were particularly subject to attack by communism during the period of the late war and in the years immediately succeeding that conflict. The stage, the screen, the radio, and every other medium of public entertainment and public information came under a premeditated and determined attack during the period. Recruits were found and Communist cells flourished wherever artists for one reason or another lent themselves to this conspiracy.

There is, of course, no greater medium of information in the world today than the medium of moving pictures. From the small beginnings in Hollywood of Vitagraph and Pathé Pictures, and of many of the other early studios, there has grown a great and prosperous industry, an industry in which there has been made financial investments totaling hundreds of millions of dollars; an industry which has furnished employment to thousands and thousands of American citizens of unquestioned integrity and unquestioned loyalty. From Kankakee to Tanganyika there is no hamlet, no matter how small, that has not come under the influence of motion pictures. There is scarcely a community of any size in the world today which does not number among the groups and associations in that community a fan club of one sort or another who take as their idol one of the great artists of the moving picture industry. Mabel Normand, Pearl White, Nita Naldi, Charlie Chaplin, William and Dustin Farnum, William S.

Hart and a score of other great stars in the early days of the moving picture industry were forerunners of those who were later to amass fortunes and become known throughout the civilized world through the medium of moving pictures. In short, it can be said that within the space of a very few years the motion picture became a great medium for good or for evil. The Communists were not slow to recognize this fact. As adept as they are in propaganda efforts, they early recognized the medium of the motion pictures as a channel through which there might be disseminated that information which they considered essential to the creation of a political climate in which communism could and would flourish. We, who have the privilege of living in the so-called democratic nations of the earth, are sometimes slow to use the weapons at our hands for the dissemination of information which tends to paint an accurate picture of life here in America. The Communists, on the other hand, are never asleep at the switch and are always ready to seize upon any opportunity given them to spread their doctrines and their philosophies.

Hollywood, obviously then, offered to the Communist movement four great things. If they could capture and could control the moving-picture industry there were open to them four channels of inestimable value. In the first place, the Communist movement, if successful in Hollywood, would gain the prestige of great names, names known throughout the world as leading artists, directors, writers, and others in the industry. They would obtain, secondly, financial support from the world capital of the moving-picture industry in which fabulous salaries were being paid to the artists. They saw also the opportunity of gaining control of the craft unions and the guild unions in Hollywood, which control would, in turn, place them in a position to dictate their own terms to the industry leaders and lead, in turn, to the fourth great propaganda medium which they hoped to achieve, and that was the planting of Communist propaganda in motion pictures by the insertion of material favorable to the Communist system.

Under the direction of V. J. Jerome, the Communist Party cultural director, the attack was launched. John Howard Lawson, one of the Hollywood 10 who was imprisoned for contempt of the Congress, became the bellwether of the Hollywood flock. It was to John Howard Lawson that confused and bewildered members of the party took their problems. It was John Howard Lawson who explained how the United States could be allied with one force on any given day and then move 180 degrees around the circle and be with the other side on the following day. Evidently Mr. Lawson did a splendid job of rationalization in this respect, because he did convince a number of people that these changes of course were logical and justified. Recruits were sought in Hollywood and were obtained in every section of the moving-picture industry. Stars, directors, writers, grips, electricians—all of the guilds and crafts—were finally represented in the Communist Party in Hollywood when it reached the height of its strength during the war years.

resented in the Communist Party in Hollywood when it reached the height of its strength during the war years.

If there is any question, Mr. Speaker, that is asked more frequently than any other, it is, How is a high-paid moving picture actor or actress induced to join the Communist Party, a political group which holds as anathema anything and everything connected with the capitalistic system? Several reasons have been advanced by those witnesses who appeared before our committee as the reason why they, as individuals, became members of the Communist Party and took part in its activities. In the first place, there was the thrill of the unique and unconventional which might be compared to the feeling of self-achievement experienced by one who sits on a flagpole for a hundred days. Secondly, there was the individual who had a sincere and deep sense of social obligation, and it appeared to him that he could best find an outlet for this expression in the ranks of the Marxists. Third, there were the careful characters, those who thought, that while the democratic way of life might continue to exist and prosper, there was always the chance that a Communist system might overcome the democratic form of life in the final struggle. These people said, "Just to be safe I am going to keep a foot in each camp."

There was another large group who suffered from a weird assortment of neuroses and who took those neuroses with them into communism and tried to solve their problems within the framework of the Marxist philosophy.

Finally, there were those for whom no brief can be held at all except to say that they were stupid.

It has been estimated that during the height of the Communist activity in Hollywood from 200 to 250 name personalities were recruited into the party. This would have been during the period of the late 1930's and the 1940's. Many of those individuals have since that time unquestionably left the Communist Party, but by the same token many are members to this day.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of California. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS. The gentleman is making a very good contribution to what might be called a library of information that is accumulating, especially out of his committee, on not merely the effort but the technique of imposing thoughts upon this country. I wonder if he could answer this: Has the gentleman any idea of what was taken out of the movie colony in money during those days?

Mr. JACKSON of California. I hope to come to that if time permits.

Was the Communist Party in its Hollywood activity successful in achieving any of the objectives which I have set forth? The prestige of great names was achieved and used successfully, especially within the ranks of the party itself, to attract others to membership. The names played a material part in recruitment.

In the field of financing, I question very much whether it will ever be known how much money was contributed by

party members to the Communist Party in Hollywood. We do know that several witnesses have testified that they drew salaries in amounts varying from \$2,000 to \$4,000 and \$5,000 during the period when they were members of the party and that regular pledges were paid to the party over a period of many months.

As to the control of unions, there was a marked success during one particular period when the Conference of Studio Unions, under the leadership of Herbert K. Sorrell, struck and succeeded in tying up the entire moving-picture industry over a period of many months. However, it must be said in all justice and all fairness that the Communists were never successful except in very isolated cases in obtaining control of any of the craft or guild unions.

Propaganda in picture content was successful to some extent, particularly during and immediately after the war years, when the Soviet Union was our ally. The so-called documentary film offered an excellent medium for Communist propaganda.

During the last 5 months the House Committee on Un-American Activities has been investigating the extent of Communist infiltration and activity in the motion-picture industry. I should like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that "industry" in this sense means not only the men who control the destinies of the studios but comprises as well thousands and thousands of American citizens who, after their work is finished, go to their homes and their families in much the same manner and with much the same spirit as do millions of other Americans.

One of the first witnesses this year before the House Committee on Un-American Activities was Larry Parks, the star of the Jolson Story. The case of Larry Parks is unusual because he was the first to appear before the committee and admit prior membership in the Communist Party. Since then the committee has heard two score or more witnesses from Hollywood, and they have been, according to their own determination, cooperative, uncooperative, arrogant, or contemptuous. Each has been an individual case and has had to have consideration upon its individual merits.

The majority of the witnesses have been represented by counsel. An attorney, Mr. Ben Margolis, of Los Angeles, who has represented a number of non-cooperative witnesses, has been identified on the witness stand as being himself a member of the Communist Party.

Great progress, I believe, has been made in the current hearings, and there is reason to believe that a majority of the more prominent members of the party in Hollywood have at this time been identified. I believe it is the intention of the committee to carry on further investigations on the west coast, and unquestionably a number of additional subpoenas will be issued at the proper time.

The right of a witness to answer questions or not to answer questions put to him by committee counsel or by committee members has been scrupulously observed in the present hearings.

In general, I can say that witnesses who have appeared before the committee

during the past 6 months can be classified in three categories. We have first of all the witness who has been a member of the Communist Party and whose membership in the Communist Party is documented. That category of witnesses breaks down still further to first, those who talk, and second, those who do not talk. Naturally, the first category is very helpful to us in gathering the information necessary to propose intelligent legislation to the Congress.

In the first category of those who talked to the committee were Parks, Collins, Hayden, Rosenberg, Dmytryk, and Lawrence, among others. In the category of those who refused to cooperate with the committee were Gough, Da Silva, Polansky, and of course, in 1947, the original Hollywood ten. Obviously the committee obtains its best information from those former Communists who are willing to cooperate and who are willing to tell the committee what they know about the operations of the party and tell about those who held membership during the same period of time.

The Committee on Un-American Activities has a tremendous job to do. It has the job of spotlighting those whose activities are subversive in nature and those whose activities and whose public statements have made them suspect. Not only in entertainment, but in education, labor unions, and in industry Communists have succeeded in infiltrating. Even at this moment there are seminars and institutes being held throughout the country at which some of those who have become suspect are participating.

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of California. I yield.

Mr. HILLINGS. I wish to commend the gentleman for the excellent presentation he is making this afternoon on the very important subject of subversive activities. I might say that I can remember when not very many months ago the conservative and liberal elements throughout the country, in addition to Communists and the Communist Party itself were roundly condemning the Committee on Un-American Activities of this body for the work it had been doing. I prefer to recall the splendid work of the committee in sending Mr. Alger Hiss to the Federal penitentiary.

Again I wish to commend the committee for the excellent job it has done in exposing these subversive activities.

I wish to ask the gentleman if he is aware of the fact that an organization known as the Institute of International Relations currently is holding a meeting on the west coast at Whittier, Calif., in which a number of the individuals who are carrying the torch for some of this Communist propaganda are scheduled to be in attendance. Is the gentleman familiar with that?

Mr. JACKSON of California. I would say to the gentleman from California that my understanding is that such an institute is being held and that several of the individuals who have become suspect over the years are connected with that institute. If the gentleman likes, I will read a couple of paragraphs here

which might cast some light on that subject.

Mr. HILLINGS. I would appreciate it if the gentleman would do that.

Mr. JACKSON of California. One of the participants in the institute in question is Mr. Henry J. Cadbury, a professor at Harvard University. Dr. Cadbury was one of the sponsors of the American Rescue Ship Mission arranged under the auspices of the United American Spanish Aid Committee. That committee was cited by Attorney General Tom Clark and he said in the citation:

The Communist Party threw itself wholeheartedly into the campaign for the support of the Spanish Loyalist cause, recruiting men in organized, multifarious, so-called relief organization.

There are several other citations with respect to Dr. Cadbury.

Mr. HILLINGS. Would the gentleman find it possible to place that material in the RECORD?

Mr. JACKSON of California. I should be very happy to place all of the material in the RECORD.

Another educator connected with the same institute is Dr. Maynard C. Kreuger, professor of economics at the University of Chicago. The citations are too long to read in the time allotted to me, but I will ask permission to extend them in the RECORD.

Mr. HILLINGS. I wish again to thank the gentleman and urge that this material be brought to the attention of some of the people who are concerned about the particular meeting which I have mentioned.

Mr. JACKSON of California. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I feel that the Committee on Un-American Activities is doing a constructive, well thought out, and conscientious job in bringing to light these facts. This is not a question of thought control. It is not a question of suppressing opinions. It is simply a question of certain individuals holding opinions which those under their control or those who are subject to their instruction should know.

It is one thing to teach the facts about any political party, including the Communist Party, but it is another thing to propagandize under the guise of education. This is a matter of grave concern to everyone who is concerned with education. It is to be hoped that if any injustice has been worked upon any of the individuals I have mentioned, that they will come forward to repudiate the associations or to make a statement relevant to the matter. I might say, and I am sure that Judge Wood has said this same thing many times, that anyone who feels the House Committee on Un-American Activities has been unfair, or has been instrumental in damaging his character is welcome to come before the committee and make a full explanation. This does not mean, of course, that we are particularly anxious to have a long procession of people through the committee who decline to answer the questions of the committee. We are seeking information, and we are not trying to be a whistle stop on the way to jail; but the

only way we can get this information is from individuals who appear as witnesses and cooperate with the committee.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I should like to call attention of the membership of the House to the recently published document Guide to Subversive Organizations and Publications which was prepared and released by the House Committee on Un-American Activities. It should be in the office not only of every Member of Congress, but of every educator, of every union official, of every captain of industry. This is the listing of organizations whose conduct across the years has been such as to indicate that they have been consistently following the Communist Party line. I recommend it to the attention of the membership of the House and of the American public at large.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may insert at this point in my remarks the information I referred to earlier in my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

(The matter referred to follows:)

The public records, files, and publications of the Committee on Un-American Activities contain the following references to persons named in the subject above:

Henry J. Cadbury (Hollis professor of New Testament, Harvard University, and chairman of the American Friends Service Committee):

Dr. Henry J. Cadbury was one of the sponsors of the American Rescue Ship Mission, arranged under the auspices of the United American Spanish Aid Committee, as was shown on a letterhead of that committee dated February 13, 1941. In 1937 and 1938, "the Communist Party threw itself wholeheartedly into the campaign for the support of the Spanish Loyalist cause, recruiting men and organizing multifarious so-called relief organizations," among which was the United American Spanish Aid Committee (Rept. 1311 of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, released March 29, 1944, pp. 82 and 138). Attorney General Tom Clark cited the United Spanish Aid Committee as Communist on lists furnished the Loyalty Review Board (press releases of April 25, 1949, and July 25, 1949); he further cited the American Rescue Ship Mission as Communist and "a project of the United American Spanish Aid Committee" on his list which was released to the press July 25, 1949.

The Daily Worker of September 24, 1940 (p. 1), reported that "83 prominent church men, educators, and other leaders in public life joined yesterday in an open letter to Attorney General Robert H. Jackson urging him to take action under Federal statutes on unlawful attempts to prevent minority parties from being placed on the ballot. The letter was made public by Dashiell Hammett, chairman of the Committee on Election Rights, 1940, of the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties." Among the list of persons who signed the open letter was the name of Dr. Henry J. Cadbury, Harvard University, a leader in the Society of Friends.

The Special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the Committee on Election Rights as a Communist-front organization "whose function was to agitate for placing the Communist Party on the ballot throughout the United States" (Rept. 1311 of March 29, 1944, pp. 47 and 48). The same report contained the following citation of the National Federation for Constitutional

Liberties: "There can be no reasonable doubt about the fact that the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties—regardless of its high-sounding name—is one of the viciously subversive organizations of the Communist Party" (also cited in the Special Committee's reports of June 25, 1942, and January 2, 1943). The congressional Committee on Un-American Activities cited the National Federation as "one of the organizations spawned for the alleged purpose of defending civil liberties in general but actually intended to protect Communist subversion from any penalties under the law" (Rept. No. 1115, released September 2, 1947, p. 3). Attorney General Tom Clark cited the National Federation as subversive and Communist (letters to the Loyalty Review Board, released to the press December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948); Attorney General Biddle cited the National Federation as "part of what Lenin called the solar system of organizations, ostensibly having no connection with the Communist Party, by which Communists attempt to create sympathizers and supporters of their program." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 88, part 6, page 7446.)

Maynard C. Krueger (professor of economics, University of Chicago; frequent participant University of Chicago Radio Roundtable):

A press release which was issued by the American Youth Congress named Maynard Krueger, vice president, American Federation of Teachers, as one of the prominent individuals who endorsed the American Youth Act. Attorney General Tom Clark cited the American Youth Congress as subversive and Communist (letters to the Loyalty Review Board, released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948); "it originated in 1934 and * * * has been controlled by Communists and manipulated by them to influence the thought of American youth." (Attorney General Francis Biddle, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 88, part 6, page 7444; also cited in re Harry Bridges, May 28, 1942, p. 10.) The Special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the American Youth Congress as "one of the principal fronts of the Communist Party" and "prominently identified with the White House picket line * * * under the immediate auspices of the American Peace Mobilization." (Report of June 25, 1942, p. 16; also cited in reports of January 3, 1939, p. 82; January 3, 1941, p. 21; June 25, 1942, p. 16, and March 29, 1944, p. 102.)

On August 17, 1938, Mr. Walter S. Steele appeared before the Special Committee on Un-American Activities and testified as follows:

"Just as the Communist Party has its defense movement, the International Labor Defense, so also has the Socialist Party, the Workers' Defense League. The latter organization was formed in May 1936 by leading members of the Socialist Party. * * * The National Committee of the Workers' Defense League is composed of the following Socialist and extreme left wingers: * * * Maynard Krueger." (Public hearings, vol. I, pp. 678-679.)

Milton Mayer: Milton Mayer, identified as a professor at the University of Chicago, was reported to have addressed a meeting of One Worlders in Syracuse, N. Y., as follows: "We must haul down the American flag. And if I wanted to be vulgar and shocking, I would go even further and say haul it down, stamp on it, and spit on it." (from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 93, part 2, pages 1720-21, Representative Gearhart of California, in introducing H. R. 234 for punishment of those who desecrate the flag; his quotation was from newspaper clipping from Syracuse Post-Standard of February 16, 1947.)

The Daily People's World for July 5, 1950 (p. 4), reported that Milton Mayer, who described himself as "a rabid anti-Communist," addressed the Quaker Institute of International Relations and told them that the United States policy in Korea "seems dangerously like the totalitarianism we are supposed to be fighting."

Mordecai Johnson (president of Howard University, Washington, D. C.):

According to the Daily Worker of March 16, 1932 (p. 1), Mordecai Johnson praised the Communist Party; he praised the Communists and defended the Soviet Union (Daily Worker, May 21, 1948, p. 7).

The Summary of Proceedings of the Win-the-Peace Conference of the National Committee To Win the Peace, Washington, D. C., April 5-7, 1946, carried the name of Dr. Mordecai Johnson as chairman of the Saturday Evening Session. The National Committee To Win the Peace was cited as subversive and Communist by former Attorney General Tom Clark in letters furnished the Loyalty Review Board and released to the press by the United States Civil Service Commission December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948.

An advertisement of the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties carried in the New York Times of April 1, 1946 (p. 16), listed Mordecai W. Johnson, educational administrator, Howard University, as one of the signers of a statement opposing the use of injunctions in labor disputes. The Daily Worker for March 18, 1945 (p. 2), shows that Dr. Mordecai W. Johnson was one of the endorsers of a statement sponsored by the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties, hailing the War Department's order on commissions for Communists. (See pp. 1 and 2 of this memorandum for citation of the National Federation.)

Mordecai W. Johnson spoke at the Southern Negro Youth Conference, as shown by the Daily Worker for January 23, 1937 (p. 3). The Southern Negro Youth Congress was cited as subversive and among the affiliates and committees of the Communist Party, USA, by Attorney General Tom Clark in a letter furnished the Loyalty Review Board, released to the press December 4, 1947. The Special Committee on Un-American Activities (in its report of January 3, 1940, p. 9), cited the Southern Negro Youth Congress as a Communist-front organization.

Dr. Johnson spoke at the second conference of the Southern Conference for Human Welfare, Chattanooga, Tenn., April 14-16, 1940, as shown by the Call to the Conference. The Southern Conference was cited as a Communist-front organization by the special committee in its report dated March 29, 1944 (p. 147). The congressional Committee on Un-American Activities, in its Report No. 592, released June 12, 1947, cited the Southern Conference as an organization "which seeks to attract southern liberals on the basis of its seeming interest in the problems of the South" although its "professed interest in southern welfare is simply an expedient for larger aims serving the Soviet Union and its subservient Communist Party in the United States."

Dr. Mordecai W. Johnson was quoted with approval by the Daily Worker (November 24, 1950, p. 3); a speech delivered by Dr. Johnson was reprinted in the December 17, 1950, issue of that newspaper (p. 2) and he was also quoted with approval in the December 24, 1950 issue (sec. 2, p. 5). The Daily Worker was cited as "the chief journalistic mouthpiece of the Communist Party * * * founded in response to direct instructions from the Communist International in Moscow" by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities in its report dated March 29, 1944 (pp. 59 and 60). It was cited as the "official Communist Party, U. S. A., organ" by the Congressional Committee on Un-American Activities. (Rept. No. 1920 of May 11, 1948, p. 44.)

James A. Cobb, attorney, testified before the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on November 5, 1938, in public hearings, "that Dr. Mordecai Johnson, president

of Howard University, has publicly advocated the doctrines of communism." He read portions of speeches delivered by Dr. Johnson to substantiate his statement. (Vol. 3, public hearings before the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, pp. 2143-2161.)

NAM ATTACK ON ERIC JOHNSTON

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks at this point in the Record and to include immediately following my personal remarks the contents of two letters with respect to the National Association of Manufacturers controversy with Mr. Eric Johnston.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, the National Association of Manufacturers, which was the big winner here in 1946 when the Congress crippled price control—and which was promising the people that prices would not go up out of line if price control was killed—is now trying once again to persuade the Congress of the United States to rip off the only protection the people now have against higher and higher cost-of-living prices. The NAM says get rid of price controls and use taxes and credit restraints instead. But the same NAM that says do not use price control to curb inflation because taxes can do the job, also was in here last week trying to kill off the tax bill. That kind of logic might appear to the NAM to be good enough to fool Congress with, on the theory that it does not take much to fool the Congress, but the NAM is wrong on that theory just as it is on most of the theories it tries to lobby into law.

I was very disturbed, Mr. Speaker, to see that this organization, which is not above turning itself into a lobby for organized greed, has launched an attack on an outstanding American businessman who has had the patriotism to take over a difficult and thankless job of trying to stabilize this economy in the face of the dangerous inflationary threat ahead. I am referring to Mr. Eric Johnston, the Administrator of the Economic Stabilization Agency, a man who has had the courage to stand up for the consumers and the people against this selfish drive for business-as-usual in time of national crisis.

The NAM says Eric Johnston now has a "new economic religion" from the one he followed when he was president of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States and an active businessman. It says he has "not been engaged directly in business for some time," meaning, therefore, that he just cannot know what he is talking about when he calls upon business to do its part in this emergency by holding down prices—and requiring that prices be held down.

I was therefore very pleased to learn that when a businessman sent Mr. Johnston a copy of a NAM attack on him, and chided Mr. Johnston for allegedly changing his economic views, that Mr. Johnston not only replied forcefully but made public the exchange of correspondence.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the Members of Congress would be interested

in reading that exchange of letters for a real insight on how an outstanding businessman can go ahead in a difficult job in the public interest despite smears from an outfit from the NAM.

The exchange of correspondence follows:

OTT-HEISKELL Co.,

Wheeling, W. Va., June 8, 1951.

Mr. ERIC JOHNSTON,
Washington, D. C.

GOOD MORNING, Mr. JOHNSTON: There is an editorial in the June 9 issue of NAM News captioned "Eric Johnston's new economic religion." I think your position, as quoted in press interviews, gives ample grounds for this editorial.

Of course, it's all right for an individual to change his mind. That is often done, but for one with your background—one with your past experience—it seems to me you would be a bit loath to give up all that you once believed in simply because of a changed position now. For one, I am still old-fashioned enough to believe that America should remain a land of freedom and opportunity. A system you once advocated and defended. It is still a pretty good plan to follow. What has become of the rugged individual you once were?

Yours truly,

W. F. KENNEDY.

ECONOMIC STABILIZATION AGENCY.

Mr. W. F. KENNEDY,
President, Ott-Heiskell Co.,
Wheeling, W. Va.

DEAR Mr. KENNEDY: As you were thoughtful enough to take a few minutes from your busy day to write to me about the editorial in the NAM News of June 9, I am taking a few minutes to reply.

Although my views on the need for temporary direct controls apparently differ from the stated position of the National Association of Manufacturers, I have no quarrel with that organization, or any organization that takes the NAM position. The writer of the editorial you sent is entitled to his point of view and his right to express it. I only regret his many inaccuracies which give a distorted picture.

Among those is the statement: "It is fair to point out, however, that Mr. Johnston has not been engaged directly in business for some time. His cast of thought and motivation are no longer governed by the requirements of running a business successfully to safeguard the jobs of employees and the rights of stockholders."

Now, what are the facts? I have been the operating head continuously, until I took the position as Economic Stabilizer in January, of four businesses in the Northwest, three of which I founded. These businesses are all successful financially. They give employment to a number of people. The businesses are expanding and are creating more jobs. The stockholders appear to be satisfied with the operation and with the dividends they are receiving.

But the factual inaccuracies are not the only unfortunate aspect of the NAM editorial. Isn't the writer saying, in effect, that the United States has citizens of the first class, in those who are engaged in business, and second-class citizens in those who are not in business? Is that the kind of country we want America to be? It certainly is not my idea of America.

And I'm wondering if you'd really subscribe to the editorial writer's indicated philosophy of public service. He lays down a rule that Government officials should be guided by the requirements of running a business successfully with the first regard to employees and stockholders. Wouldn't you agree with me that a man who accepts a position of responsibility with the Federal Government in time of national emergency

has a greater loyalty that comes first? I mean a loyalty above all to the public interest. I believe the public interest embraces business, labor, the farmer, the consumer and transcends the interest of any one group, no matter how vocal or politically powerful that group may be.

In discharging the responsibilities of my office I believe that I can be most effective in safeguarding the rights of stockholders and the jobs of employees by safeguarding the security of the United States to the best of my ability. And right now that means bending all my efforts to speeding the national-defense program as effectively as possible.

Would the NAM editorial writer set up the requirement that one must be a businessman to serve in Korea? Would he reserve the Purple Hearts for those who are stockholders in corporations? Would he save the headstones for those who have met a payroll?

There never has been any secret about my views on the American economy and the place of controls in that economy. I have said repeatedly, and I say now, that I am inherently opposed to controls. But during this period of emergency, controls are a safeguard to our democratic capitalism, and uncontrolled inflation is the major threat to our system. It's because I want to see our capitalism continue that I support controls as a temporary necessity.

Why do we need controls? Because the American people are determined to preserve their freedoms. They realize that when we are dealing with an aggressor who respects only force, we must rearm as rapidly as possible. And that is what we are doing, rearming for national security and survival. The decision to take this course was not a Washington decision. It was made by 150,000,000 Americans. I am sure you are among them, and that other members of the NAM are among them.

In building up our national defense we are going to spend vast sums for things that cannot be consumed. The national income is rising while the supply of consumer goods is being restricted. By this time next year we will be spending for national defense at the rate of about \$60,000,000,000 annually. More people will be employed than ever before, more hours will be worked, more overtime will be paid. At the same time there will be fewer civilian goods and services to purchase.

This is the making of a highly inflationary spiral. We must attempt to prevent this inflationary spiral by both direct and indirect controls until we can increase production sufficiently to provide both the implements of war and the requirements of the civilian economy. I believe that barring all-out war, we can increase production sufficiently to achieve this objective within 2 years.

Why is it necessary to stabilize? First, because we could lose all through inflation. Already we have paid a heavy price to it. Already inflation has cost the Defense Department \$1 out of every \$5 voted by the Congress last year for the rearmament program. That means guns and planes and tanks lost just as surely as if they were destroyed by enemy action. The revenue from the two tax bills voted by the Congress last year was wiped out by inflation. If inflation were uncontrolled, do you think Congress could pass tax bills fast enough to keep up with the requirements of national defense?

Now look what inflation has done to consumers. Every 1 percent increase in the cost of living adds \$2,000,000,000 to the consumers' bill for goods and services. This means that already inflation has cost the American people some \$21,000,000,000 since January a year ago. And let's not forget that there are no margins for the consumer—no pass-through provisions in the family budget.

That \$21,000,000,000 is an appalling sum, especially when we consider that the consumer got no benefits. Instead he got it in the neck. It's more than all farm families received in income in the peak year of 1947. It's more than all of us spent for housing, or clothing last year. It's almost as much as all profits after taxes from all businesses in 1950.

Do you think we could continue to pay a price like that to inflation without economic catastrophe? I don't. Do you think we could achieve our rearmament goals? I don't.

Do you think we could long maintain our system of business, private property, free institutions, and representative government if we allowed uncontrolled inflation to take hold? I don't.

Such a course could lead only to disaster for all of us and I don't propose to see us follow that course if I can help it.

Next time you're in Washington why don't you come in to see me? I'd be pleased to discuss this whole question of economic stabilization with you further. I think it's most important for all of us to discuss it, to understand it, and to do something about it.

Sincerely yours,

ERIC JOHNSTON,
Administrator.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] is recognized for 15 minutes.

GEN. GEORGE C. MARSHALL

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I would like to discuss briefly recent attacks against the Secretary of Defense, George C. Marshall, which, to my mind, have made little contribution to our national unity, nor to the solution of our grave and pressing problems in this critical and uncertain period in our history.

I am less interested in defending the Secretary of Defense than I am in analyzing the meaning and effect of the attacks against him, in themselves. General Marshall needs no defense from me or anyone else. You cannot serve your country and your people for half a century, as he has, without making some mistakes. No one can. But, on the other hand, no man in America can go from one high office to another for generations unless there is great justification for the public confidence implied in the proffering of those posts of high responsibility. The rules of politics in a democracy require that a President appoint to important office men whom the public trusts, whose character is above reproach, and whose ability is not open to question. A man appointed to office of national—in these days, international—prominence, will not and cannot long survive the scrutiny of a questioning public and an alert, often hypercritical press unless he measures up to those qualifications.

George Marshall, as you all know, has held not one but three such posts in the last 10 years. As Chief of Staff during World War II, he more than earned the tribute paid him by his Chief, Secretary Stimson, on the day of Germany's unconditional surrender, when he said, and I quote:

I have seen a great many soldiers in my day, and you, sir, are the finest soldier I have ever known.

Churchill saw him, not only as "a magnificent organizer and builder of armies," but as a "statesman with a penetrating and commanding view of the whole scene." Admiral Leahy said that "his drive, courage, and imagination transformed America's great citizen Army into the most magnificent fighting force ever assembled." These are but a fragment of the tributes paid Marshall for his work as Chief of Staff, but they suffice to show the measure of his contribution in that post during the greatest war in history.

As if his wartime service were not service enough, George Marshall became Secretary of State in January 1947, at a time when Soviet aggression was on the march and many of the problems we face today were in their early stages. Here, again, the record speaks for itself. The Marshall plan is best known to us as the major achievement of his term in office, but there was achievement, and, of course, frustration in other fields. You may recall the beginning of military aid to Greece and Turkey, forerunner of our present vital program of military assistance. You may recall that it was Marshall who asked the UN to establish its Little Assembly to meet the continuing problems of the international situation. It was Marshall who asked the United Nations to eliminate the much-misused veto in the Security Council. It was Marshall who, on September 17, 1947, placed the problem of Korean independence before the General Assembly because he was determined that Soviet obstructionism should not delay the urgent and rightful claim of the Korean people to independence.

The New York Times' James Reston wrote of Marshall as Secretary of State, and I quote:

Here is a forbidding, honorable, dispassionate, moral man who can speak for America * * * he has the clarity that is necessary to form a sharp vision of the basic purpose of our foreign policy, and he has the integrity to try to relate each day's action to that purpose.

Of Marshall's record as Secretary of Defense little need be said. He is faced now with doing in the military sphere what he did in the diplomatic, namely, building up this country and the world to the point of strength where the Communists will think more than twice before threatening the security of the free nations of the world. As a long-time exponent of the unification of the Armed Forces, and a level of military strength sufficient to meet our global, diplomatic commitments, he is superbly qualified to hold this post.

Against this background, we have a barrage of attacks against George Marshall which, if their peddlers' sincerity were not open to question, would more than justify a resolution of impeachment. I must confess I do not understand these charges.

Is their purpose to solve the problems raised by the Korean war? Obviously not. I find no constructive suggestions in these attacks that would help the United States and the United Nations in their fight against flagrant and unwarranted aggression.

Is their purpose to study the history of the past 10 years with an eye to better

judging our present position by it? I think not. The study of the past is certainly a valuable guide to our conduct in the present and the future. But no historian of note ever reached his conclusion first and then found the facts to support his point of view. And when the facts are untenable, the conclusion preposterous, the resulting distortion is laughable.

Is the purpose of these attacks to malign a public servant for political purposes? Here, perhaps, is a possible motive. But those who attempt to do so underestimate, in my opinion, the public esteem for their target. The public may listen to such charges, but it will not be fooled.

Paraphrasing, Mr. Speaker, I might point out that whatever the purpose of these attacks, they will not induce capable men to enter the Government service. Admitting a continuing need for the talents of the ablest men we can find, I do not understand how we can ask them to submit themselves to constant libel and vilification. And who may be immune from such falsification if a man who has been called the "greatest public servant of our times" is subject to it?

If there is any purpose, Mr. Speaker, in these attacks, it is to create dissension and disunity in this country when we need, as we have never needed so much before, to present a unity of purpose and design to the world. I suspect that those who expound these charges are less than happy with our relatively new role of international responsibility. They would, I suggest, retreat into the foxhole of isolationism that offers, at best, only temporary protection from the realities of global life. Today, far more than in 1920, such a position invites disaster.

When I speak of unity, I do not mean that we must stifle constructive debate on foreign and domestic issues. We cannot expect to formulate sound policies without intelligent discussion both in Congress and elsewhere. But I do say that there is no place in the United States today for the contemptible attacks to which I have referred. It is enough that we must deal with the false and irrational charges of the Russians, without having to face equally senseless propaganda on the domestic scene. In the case of the Soviet Union there is, I suppose, a method in their madness. As regards the attacks on George Marshall, there is no method involved of which we can be proud.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I want to compliment the gentleman on his very able remarks and to agree with him that as far as General Marshall is concerned he needs no apology. I think General Marshall is one of the greatest Americans of all time. He is a man who has earned his retirement, but a man who on two occasions came back out of that retirement to serve his country in an extremely difficult situation.

The gentleman mentioned the fact that Secretary Stimson, in my opinion one of the greatest Secretaries of War; Mr. Churchill, and others had kind words to

say about General Marshall. I would like to add to that list Mr. Bernard Baruch who at the ceremonies at VMI honoring Marshall had equally fine words to say about him. I hope that the gentleman's words will be taken and that we will give to General Marshall the respect, the admiration, and the affection which is his due.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I appreciate the very fine observations made by the gentleman from Montana. I know that his long service on the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, before which Secretary Marshall has appeared from time to time as Secretary of State and as Secretary of Defense, has given him the opportunity of seeing General Marshall's fine qualities at first hand.

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to express my agreement with the gentleman in his commendation of General Marshall who I, too, think is a great American. I also want to commend the very able gentleman from Washington, [Mr. JACKSON], for so pointedly high lighting a very sad and sorry situation which some people seem to be more and more engaging in these days and times in personal assassination of those with whom they have disagreements on issues and on policies. I think it is a sad commentary in the history of our country that some people, elevated to public office and holding positions of public trust and importance, either in public or in private life, are so devoid of the finer sense of values and of responsibility that they cannot keep the disagreement to the issue without engaging in character vilification. I certainly wish to commend the gentleman for high lighting that particular point in his address and in commending General Marshall, who is certainly an outstanding American.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I thank my good friend from California for his very fine contribution.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DEMPSEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an address delivered by the Ambassador of Spain.

Mr. YATES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an address by Hon. Hugo L. Black, Associate Justice of the United States Supreme Court, on June 7 in the city of Chicago.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous material.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a newspaper article.

Mr. FISHER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article by Father Gillis in the Boston Pilot.

Mr. SHEEHAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. AYRES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a statement.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include appropriate data.

Mr. DAGUE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. DOLLIVER asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in two instances and include extraneous material.

Mr. CRAWFORD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a letter.

Mr. PATTERSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include articles.

Mr. WERDEL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a news item.

Mr. HAND asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made in Committee of the Whole, following the address of Mr. HUNTER, and include a letter.

Mr. HARRIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an address by Mr. A. P. Frame, entitled "Observations of a WOC," notwithstanding the fact that it will exceed two pages of the Record and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost \$191.34.

Mr. BROOKS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. McCARTHY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include two editorials.

Mr. HELLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in six instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. ZABLOCKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. MANSFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and in two include extraneous material.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 44 minutes p. m.) the House, under its previous order, adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 27, 1951, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

560. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting copies of the orders of the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization granting the application for permanent residence filed by the subjects of such orders, pursuant to section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

561. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a letter relative to the cases of Basil Nicholas Krallis, file No. [REDACTED] CR 30405, and Marina Massip y Villar Schoonmaker, file No. [REDACTED] CR 29978, requesting that they be withdrawn from those now before the Congress and returned to the juris-

diction of the Department of Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

562. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled, "a bill to extend the provisions of the Federal Credit Union Act, as amended, to the Virgin Islands"; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

563. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "a bill to repeal the provision of the act of July 1, 1902 (32 Stat. 662), as amended, relating to pay of civilian employees of the Navy Department appointed for duty beyond the continental limits of the United States and in Alaska"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

564. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "a bill to exempt certain civilian employees of the Department of Defense from the laws governing the employment, removal, classification, pay, retirement, leave and disability and death compensations of Federal officers and employees"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MITCHELL: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 285. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 1181, a bill to amend section 207 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 so as to authorize payment of claims arising from the correction of military or naval records; without amendment (Rept. No. 647). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COX: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 286. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 3463, a bill to authorize the transfer of certain naval vessels; without amendment (Rept. No. 648). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. CANNON: Committee on Appropriations. House Joint Resolution 277. Joint resolution making temporary appropriations for the fiscal year 1952, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 655). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 360. An act for the relief of Stefan Lenartowicz and his wife, Irene; with amendment (Rept. No. 644). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 417. An act for the relief of Sui Ken Fong and Sui Tung Fong; without amendment (Rept. No. 645). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 915. An act for the relief of Betty Minoru Kawachi; without amendment (Rept. No. 643). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MACHROWICZ: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 536. An act for the relief of the estate of Sidney Lomax, deceased; without amendment (Rept. No. 649). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MACHROWICZ: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1109. An act for the relief of Grady Franklin Welch; without amendment

(Rept. No. 650). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MACHROWICZ: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1113. An act for the relief of Philip J. Hincks; without amendment (Rept. No. 651). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 796. A bill for the relief of Roy F. Wilson; with amendment (Rept. No. 652). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FRAZIER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3026. A bill for the relief of Joseph A. Ferrari; with amendment (Rept. No. 653). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4456. A bill for the relief of Vincent F. Leslie; without amendment (Rept. No. 654). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 4601. A bill to provide that the admissions tax shall not apply in respect of admissions free of charge of uniformed members of the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 4602. A bill to amend the Excess Profits Tax Act of 1950 by adding thereto a new subsection 432 (f); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TEAGUE:

H. R. 4603. A bill to provide additional compensation for members of the Army, Navy, and Air Force during periods of combat duty; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BEALL:

H. R. 4604. A bill providing for an investigation and study by the Interstate Commerce Commission of the adequacy and convenience of passenger carrier facilities and services and the reasonableness of fares in the metropolitan area of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. R. 4605. A bill for the establishment of a temporary National Advisory Committee for the Blind; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa:

H. R. 4606. A bill to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 4607. A bill to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By AUGUST H. ANDRESEN:

H. R. 4608. A bill to control imports of fats and oils, oil-bearing materials, peanuts, butter, cheese and other dairy products, and rice and rice products; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FORD:

H. R. 4609. A bill to amend part VIII of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), so as to increase the outside compensation which a veteran may earn while receiving subsistence allowance thereunder; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BUDGE:

H. R. 4610. A bill to provide for the grant of certain lands to the American Falls school district No. 381, American Falls, Idaho; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. R. 4611. A bill to amend the Trading with the Enemy Act to extend the time for filing claims in the case of certain Italians; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan:

H. R. 4612. A bill to amend section 402 (a) (3) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CANNON:

H. J. Res. 277. Joint resolution making temporary appropriations for the fiscal year 1952, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H. Con. Res. 128. Concurrent resolution providing a code of ethics for Government service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HALE:

H. Con. Res. 129. Concurrent resolution providing a code of ethics for Government service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LANHAM:

H. Con. Res. 130. Concurrent resolution providing a code of ethics for Government service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BATTLE:

H. Con. Res. 131. Concurrent resolution providing a code of ethics for Government service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. Con. Res. 132. Concurrent resolution providing a code of ethics for Government service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SHEEHAN:

H. Res. 282. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the massacre of Polish Army officers in the Katyn Forest, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and the disappearance of other Polish Army officers who fled for protection to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics in 1939 and 1940; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DEMPSEY:

H. Res. 283. Resolution favoring the negotiation of a treaty for the defense of the Mediterranean area against Communist aggression; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. Res. 284. Resolution to provide for a Select Committee on Problems of the Aging; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H. R. 4613. A bill for the relief of Karlo Mattiazzi and Kostanza Mattiazzi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOLLING:

H. R. 4614. A bill to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COUDERT:

H. R. 4615. A bill for the relief of Gattas A. Maloof; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GORDON:

H. R. 4616. A bill for the relief of Stanislaw Stein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. R. 4617. A bill for the relief of Luiz Lourenco Diniz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H. R. 4618. A bill for the relief of Victoria Lardizabal Valencia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 27, 1951

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

God of our fathers, above all the commotion and confusion of the busy present, with its demands that drain our souls, we would turn for this hallowed moment to seek the quietness of Thy presence at the beginning of the day's deliberations. In the secret of Thy pavilion we take refuge from the strife of tongues. By tasks too difficult for us we are driven unto Thee for strength to endure and wisdom to interpret rightly the signs of these trying times. In these hallowed halls may Thy servants, trusted by the people with high responsibility, serve with fidelity the cause of our country and our common humanity, and so help to build the city of God on the ruined wastes of this disturbed and disordered world. We ask it through riches of grace in Christ Jesus our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, June 26, 1951, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 51) providing for United States participation in the celebration at Philadelphia, Pa., of the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of the signing of the Declaration of Independence.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1103) for the relief of Sidney Young Hughes; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. WALTER, Mr. FEIGAN, and Mr. GRAHAM were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1424) for the relief of T. L. Morrow.

The message also announced that the House had severally agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the following bills of the House:

H. R. 512. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Mrs. Walter J. Bickford;