

from all of the agencies concerned, the Comptroller General, the Munitions Board, the defense agencies, RFC, and the Department of Commerce, all approving the amendment. Originally it called for the establishing of a Small Defense Plants Corporation. The changes have been made in accordance with the recommendations, and these agencies are asking for the proposed legislation.

Therefore, Mr. President, on behalf of myself and other Senators who would like to join me, although I have not included their names because I have not had an opportunity to clear it with each individual Senator who joined in the other amendment, I send to the desk a proposed amendment to the pending bill and ask that it be printed and lie on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be printed and lie on the table.

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

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to offer an amendment to the bill and have it printed and lie on the table. The amendment is to line 9, page 2. I want to strike the word "lower" and insert in lieu thereof the word "either."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be printed and lie on the table.

RECESS

Mr. McFARLAND. I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 9 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, June 28, 1951, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 27, 1951:

COMMISSIONER OF INTERNAL REVENUE

John B. Dunlap, of Texas, to be Commissioner of Internal Revenue, in place of George J. Schoeneman, whose resignation is effective July 31, 1951.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Harvey Erickson, of Washington, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Washington. He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired February 7, 1951.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Wayne Bezona, of Washington, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Washington. Mr. Bezona is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired September 27, 1948.

IN THE NAVY

William C. Bagot (Naval ROTC) to be an ensign in the Navy, in lieu of ensign in the Navy as previously nominated and confirmed, to correct name.

The following-named (Naval ROTC) to be ensigns in the Medical Service Corps of the Navy, in lieu of ensigns in the Navy as previously nominated and confirmed:

Kenneth N. Anderson
Richard S. Jonas
Maurice Leenay

The following-named women (civilian college graduates) to be ensigns in the Navy:

Barbara A. Garrett
Helen L. Larson

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to the grade indicated in the Medical Corps of the Navy:

LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE)

James C. Larkin, Jr.
William R. Ploss

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to the grade indicated in the Dental Corps of the Navy:

LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE)

Howard H. Morman
Paul H. Ohlson
Edwin F. Weaver III

The following-named to be ensigns in the Nurse Corps of the Navy:

Annette K. Dingman
Nancy A. Hamlen

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 27, 1951:

IN THE ARMY

The nominations of John F. Connole et al. for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on June 13, 1951, and appear in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of John F. Connole, which appears on page 6501, and ending with the name of Webb S. Wraith, which is shown on page 6503.

IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

The nominations of Willard Mayes Shankle and other officers for promotion in the United States Air Force, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on June 11, 1951, and appear in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Willard Mayes Shankle, which appears on page 6366, and ending with the name of John Patrick Foy, which is shown on page 6371.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate June 27, 1951:

POSTMASTER

Bruce W. Freck, Fall River, Wis.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 27, 1951

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m. Rev. George Creitz, First Reformed Church, Easton, Pa., offered the following prayer:

Our Heavenly Father, we give thanks unto Thee for Thy guidance in times past. We pray for Thy continued guidance in times to come, with an ever-increasing awareness of Thy providence. We are grateful especially in this place for Thy national blessings. We thank Thee for our liberty. Only enable us to use our liberty not as an occasion to the flesh but in love serving one another. We thank Thee for our Union. Only guide us that we may live as a united people in the spirit of brotherliness. We thank Thee for our democratic in-

stitutions. Enable us to perpetuate the spirit of democracy by noble and consecrated citizenship in all walks of life. This we ask so that, being blessed of Thee, we may become a blessing to all nations, to the praise and honor of Thy holy name. Amen.

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

ONE HUNDRED AND SEVENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SIGNING OF THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 51) providing for the 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 Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Whereas the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of the adoption of the Declaration of Independence will occur on July 4, 1951; and

Whereas it is desirable to accord suitable recognition of the value of the precepts of the Declaration in sustaining the Government of the United States as a strong bulwark against totalitarianism; and

Whereas fitting ceremonies to commemorate this anniversary are in process of preparation, such ceremonies to be held in the city of Philadelphia during the week of July 1 to July 7, 1951: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, etc., That (a) there is hereby created a commission to be composed of 12 members, as follows: Two officers of the executive branch of the Federal Government to be appointed by the President of the United States; two Members of the Senate to be appointed by the President of the Senate; two Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of the House; and six persons who are not officers or employees of the Federal Government to be appointed by the President of the United States, three upon recommendation of the Governor of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and three upon recommendation of the mayor of the city of Philadelphia if those officials desire to recommend any such persons. Any vacancy in the membership of such commission shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment.

(b) The commissioners shall serve without compensation and shall select a chairman from among their number.

SEC. 2. (a) It shall be the function of the commission, in cooperation with the government of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, the government of the city of Philadelphia, and the Commission for the Commemoration of the One Hundred and Seventy-fifth Anniversary of the Signing of the Declaration of Independence, (1) to prepare a plan for appropriate ceremonies at Philadelphia, Pa., on July 4, 1951, to observe and celebrate the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of the signing of the Declaration of Independence, and (2) to execute such plan.

(b) In performing the functions set forth in subsection (a) of this section, the commission may—

(1) prepare, print, and distribute to public libraries, public schools, universities, colleges, patriotic organizations and groups material containing such historical data as the

commission may deem desirable to acquaint the public with the nature and significance of the celebration;

(2) if the commission deems it advisable, invite the participation of other nations in the celebration, and arrange for such participation with the governments of such nations;

(3) accept contributions of money and material for expenditure for use in the various activities of the commission;

(4) do all other things it deems necessary or appropriate to carry out the purposes of this joint resolution.

(c) The commission shall submit to the Congress, on or before March 1, 1952, a report of its activities, together with a detailed statement of the manner of expenditures of any funds appropriated pursuant to the authorization contained in section 3 (b).

(d) The commission shall cease to exist 30 days after it submits the report required by subsection (c) of this section. No person employed by the commission under the authority of section 3 of this resolution shall continue to receive any salary, wage, or remuneration of any kind by virtue of this resolution after the date on which the commission ceases to exist.

SEC. 3. (a) The commission may appoint not more than two employees in 1 year and may fix the compensation of such employees without regard to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended. The commission may make such expenditures as are necessary to carry out the purposes of this joint resolution, including expenditures for printing and binding and expenditures for necessary traveling and subsistence expenses of commissioners and of employees of the commission in accordance with the Travel Expense Act of 1949. All expenditures of the commission shall be allowed and paid upon presentation of itemized vouchers therefor, approved by the chairman of the commission.

(b) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the commission such sums, not to exceed \$100,000 in the aggregate, as may be necessary for the performance of its functions.

SEC. 4. Upon the request of the commission, the heads of the various Federal agencies (including the Library of Congress) may collect, prepare, and lend documents, articles, and other exhibits which, in their judgment, will serve to carry out the purposes of this joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, in supporting Senate Joint Resolution 51 before the Committee on the Judiciary and now in the House, I would point out the peculiar significance of such a measure at this particular time.

Through the past 175 years, under varying conditions, celebrations have been held on July 4. Due regard has been observed on this our Nation's birthday of independence. When we contemplate the significance of this special anniversary, surely we should rejoice and make every preparation for its proper observance. Some days ago both the majority and the minority leaders of the House assisted by our distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania, Judge GRAHAM, gave due notice of preparations under way for a celebration to be held on July 4 in Philadelphia under the joint auspices of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the city of Philadelphia. Now it is entirely proper that the Federal Government should join in the pro-

gram. Plans are under way to have an informal session of the Congress convene in Independence Hall, thus perpetuating the history of our great country. I sincerely hope that most of us may be present and join in the joyous observance of the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of our national independence. It will be an occasion when our patriotism traditionally expresses itself in an exuberant manner, and rightly so, for not only will it mark the birthday of our beloved country but will constitute one of the most significant dates in the history of the world. In the slow march of mankind from his primeval beginnings there are certain occasions which stand out like great mountains towering over the plain whose impressiveness is thrown into true perspective the farther one recedes from them. There have been many of these great landmarks in the course of the past 10,000 years and the day on which the intrepid patriots, assembled at Philadelphia, "conceived and brought forth on this continent a new Nation" is one never to be forgotten. It was one of the major contributions to the enlightenment and progress of mankind.

So it is entirely right and proper that Americans assembled in their respective communities all over this broad land, and wherever they may be gathered together throughout the earth, should rejoice and give thanks to a merciful Providence, first, that their ancestors had the courage to resist tyranny, and second, under that same providence, the wisdom and farseeing statesmanship to create the great Constitution to bind and hold us together as a great and happy family. Let us beware, however, of complacency; that way lies destruction. The long road of history—the great Appian Way, as it were—is bordered with the ruins of nations who, forgetting that man cannot live by bread alone, fatuously assured themselves that nothing could ever shake their prosperity and that they would endure forever.

But this Fourth of July, apart from our natural rejoicing, should bring us some very sober second thoughts. For the world, my friends, as I need not tell you, is in a very perilous state. Outside this blessed land the vast majority of the world is underprivileged and underfed. And when people are underfed they become dangerous. As Dr. Frank C. Laubach, the world-famous missionary, says:

The bottom four-fifths of the world are going Communist because they are hungry, terribly unhappy, and grimly determined to rise out of their destitution.

We can stop communism cold—

Says Dr. Laubach—

by lifting these wretched people above their misery and desperation. We can do it by sharing our know-how. They lack progressive methods, and will follow anyone who promises to help them rise.

Meanwhile, the Kremlin which fattens on hunger and unrest, grows daily more insolent until its solemn declarations of peaceful intent have become a ghastly farce. In the face of this admittedly grave situation many people quite sin-

cerely see no possible alternative to complete surrender to the tide of communism but war with the source of communism—Russia. They say, these good people—and I repeat, I do not question their sincerity—that we must be practical, we must face up to the reality of the situation, we must look facts in the face.

If this were really the situation, it would be terrible indeed and I, for one, would not find room in my heart for any rejoicing even on the Fourth of July. But I protest that it is not the true picture. This realistic-pessimist attitude is not justified. In short, I do not believe war inevitable. Why not, you may ask? Because, my fellow citizens, we have at hand an instrument which, if zealously cherished and perfected, may yet save the peace and sanity of the world. I refer, of course, to the United Nations. In 1920 the United States because of a tragic domestic political battle failed to join the League of Nations. I will not here enter into the merits of that bitter controversy—it is past and "let the dead bury their dead." That the League had certain structural faults, that the Treaty of Versailles which brought it into being was in many respects both foolish and iniquitous, I presume no man today will question. At any rate, be that as it may, we did not embrace the opportunity to participate in the first genuinely international organization for the preservation of world peace.

Now we have another opportunity. In the United Nations, gathered around one common board, the nations of the earth, through their representatives, are brought face to face. Here is an unparalleled chance to know what our world neighbors think. Of course there are differences. Of course there are misunderstandings. Of course there are hot words, stubbornness, and temporary resentments. But is there anything so remarkable in that? Could not the like be found in any town meeting, municipal body, or State legislature? These 60 nations, including our own, are composed of beings who are very human indeed and it is not to be expected that all can always be sweetness and light. No, we are all very fallible but that does not excuse us from trying to make a better world. And if any undertaking ever deserved a fair trial it is the United Nations, launched with so many hopes. Already it has passed through many fiery tests each, it would seem, more crucial than the preceding one. It has had to contend with the constant, unvarying, inflexible obstructionism of the Soviet Union and its satellites. The wonder is that, hampered by such vindictive opposition within its own camp where it had the right to expect at least a degree of cooperation, the frail new structure did not collapse. It undoubtedly would have collapsed but for certain nations—among which I am proud to number my own—whose steadfast loyalty kept life in the body and gave it time to stabilize its functions.

All this is very fine, very praiseworthy, but it is not enough. We must have more than passive loyalty; we must bring to the support of this great agency for in-

ternational peace that fiery zeal, that fierce determination, which is the work of the crusader in a great moral cause. We must have faith, real faith, that ours is a great moral cause; that it can, must and shall triumph and that no temporary set-backs, no crisis of the moment shall prevent our victory. We must have faith in ourselves. As Franklin D. Roosevelt said at another great crisis, "The only thing we have to fear is fear itself."

We dare not fail. Vast and unforeseeable consequences are involved here. For example, most of us have followed the Korean situation with keen anxiety and most of us have been sorely perplexed by it. The first and most natural reaction is, let us settle matters as quickly as possible and get out. But, considering the sacrifices already made, is it really worth while to compromise and thus risk the loss of the just and lasting peace we really desire? For, of course, the only sort of peace which is going to last is the just peace. Again, in our eagerness for a quick peace can we take risks which might involve us in a long war? It is natural, even desirable, to be partial to some favorite leader, but in our confidence in our particular hero—Bradley, Eisenhower, Marshall, MacArthur—can we afford to ignore the views of other experts who may be equally competent? Yet again, in considering what we might gain by involving ourselves completely in one continent dare we fail to consider what we might lose in another? It is a wise old saying which bids us not to put all our eggs in one basket.

We have recently been witness to the uncovering of numerous traitors—men and women who have accepted all the benefits and protection of this great country, and yet who stood ready to betray it. It was a horrifying revelation and in my opinion no punishment the law permits is too great to be inflicted on these debased creatures. Yet we must be careful not to use the word appeaser too loosely. We must not automatically assume that every man and woman who honestly, openly, sincerely, and zealously endeavors to bring to fruition the goal of world peace is an appeaser of the Kremlin and of communism. Certainly no American need fear to support the United Nations to which his own country has adhered and in which it exerts a vast if not predominant influence. The United Nations may appear to be weak and indecisive at the present but remember so did the United States under the Articles of Confederation, but in time a rich and more perfect Union emerged and that is what will happen here if we all bend our backs to the wheel and give our hearts and strength to this great enterprise. And we can do it. If only for the most selfish reasons we must do it. The old, proud boast the United States has never lost a war may yet turn and rend us if we remain blind to the times. The world today is a small community; oceans are but ditches; continents but hops between starting and stopping points. It is, as Wendell Willkie truly said "one world." I put it to you whether we have not

reached the point where it is no longer safe to go it alone? Even if we stubbornly adhered to splendid isolation—to quote a famous remark of an English statesman—and actually emerged victorious from a war, we might still be the losers. No less an authority than Gen. Omar Bradley says:

There are no victors in modern warfare. The winner in the next war stand amid its own ruins in an impoverished world.

And so, my colleagues, shall we not on this our national feast day manifest humble gratitude to the Power which has made and preserved us a Nation by joining with other nations to guarantee, protect and preserve the peace of all?

At all costs we must uphold the United Nations. As General Marshall rightly says, "Its success is the hope of the world."

CARLOS SANCHEZ PEREZ

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 795) for the relief of Carlos Sanchez Perez, 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 for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Carlos Sanchez Perez shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GRANTING STATUS OF PERMANENT RESIDENCE TO CERTAIN ALIENS

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 90) favoring the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 14, after line 17, insert:
"XXXXXXXX Szasz, Alexander."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SIDNEY YOUNG HUGHES

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 1103) for the relief of Sidney Young Hughes, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and ask for a conference with the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: MESSRS. WALTER, FEIGHAN, and GRAHAM.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. 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. 89]

Adair	Gillette	Murphy
Allen, Ill.	Gordon	Murray, Wis.
Allen, La.	Hall	O'Brien, Mich.
Anfuso	Leonard W.	O'Konski
Auchincloss	Irving	O'Neill
Berry	Jackson, Calif.	Powell
Boggs, La.	Jones, Ala.	Preston
Breen	Judd	Redden
Buckley	Kearney	Scott, Hardie
Camp	Kearns	Smith, Kans.
Carnahan	Kelley, Pa.	Sutton
Chatham	Kilday	Trimble
Dawson	King	Velde
Dingell	Larcade	Vorys
Durham	LeCompte	Werdel
Elliott	McKinnon	Whitten
Ewins	Merrow	Woodruff
Flood	Miller, Calif.	
Frazier	Miller, N. Y.	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 379 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1726. An act to change the date for the beginning of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the United States, including the Territory of Alaska, from the 1st day of July to the 1st day of November, and to extend the time during which annual assessment work on such claims may be made for the year beginning July 1, 1950, to the 1st day of November 1951.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1590) entitled "An act to extend and revise the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act"; requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. NEELY, Mr. CLEMENTS, and Mr. WELKER to be conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees 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. 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."

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1952

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 35) ordering the reengrossment of the Senate amendment to H. R. 3880, the independent offices appropriation bill for 1952.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Secretary of the Senate be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to reengross the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3880) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes; and to reengross Senate amendment numbered 79 so as to read as follows:

On page 35, line 23, strike out "\$875,-163,335" and insert "\$873,105,770."

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

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] please explain the reason for the request on the part of the other body?

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, this resolution authorizes reengrossment of amendment No. 79 of the independent offices appropriation bill. It all adds up to this: Apparently the other body has made a mistake in printing or engrossing this amendment. Amendment No. 79 deals with salaries and expenses for the Veterans' Administration. What happened was that they show a reduction in that appropriation of about \$1,-200,000 more than the figure actually agreed upon by the Senate.

This merely rectifies the mistake in printing at the other end of the Capitol.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. It was just a clerical error?

Mr. THOMAS. That is all.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS]?

There was no objection.

The Senate concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

OFFICER PERSONNEL ACT OF 1947

Mr. VINSON submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 4200) to make certain revisions in titles I through IV of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, as amended, and for other purposes.

CIVILIAN PHYSICAL FITNESS AND TRAINING PROGRAM

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee

on Armed Services be discharged from further consideration of House Concurrent Resolution No. 19, to express the sense of the Congress that a civilian physical fitness and training program should be established in the interest of national security, and that the concurrent resolution be re-referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

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

There was no objection.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA EMERGENCY RENT ACT

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 1590) to extend and revise the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act, with an amendment of the House thereto, insist on the amendment of the House and agree to a conference with the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. HARRIS, ABERNETHY, and O'HARA.

TEMPORARY APPROPRIATIONS FOR GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 287, Rept. No. 657), 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 joint resolution (H. J. Res. 277) making temporary appropriations for the fiscal year 1952, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the joint resolution and continue not to exceed 3 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations, the joint resolution shall be read for amendment. No amendment shall be in order to said joint resolution except amendments offered by the direction of the Committee on Appropriations. At the conclusion of the consideration of the joint resolution for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the joint resolution to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

IMPORTATION OF FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL WORKERS

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 further 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 further consideration of the bill H. R. 3283, with Mr. GORE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday there was pending the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. POLK], and the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] to the Polk amendment.

Without objection, the Clerk will again report the amendment of the gentleman from New York.

There was no objection.

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."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. CELLER. This amendment that I have offered puts teeth into this bill. Without these teeth the bill is not worth a sou marquée. Without the sanctions which my amendment involves you have here an engraved invitation for the predatory interests along the border, the huge cotton growers in Texas and Arizona and New Mexico—I do not speak of the small cotton growers—and the huge citrus-plantation owners, for example, in the Imperial Valley to go into Mexico and induce people, smugglers, and procurers to round up all these wetbacks and bring them in and sweat them on the plantations and on the ranches, and on the huge farms. I wager that if the penalties are added to this bill, it would be defeated.

Why do I offer this amendment in addition? Attempts have been made earnestly and sincerely by the border patrol of the Immigration Office to prevent the coming into this country of these huge numbers of wetbacks. They collared 600,000 in the last fiscal year, and for every one that is picked up there

are two or three others who are not apprehended. They anticipate an invasion this fiscal year of over a million wetbacks. A wetback is one who is in this country illegally. The problem is difficult to solve. Sincere farmers must help solve it by refusing to hire wetbacks. Some burden should be upon them. They dare not refuse that burden, otherwise they convict themselves of the charge they desire to use wetbacks.

I applaud the efforts to bring in Mexican aliens legally who satisfy the immigration statutes, the public health laws, our narcotic statutes, and our internal security laws, but all should be examined and be screened by the various services at the border. Because, however, of a 2,000-mile border at the southern end of these four States it is almost impossible adequately to screen all these aliens who come in. Yet there is some duty, there is a social responsibility upon those who hire these wetbacks, to see that they do not employ illegals, but they do not want this responsibility; they want to continue to hire these wetbacks. I do not question the sincerity of those who argue here for this bill. I do question the huge farming interests who want to put something over on the gullible and unwary. But I am not fooled. There is no doubt that the huge farming interests want this bill just to have an excuse to use the wetbacks. If they are sincere, why object to an amendment?

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

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WIER. I wonder if the gentleman from New York is familiar with the position of the distinguished Senator from Louisiana, Mr. ELLENDER, who on April 26, during a discussion of this legislation, made this statement relative to the subject now before the Committee, and I cite the position of the distinguished Senator on the wetback problem.

Mr. CELLER. Yes; I think I am.

Mr. WIER. I quote: "Mr. President"—

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Are the rules being violated by quoting what some Member of the other body stated on the subject under debate?

The CHAIRMAN. It is contrary to the rules of the House to refer to the debate in another body on a particular matter. The gentleman will proceed in order.

Mr. CELLER. There is weighty opinion in Washington in both Houses to the effect that we should put sanctions in this statute. In the other body they provided that the sanctions would be in the form of a penalty involving 2 years in jail; they made violation a felony. I think that is entirely too strong. I would make it a misdemeanor involving a fine of not exceeding \$1,000—it could be anything up to \$1,000—and a jail sentence not exceeding 1 year; it could be for a day or more than a day up to 1 year.

A case was brought before the United States district court by the Immigration Service—the case of a wetback. The case went to the Supreme Court. I read the import of the opinion of Mr. Justice Rutledge, handed down in 1948 in the case of *United States v. Evans* (333 U. S. 483). Mr. Justice Rutledge said that—

There is no doubt that Congress intended to make the act of concealing and harboring any alien not duly admitted or unlawfully in the United States and not entitled to enter or reside in the United States a criminal act. The actual bringing in of such aliens undoubtedly was intended also to be a crime. But Congress' intent as to the penalty therefor is so unclear as to make it impossible for the Court to set it out.

But I want to do away with the ambiguity, which is a loophole in the law through which all these wetbacks can come in. Presumably, it may be unlawful, but there is no penalty. It is like saying, by law, do not sin, but if you sin there will be no punishment. What good is such a declaration? It is about as useful as a 2-foot yardstick.

That is like making a great pontifical declaration period. In order to avoid that, we have to prescribe a penalty so that the Supreme Court can finally say when the border patrol apprehends a wetback the person who harbors or hires the wetback intentionally and with knowledge shall be guilty of a crime and will be subjected to punishment. All the Poage bill does is to make a nice, pretty declaration. It is a nice pronouncement, it is harmless language, but it has no earthly use whatsoever to keep out the wetbacks and those who come in illegally, unscreened as to morals, not investigated as to their political affiliations and so forth.

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

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

Mr. KEATING. I am sympathetic with the objective of the gentleman and feel that perhaps something should be written into this law along the lines of his suggestion; but I am greatly worried over the wording which the gentleman has suggested in imposing a criminal penalty in a case where a person has reasonable grounds to believe or to suspect something; then later in the gentleman's amendment the word "suspect" is again used.

Mr. CELLER. I will say to the gentleman we have to put language in there that has real teeth. It is the language generally adopted by the Senate.

Judging from what we heard yesterday, it would appear everything is sweetness and light, and all these persons who retain and hire these wetbacks are perfectly angelic, they do not intend any wrong whatsoever. But that is not the case. I pass around among the Members the wretched housing conditions under which these wetbacks are compelled to live. The houses they live in are not fit for pigs to be left in and the record shows that these habitations and stockades which these huge interests set up to house these wetback are unsanitary, are rat-infested, and breed all manner and kinds of diseases.

Let me quote in part from the report of the President's Commission on Migratory Labor in American Agriculture:

The wetback undergoes no health or physical examination as he illicitly enters the United States. The bringing in of disease and contagion cannot, therefore, be avoided. Moreover, while he is here as an illegal alien, the wetback will not ordinarily risk the chance of apprehension by seeking medical or health assistance. Reciprocally, the health and medical service agencies that might otherwise be ready to provide assistance for residents will ordinarily be foreclosed to the wetback, even if he were to seek aid, because of residence ineligibility. This circumstance does not arise with legal foreigners for whom provision is made.

One of the most sensitive indicators of the state of public health in any population is the rate of infant mortality. This is defined as the number of deaths under 1 year of age per 1,000 live births. For the United States at large, this rate in 1948 was 32. The State-wide average for Texas was 46.2; for the 28 counties of Texas on or immediately adjacent to the border, the average rate was 79.5.

A wetback is in no position when offered work to ask whether there is satisfactory housing or indeed whether there is any housing at all. Members of this Commission personally inspected wetback camps in the Lower Rio Grande Valley, in the El Paso Valley, and in the Imperial Valley. Where the wetback makes up the major proportion of the seasonal and migratory work force, virtually no housing, sanitary facilities, or other conditions of civilized living are supplied. Where the wetback concentration is proportionately less, housing conditions tend to improve but even so, remain far below the level of decency. A witness testifying at Brownsville did not overstate the squalor of the housing and living conditions that are much too common in the Lower Rio Grande Valley when he said, "I have seen, with my own eyes, people living in these shacks and sheds, getting their water to use, drink, and cook with out of irrigation ditches, no type of sanitary facilities, bathing or toilet facilities of any kind within sight; living in shacks that I wouldn't put a horse in."

Speaking of the Imperial Valley, a deputy labor commissioner of the State of California told us:

"The plight of the wetbacks I consider very serious there because the majority of them live on the ditch banks or in shed housing which is very, very poor. I would say that this is true mostly with the small farmers rather than the large growers as most of the large growers have facilities, but the small growers or the small operators get them to live on the ditch banks or a chicken house. I have seen lots cleaner and better chicken houses for chickens than I have seen for human beings in the Imperial Valley."

The traffic in wetbacks reveal unspeakable rapacity and greed. The users and employers of these wetbacks who actually know they harbor and employ these illegals are directly and indirectly guilty of this rapacity and greed.

I again quote from the President's Commission on Migratory Labor in Agriculture:

Wetbacks who are without funds to pay the smuggler for bringing them in or to pay the trucker-contractor who furnishes transportation and direction from the boundary to the farm are frequently sold from one exploiter to the next. For example, the smuggler will offer to bring a specified number of wetbacks across the river for such

an amount as \$10 or \$15 per man. The smuggler or boatman with his party in tow will be met by the trucker-contractor who will then buy the wetback party by paying off the smuggler. This trucker-contractor, in turn, will have a deal to deliver workers to farm employers at an agreed-upon price per head.

There are other well-known and well-established practices to facilitate and encourage the entrance of wetbacks. They range from spreading news of employment in the plazas and over the radio to the withholding from wages of what is called a "deposit" which is intended to urge, if not guarantee, the return to the same farm as quickly as possible of a wetback employee who may be apprehended and taken back to Mexico.

The term "deposit" requires some explanation. Members of this Commission personally interviewed wetback workers apprehended by immigration officers in the Lower Rio Grande Valley. These workers had been paid for the cotton they had picked during the preceding 2 or 3 weeks. However, their employers had withheld \$10 to \$15 from their pay. Such sums, we discovered, are known as "deposits." To redeem this deposit, the wetback was required to reenter illegally and to reappear on the farm employer's premises within 10 days.

Once on the United States side of the border and on the farm, numerous devices are employed to keep the wetback on the job. Basic to all these devices is the fact that the wetback is a person of legal disability who is under jeopardy of immediate deportation if caught. He is told that if he leaves the farm, he will be reported to the Immigration Service or that, equally unfortunate to him, the Immigration Service will surely find him if he ventures into town or out on the roads. To assure that he will stay until his services are no longer needed, his pay, or some portion thereof, frequently is held back. Sometimes, he is deliberately kept indebted to the farmer's store or commissary until the end of the season, at which time he may be given enough to buy shoes or clothing and encouraged to return the following season.

When the work is done, neither the farmer nor the community wants the wetback around. The number of apprehensions and deportations tends to rise very rapidly at the close of a seasonal work period. This can be interpreted not alone to mean that the immigration officer suddenly goes about his work with renewed zeal and vigor, but rather that at this time of the year cooperation in law enforcement by farm employers and townspeople rapidly undergoes considerable improvement.

Of course we have to be mighty careful when we devise a penalty to be sure that only those who harbor, those who retain, those who hire wetbacks have knowledge or reason to believe or could easily find out those whom they employ are wetbacks shall be subject to penalty. Intent must be proven before conviction. It is a very simple matter for those who hire a wetback to ask the wetback: Where is your card issued by the immigration authorities? Where is your social-security card? Identification would not be difficult.

Up in New York or up in Rochester, for instance, where the gentleman from New York comes from, or out in Chicago, where the gentleman from Illinois comes from, if anyone would hire, retain, harbor, and give comfort to an illegal alien coming down from Canada or coming in from Poland or Russia or what have you, they would be on top of that indi-

vidual in a minute, would detain him and invoke all possible penalties against him. But when it comes to farm laborers who come from Mexico, no. The shoe is on the other foot. Texas employers of wetbacks and aliens illegally are sacrosanct. We put the aura of legality around everything they do. I cannot swallow that.

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

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I appreciate the sincerity of the gentleman and his desire to do something effective, but does he realize that there are thousands of these alien Mexicans who fall within the category described by the gentleman's amendment who have dependent children born in this country, therefore are American citizens, and who would be starved out?

Mr. CELLER. If they are American citizens they do not come within the purview of this amendment. I do not wish to and actually do not harm American citizens. Any citizen can produce easily records to show his citizenship.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I am speaking about the parents.

Mr. CELLER. If they are American citizens or children of American citizens, they are not within the four squares of this legislation whatsoever.

The employers of wetbacks think they have a vested right to them.

I quote from the report of the President's Commission once again:

Although farm employers testified they preferred legal to illegal labor, their position comes to this: If Mexican labor cannot be obtained legally on terms satisfactory to the employers, they will obtain Mexican labor illegally. The manager of the Agricultural Producers Labor Committee said as much in his testimony at Los Angeles:

"If Government red tape and the inability of the two Governments involved prevent us from putting under contract the help we need during the peak harvest seasons, we will use wetbacks, because we are going to harvest our crops. We have wetbacks in our employ today. In fact, one of our association's representatives is in El Centro and Calexico today legalizing wetbacks."

Arizona has the least wetback traffic. This unequal access to wetback labor causes resentment, as is well expressed in the testimony of the manager of the Arizona Cooperative Cotton Growers' Association:

"Our farmers for several years have had a continuous and loud complaint that their friends and acquaintances in other bordering States have a comparatively large supply of wetback labor, while in Arizona the border patrol very successfully and carefully enforces the law against illegal aliens on the ranches. We have never tried to exert pressure to have this enforcement relieved, but we do want to call the attention of high figures (officials) to the fact that the other States should be treated alike; that if enforcement is being relaxed in other States, it should be relaxed in Arizona; that if enforcement is going to be strict in Arizona, we want it strict in other States."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to make it perfectly clear that the House Committee on Agriculture is not interested in perpetuating the influx of wetbacks into this country. There is nothing in this bill that impairs or imperils any of the immigration laws of this Nation. It is amazing to me to hear the distinguished gentleman from New York, the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, charged with the responsibility of giving attention to the immigration laws, standing in the well of the House and denouncing a bill from the Committee on Agriculture which in no way interferes with the jurisdiction of the gentleman's committee. He stood here yesterday with tears in his eyes, almost, begging you to protect the health of the people of this Nation from the loathsome hands of the Mexicans that were coming in with all kinds of diseases that were likely to destroy the health and habits of our people. Why does the gentleman not go to his own committee room and assemble his own committee and do something about the wetback problem? That is not my problem; that is his problem. The wetback problem is deplorable. There is a responsibility, and all of us know where it belongs, and it is not in the Committee on Agriculture. If we, by chance, should be bold enough or audacious enough to come out with a bill that interfered with the gentleman's jurisdiction, he would be the first one to protest about it. Why does he not look after the aliens of New York and catalog them and examine them? What is fair for the goose is also fair for the gander. If they want to clean up this country of all aliens, they will have the cooperation of the gentleman from North Carolina and other members of our committee. I am anxious to enforce the immigration laws and I want them enforced, and I am not willing to do anything to weaken them.

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

Mr. COOLEY. I yield for a question.

Mr. CELLER. I would say that the Committee on the Judiciary has inaugurated an investigation of the wetback situation, and that investigation is in process now. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] is chairman of the subcommittee, and they are going down into the various areas and checking on that very matter. We are working on it.

Mr. COOLEY. That is not a question. The gentleman's committee started working on this problem after I had appointed a subcommittee and after our subcommittee had conducted hearings throughout the country.

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

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

Mr. JOHNSON. Furthermore, the wetback problem is over 25 years old. This has been going on for a long time.

Mr. COOLEY. Certainly, and there is nothing new about it. For the gentleman from New York to become so zealous and intemperate and refer to the cotton farmers of the South as a bunch of

predatory pimps and procurers is intolerable.

Mr. CELLER. I did not say that.

Mr. COOLEY. That is what I understood the gentleman to say. He said that the little ones were the pimps but the big ones were predatory pimps and procurers, as I understood it.

This amendment appears to me to be just about as ridiculous as the gentleman's argument in support of it. He would make it unlawful for an American citizen to fail to report a person whom he suspected of being in this country illegally. Is there any precedent, I ask you, in all the legal jurisprudence of this Republic that you could point to for support of any such proposal as that?

If, by chance, an American citizen, some farmer in some section, failed to comply, he could be fined and imprisoned.

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

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

Mr. POAGE. I fear he has misunderstood the gentleman from New York, because his amendment does not say that if anybody suspicions anyone else of being in here illegally that he is guilty of any crime if he does not report it, but only if an employer, who suspicions a Mexican being in here illegally, does not report him. If he is living in New York City he is not guilty of any crime.

Mr. COOLEY. That is right, as long as he is not a Mexican.

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

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

Mr. KEATING. The amendment goes further than that and says, if he has any reasonable grounds to suspect.

Mr. COOLEY. That is right.

Mr. KEATING. I do not agree entirely with the gentleman from North Carolina. I would like to support an amendment on this general subject, but I cannot support the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COOLEY. Certainly the gentleman would want to support something that could operate with uniformity and in all sections of this country.

Mr. KEATING. And furthermore, something that would be constitutional.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. CELLER. I object, Mr. Chairman, unless the gentleman will respond to a question.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, is there a condition attached to it?

The CHAIRMAN. The question before the Committee is the unanimous-consent request of the gentleman from North Carolina.

Is there objection?

There was no objection.

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

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

Mr. CELLER. Is the gentleman acquainted with the fact that the other body passed an amendment making it a felony, and that I reduced it to a misdemeanor and the other body accepted it?

Mr. COOLEY. That may be true, but that does not mean that I am willing to accept it, nor does it mean that the House should accept it, and I do not think it is right for us to pass a law of this kind with all these penalties and pains in it, and make it applicable only to the Mexican people.

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

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

Mr. ABERNETHY. The gentleman has just stated that there are no precedents in this country, or in the jurisprudence of this country, for a law of this kind, and he is eminently correct. I would like to point out to the gentleman and to the House that there was a precedent for such in Hitler's Germany and Mussolini's Italy. The fiery ovens of Buchenwald are still smoking from the burned flesh of a particular group of people because of their failure to report to Hitler and Mussolini the knowledge or suspicion which they had or should have had of some individuals who had violated Hitler's laws. America has never punished its people because of their failure or refusal to be snoopers and more particularly for their failure to report their suspicions of offenders of the law.

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

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

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I should like to make a correction or see that the committee is aware of the facts with reference to the statement just made by the gentleman from New York. I understood him to say that his amendment was identical with the provisions enacted by the other body. That is not the fact, because the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York states, "Any person who shall employ as farm laborers." Those words did not appear in the Senate bill and those words very distinctly modify the provisions of the bill proposed by the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COOLEY. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. He sets out a certain class of people to whom the law should apply, whereas the general practice is to make it apply to all.

Mr. COOLEY. It applies only to farm laborers. If it is adopted, you could bring them in for any other work except on farms. That is the very place we need them. I do not need them in my district, but there are 18 States in which the farmers are calling for aid to help them harvest the crops.

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

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

Mr. SHELLEY. May I ask the gentleman from North Carolina in all fairness if this is a fact, that the proposal in a general nature, applying to all workers and to all employers, was stricken out on a point of order yesterday?

Mr. COOLEY. Yes, it was.

Mr. SHELLEY. Therefore, the only way that any penalty provision could be brought into the bill at all was by applying it to the title of the bill and narrowing it to agricultural labor.

Mr. COOLEY. The thing about it is that, the gentleman of course realizes, all of section 509 went out of the bill.

Mr. SHELLEY. That is right, but I do not want to leave the impression with those who were not here yesterday that this is just addressed to farm laborers.

Mr. COOLEY. Of course it is.

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

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

Mr. POAGE. Is not that exactly the reason the Committee on the Judiciary ought to consider a matter of this kind and give some active consideration to it, rather than trying to amend our bill on the floor?

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman is correct. Section 509 is properly within the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

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

Mr. YATES. How would the gentleman enforce compliance with the law other than through a penalty provision?

Mr. COOLEY. This is the confusion. We are not trying to legalize the entry of wetbacks. We are not dealing with the wetback problem except insofar as we are providing a legal method by which contract labor can be brought into this country under contracts negotiated between the Republic of Mexico and the United States Government.

Mr. YATES. Do not such contracts set forth certain conditions and regulations which farmers must obey?

Mr. COOLEY. That is right.

Mr. YATES. Suppose there is a violation of the contract provision, how would the gentleman enforce the contract?

Mr. COOLEY. The employer is held to account, first for the cost of transportation.

Mr. YATES. How?

Mr. COOLEY. All of this will be taken care of in the contract.

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

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

Mr. POAGE. There are two provisions involved there, first the provision that before the farmer can get the contract labor he has to enter into an obligation with the United States Government to carry out the provisions of the contract, and second, that if he violates any of the terms of the contract he cannot get any more contract labor. To any man who

is in the farming business, that is the most effective way to keep him from a violation.

Mr. COOLEY. And he has a civil liability at every moment of the time the man is in the country.

Mr. FOAGE. The chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary is noted for the fact that he has sought to defend the rights of minority groups. He has sought to see that some minorities are not oppressed. The chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary with that creditable record in behalf of certain minorities now comes here and asks us to pass a piece of legislation which would utterly destroy the rights of a great group of American citizens, to wit, those American citizens of Latin ancestry. You cannot tell whether they were born in the United States or whether they were born in Mexico.

Our distinguished colleague who represents the State of New Mexico stood in the well yesterday and pointed out that were this amendment to be adopted in all probability he would find it extremely difficult to secure employment anywhere under normal conditions or when there was a surplus of labor, because nobody could look at him and tell whether he was born in the United States or born in Mexico, and that he could not prove that he was born in the United States.

There are 3,000,000 of these citizens of Latin ancestry in the United States, and they are just as much citizens as the gentleman and I are. They were born here, but you cannot tell whether they were born in the United States or born in Mexico. They are the ones on whom the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary would impose the burden, because it would be they who would not get employment. With this amendment in force, what farmer would employ an American of Latin descent if he could find somebody else to employ. He would say, "Why take a chance? Why employ you?" I might suspect that any man was of Mexican ancestry because perchance he could speak Spanish. This would put a penalty on every man who speaks Spanish. Are we going to do that sort of thing in the United States? Are we going to create discrimination by law against a great part of our citizens? Is that the kind of treatment the gentleman from New York advocates for minorities?

Mr. COOLEY. I just want to ask you not to lose sight of the importance of these objectionable amendments, because if the amendments are adopted, I am convinced we will just not have any legislation on the subject. I think this legislation is badly needed, and I hope you will vote the amendments down.

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

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. CELLER. Since my name was not mentioned—reference being made to the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary—I want to point out that it will simply be a matter, so far as the Mexican aliens are concerned, of them being possessed of a court order admitting them, and they could show that to

the prospective employer. So far as engaging workers of Spanish-American origin, there is nothing unlawful about hiring those of Spanish-American origin.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I think in this debate we have lost sight of the purposes of this bill. This bill was introduced to give some relief to the agricultural producers of America, who have been called upon to produce as they have never produced before. Down in my section of Missouri, and some people do not consider Missouri as a cotton-producing State, we will need 10,000 Mexicans if we are to get out the cotton crop that we have been asked to produce. I make that statement based upon a statement made by the Division of Employment Security at Jefferson City, in which it is said that we are going to need these employees. Substantiating this statement, I herewith quote a letter from the Division of Employment Security, Department of Labor and Industrial Relations of the State of Missouri, Jefferson City, Mo., under date of May 7, 1951, addressed to S. Crews Reynolds, president, Missouri Cotton Producers Association, Portageville, Mo.:

DEAR MR. REYNOLDS: I want you to know that I share the concern expressed in your letter of May 3, regarding labor supply for your cotton crop this year. We are directing our efforts to the supplying of every possible assistance in recruiting the necessary workers for cotton chopping and picking in south-east Missouri, and I expect to fully support the importation of any workers from outside the United States that may be necessary to supplement our available labor supply.

The following answers to your specific questions are based on the best information that we can obtain. As you suggest, the questions are difficult, but we at least have some background of experience to support our estimates on labor supply and demand for cotton production this year.

1. Under normal conditions the production of 600,000 acres of cotton, plus other crops in the cotton counties, requires about 53,000 workers at the peak of cotton chopping. Due to mechanization in crops other than cotton, and due to the fact that acreage for other crops varies in relation to the amount of acreage set aside for cotton production, we believe that labor for crops other than cotton can be handled without any material increase in the total of workers estimated for the cotton crop. This same observation also holds for the harvesting season.

2 and 3. We estimate that approximately 38,000 workers in the local area will be available for cotton chopping. This will leave an additional need for 15,000 workers at the chopping peak. We estimate that 3,000 of the 15,000 workers will be obtained from adjacent and other areas in Missouri, and that approximately 12,000 will have to be brought in from out of State areas. We believe that the necessary 12,000 workers can be obtained from the States of Texas, Arkansas, Tennessee, Illinois, and Kentucky, and doubt that workers imported from outside the United States will be necessary during the chopping season.

4. We estimate that a total of 100,000 workers will be required under normal conditions to harvest 600,000 acres of cotton. This means 100,000 "different" workers, as the average worker does not work throughout the cotton-picking season. We further estimate that approximately 88,000 workers will be needed for the peak of the cotton

picking season during the latter half of October. As I stated in an earlier paragraph, other crops in the area, we think should be harvested without materially increasing the total of workers required for the cotton crop.

5. It is our estimate that approximately 50,000 local workers will be available for the cotton-picking season.

6. On the above basis, about 35,000 or 36,000 workers from outside your local area will be needed for the peak of your cotton harvest. We estimate that 5,000 to 6,000 of these additional workers will come from other areas in Missouri, and that probably up to 30,000 will need to be brought in from outside the State. Migratory workers from the States of Texas, Arkansas, Illinois, Kentucky, and Tennessee constitute the usual source of supply for pickers during the season peak.

It is our opinion at this time that it may prove difficult to obtain all of the 30,000 additional out of State workers from the States indicated. You may be interested to know that we had a meeting last Wednesday with Representatives Wallace, Buckley, Sando, and Penman, who with others sponsored the recent House resolution with reference to the urgency of the labor-supply situation for cotton production in Missouri. We agreed with these gentlemen that probably up to 10,000 Mexican nationals may be needed to supply the possible deficit in our available labor supply during the cotton harvest. If it is necessary to import such workers I will use all the means within my power in an endeavor to obtain these workers for you.

As a matter of interest to you, Mr. Charles Kenyon, our farm placement representative, is in Austin, Tex., this week to make any preliminary arrangements that may be possible to direct Texas migratory workers to Missouri this year. Also Mr. Joseph Feigenpan of our employment service is en route to old Mexico where we are hoping he may be very useful in representing our anticipated need for Mexican national workers for the cotton harvest.

You will find enclosed a short narrative which will give you some detail regarding the organization and program maintained by our agency to assist cotton producers in their labor supply problems. This narrative also contains our pre-season estimates on labor supply and demand for Missouri cotton production this year, and I believe it will, to some extent, amplify my reply to your questions.

I appreciate your interest in writing to me, and will be very glad if you will advise me at any time that you believe I may further assist you.

Very truly yours,

CHAS. A. RICKER, Director.

Also I would like to present herewith a copy of a resolution adopted in the House of Representatives of the Missouri Legislature, pertaining to this same subject:

House Resolution 90

Whereas by reason of national mobilization for defense production the Federal Government has requested that the acreage used for the growing of cotton be increased to 30,000,000 acres in 1951, an increase of 11,000,000 acres over that grown in the year 1950; and

Whereas Missouri's quota of such acreage devoted to the growing of cotton has been fixed at 600,000 acres; or 40 percent over 1950 planted acres; and

Whereas cotton constitutes the largest cash agricultural crop produced in the State of Missouri; and

Whereas such increase in acreage as well as increased production required in the production of all agricultural products, will

necessarily require a substantial increase in the number of farm workers to plant, cultivate and harvest such crops; and

Whereas in the year 1950, out of a total of approximately 100,000 workers required to handle the cotton crop, over 42,000 were brought into the State for such purpose; and

Whereas the Government is building and will soon operate an atomic bomb plant at Paducah, Ky., which will require thousands of employees in its operation, most of whom will be drawn from southeast Missouri and on the neighboring States of Kentucky and Tennessee, thus further reducing the potential labor supply; and

Whereas the increased acreage as aforesaid will require about 20 percent more workers in 1951 than was used in 1950 to plant and cultivate said cotton crop and about 30 percent more workers for the harvesting of such crops: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Federal Government, the United States Employment Service, and the Missouri State Employment Service be requested by the House of Representatives of the General Assembly of Missouri to lend assistance to the cotton growers of this State in providing adequate numbers of farm workers to enable the production of the amount of cotton required as aforesaid; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded by the chief clerk of the house to the President of the United States; to Senators Thomas C. Hennings, Jr., and James P. Kem; to Hon. Paul C. Jones, Representative in Congress of the Tenth District of the State of Missouri; to the Honorable Maurice Tobir, Secretary of Labor; Hon. Robert Goodwin, Director of the United States Employment Service; to Gov. Forrest Smith, and to Hon. Charles A. Ricker, director of the Division of Employment Security of the State of Missouri.

I think it is very unfair for people who are not acquainted with this situation at all, and I have noticed that most of those who are speaking against this bill have never had any experience with this type of labor, to attack the bill. This bill is not for the purpose of helping any wetbacks to get into the country. If you will read the bill as it was approved by the committee, you will find it was to permit the legal entry of emergency temporary agricultural workers. Now, some do-gooders would try to cover up or correct mistakes which should have been corrected by some other committee, by putting on a rider to this bill. I think you should consider the fact that in the other body the section which was adopted as an amendment to the original bill was declared out of order here yesterday. Then they seek to put on another amendment here which has not been considered by the committee and which could not properly have been considered by the Committee on Agriculture, which brought forth a good bill, which will give relief. In view of the action taken yesterday, I believe most people will agree that we should pass the bill as originally reported by our committee.

I ask all of you people who are interested in helping the agricultural people and the farmers of this country who are sorely in need of labor, to help the farmers and to help us get through a bill which will permit the legal entry and legal contracting of these workers and leave the correction of any inequities or

any illegalities that may exist to the proper committee.

All I ask is that the farmers and the people who are producing be treated fairly and be given an opportunity to bring in these workers who are so sadly needed in this emergency.

For that reason I ask that the amendment of the gentleman from New York be defeated and that the Senate substitute be defeated, and that we adopt a bill which has been considered and approved in committee, and not a bill written on the floor of the House because we will make the same mistake in doing that that they made in the other body when they adopted an amendment which was out of order, although the point of order was not raised there at the time—and I think if it had been raised there, we would not have had this thing come up here.

Some of the opponents of this bill who apparently are posing as experts on this subject merely because they have read a series of newspaper articles written by a New York correspondent seem to place implicit confidence in this one man's opinions and apparently have sought no further information. It is rather amusing to note that not less than three of the opponents have each seen fit to have inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, either all or excerpts from this series of articles and appear to be basing their case wholly upon the writings of this one man. Here again the opponents persist in calling attention to the existence of a problem which no one denies does exist, despite the fact that it may be greatly exaggerated, but at the same time it is not a problem which should be corrected by the bill before the House or by any legislation emanating from the Committee on Agriculture. The age-old problem of the illegal wetbacks is one which should be corrected by the Committee on Judiciary after the proper consideration and not be hastily-drawn legislation on the floor of the House.

As to the problem presently before the House, I have stated my position on several occasions along the lines contained in the following excerpt from a recent weekly newsletter which appeared in most of the newspapers of my district, as follows:

Reconsidering its previous action, the Committee on Rules on last Wednesday granted a rule permitting the migratory (Mexican) farm labor bill to be brought before the House for consideration. Members from the cotton-producing States, where such labor is used, are hopeful that this bill will be brought up some time during the coming week. While there is considerable opposition to the bill, I think most of this comes from the fact that many people, including some of my friends in southeast Missouri, do not appreciate the problem which we are facing as a result of a labor shortage which appears to be likely this fall unless some arrangements are made to import some of this emergency migratory labor.

A recent communication from the Division of Employment Security in Jefferson City states that a recent survey indicates that approximately 86,000 workers will be needed for the peak of the cotton-picking season in southeast Missouri during the latter half of October. That office estimates that approxi-

mately 50,000 local workers will be available and that an additional 5,000 to 6,000 workers will come from other areas in Missouri. In addition, there will be migratory workers from the States of Texas, Arkansas, Illinois, Kentucky, and Tennessee who will be attracted to our section during the cotton-picking season. In checking the possibility of obtaining outside labor from adjoining States, the State employment service estimates that probably up to 10,000 Mexican nationals may be needed to supply the possible deficit in our available labor supply during the cotton harvest. This agency has been working with a delegation from the Missouri State Legislature which recently adopted a resolution urging "the Federal Government, the United States Employment Service, and the Missouri State Employment Service * * * to lend assistance to the cotton growers of this State in providing adequate numbers of farm workers to enable the production of the amount of cotton required. * * *"

Despite the fact that under normal conditions few of us like to see any type of migratory or foreign labor come into our community and would much prefer to have all of this work done by citizens residing in our own communities, I think we must recognize the situation that due to the fact that Missouri has planted its largest cotton crop in the face of an impending labor shortage, it is imperative that we make such arrangements as are necessary to provide for the picking of this crop. Only by obtaining an adequate supply of labor can southeast Missouri and other cotton-producing sections of the Nation reach the production goals which have been called for by the Secretary of Agriculture, and it is also necessary that this labor be made available if our farmers are to avoid the great loss which would follow failure to harvest what may prove to be a record-breaking crop.

Under the law we are seeking to pass, all foreign labor would be available only after the United States Department of Labor had certified that domestic labor was not available at the time and place needed to perform the work for which such workers are to be employed; (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.

The urgency for this legislation is brought about by the fact that the agreement between the United States and Mexico under which Mexican agricultural workers are permitted to enter this country under contract to perform certain specific work expires on June 30 and the Mexican Government has already indicated that it will not be favorable to renewing this agreement until some legislation has been passed.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this piece of legislation is distasteful to some of us because we think it opens the door to bringing in people who are undesirable and who might be permitted to remain here. However, the present administration has created the conditions which make it necessary that some of our fruit growers and farmers have help. This administration has taken the boys from the farms, out of the orchards and berry patches, and sent them overseas to fight in a war the purpose of which is still—after a year of fighting—unknown.

This administration will have 2,000,000 or 3,000,000 more young Americans, if their plans succeed, over in Germany pretty soon. It will keep our young men in military service for seven or more years if it has its way.

The old folks, 60 and 65 years of age, in my district, and I notice along the road as I drive home through Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Indiana, who are operating the tractors in the fields long after the sun goes down, yes and often all through the night. The old men and the old women are trying to farm, and produce the food for our people and for our Armed Forces. They are finding it difficult. They just cannot complete their task and do a worth-while job without help. The gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] who knows so much—and I do admire his educational ability—he has traveled, as I understand, all over the world and he knows quite a bit about slums, I take it that he could have learned more about that right at home in New York than anywhere else. Gratuitously—we did not pay him for it, and I do not think that anyone else did—he gave it to us from the goodness of his heart, he criticized and took a crack at the farmers because, he contends, they are not treating migrant laborers as they should be treated. He intimidated some of our farmers and fruit growers are compelling these people to live in slums. Well, it is unfortunate that the gentleman does not get on a horse or take his automobile, or a plane, and get out to Michigan, for example, over on the west side of the State, next to the lake where people live like human beings and treat not only their neighbor—yes, everyone with whom they come in contact with kindness and consideration. He will find mile after mile along that lake shore and going back several miles from the lake shore clear up to Petoskey, Mich., land under a high state of cultivation; he will find square mile after mile of berries and fruit of all kinds being grown and harvested. He will find miles of orchards producing millions of bushels of apples, peaches, pears, plums. He will find people coming in from Mexico principally, however, from some of the other States to the southwest living there, some of them making as much as \$50 a day picking berries by the pound. He will find them, true, living outdoors in tents, cabins or shacks. He will find them out in God's sunshine and clear air, their living and sleeping accommodations similar to all living and working conditions where people are seasonably employed. He will find them eating good food, sleeping in good beds. He should go see those so-called slums, as he calls them. People are there who have come back year after year for 10, 15, or 20 years. Those people come back every year because they find the work profitable, the living conditions satisfactory. They get this fresh air, they get this good food, pure water, plenty of milk, eggs, fruit—oh, yes, and they get some meat once in a while too, quite often, much oftener I think than the average dweller in New York city; and year after year

they come back. They live better in western Michigan than many do at home. They like it, they earn good wages, they have a vacation up there, in many cases with members of their families; they work and save their money, and they go back home with a pocket full of money and they go back much stronger, healthier than when they came. They like it; the work is good for them. They go home fat, healthy and happy—thinking of the day when they can return. These folks from New York and the other cities who are complaining about legislation—I suggest to the gentleman and others that they go back to their home cities, clean up their own slums and send some of the people who live there, if they really want to enjoy a vacation this summer, send them out to Michigan. We will give them plenty of everything they ought to have not only for their material body, but we will get a little more religion and patriotism into some of those who have never seen or lived in the country—in the great outdoors. Because they live out in the open—room to move around—to see and enjoy the sunshine during the day—good restful sound sleep during the quiet nights—they will be better Americans for the experience.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment end in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I am going to admit to start with that this amendment which the gentleman has offered is effective if what you want to do is to starve every illegal Mexican alien out of this country; it is most effective. The trouble is that it affects and punishes a lot of other laborers who are not Mexican aliens, but Americans. As I said yesterday, a man of my nationality, American, but of Mexican or Spanish descent, with a Mexican or Spanish name, would be very adversely affected in his efforts to obtain employment.

This amendment would require the farmer to become a policeman, an investigator, an informer, or run the risk of being a criminal. And you know very well that the average farmer is not going to run any such risk by employing anybody unless he can present an immigration card—and I could not do that myself. Once people like myself leave their States or communities in search of work, it would be most difficult to present proof that they are American citizens, American born. The simple fact of the matter is that they did not have any system of reporting births in my State until late years, and even now it is not the best.

In addition to those people I have already mentioned, there are thousands of Mexican aliens, some of them having lived here 10, 15, and 20 years, many of them with dependent children who were born in the United States, and are American citizens, yet their parents are Mexican aliens, and most would fall in the category covered by this amendment. Under this amendment, the farmers

could not afford to employ the parents of those dependent American children. Under this amendment, you propose to starve them and their children.

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

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

Mr. BAILEY. The gentleman says they could not produce a birth certificate. Why would not a social-security card be all right? I will answer the question for the gentleman—because the social-security laws are set aside by this bill and amendment and they would not be sufficient. That is the answer.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. That is a poor excuse for the gentleman's position. I have no social-security card. The social-security card is no answer, nor does the amendment provide any exception in cases where a man does carry a social-security card.

Mr. BAILEY. This amends the social-security law.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. If the substitute does that, the gentleman seems to be supporting it. The trouble with this amendment is that it is wrong in principle. To starve people into submission is wrong in principle, it is un-Christian, it is un-American. We are using a weapon that is wholly foreign to American concepts of justice. This country is too great to resort to that. That great humanitarian, President Roosevelt, would have never tolerated any such inhumanity to poor people seeking a livelihood. Our immigration officials can, if they will, cope with the problem. Proof of that is that this last year they returned over 600,000 illegal Mexican entrants back to Mexico. The trouble is that the border officials are not enforcing the law in some places as they are in Arizona and New Mexico, where there is no problem of excessive illegal immigration.

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

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

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I am seeking information. I am very much interested in the point the gentleman makes about the farmer not daring to run the risk of hiring someone, as the gentleman, for instance. First of all, the action would only come up if a Government attorney brought an action against the farmer?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. That is correct.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. In order to do that he would first have to prove that the employee was not a citizen of the United States and secondly, he would have to prove intent on the part of the farmer to employ a noncitizen.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Yes; in order to convict him, but you could have farmers being hauled up to court and harassed, and the farmer shuns litigation like the plague. So he would demand an entrance certificate before taking the risk of employing anybody with a Spanish name. Can you blame him?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. The gentleman is really worried about possible harassment?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. That is right. You could not convict a man in my State for hiring a needy Mexican laborer, but the zealous Government can harass him, and he is not going to take any chances on being hauled into court, nor will he submit to becoming an informer, a gestapo agent.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I sense a good deal of emotion in this debate, and I am trying to get away from that. What the gentleman is really worried about is the possible harassment and what the gentleman has just said actually is that the farmers are going to employ these people anyway regardless of whether they are citizens or not?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Indeed not. He will employ only the Mexican with an immigration card and the Negro to the exclusion of Americans who look, speak, and have names like the Mexican nationals. I said any provision that would tend to involve the farmer or make him an informer is most effective in denying employment to people who are or look and talk like Mexican aliens, but who have no immigration card. Such result is inhuman in that it starves the Mexican who is guilty, and the native American of Mexican descent who is innocent.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Mexico has expired.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

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

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

Mr. CRAWFORD. Let me ask the gentleman this question in all seriousness. We are conducting hearings on furnishing eight and a half billion dollars more of economic aid. Why not put this in as a contrary movement to economic aid, feed part of the world on the one hand and fix it so that our own citizens and our good neighbors across the Rio Grande cannot work in this country. Let us stigmatize them, let us starve them to death, while we feed all the others.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Yes, this amendment has that effect, it starves them out, to be rid of them, and it starves American adults and American children along with them.

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

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LYLE. What this amendment proposes to do in effect is to make every man of Mexican name, every man who is of Latin-American descent, a suspect?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. That is right.

Mr. LYLE. It would be embarrassing to them, they would hesitate to drive up and down the area where Mexicans live.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Yes. We have native Americans in New Mexico, natives we are called, who go to Wyoming to

the sheep camps, to Colorado for the beet fields, to the Northern and Western States on other crops. They could not afford to make the trip and then come back disappointed, because they could not present an immigration card, which of course they could not. That is the trouble with the amendment.

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I certainly have nothing against our farmers. I am certainly not against the best interests of the farmers of my own State. I do want to do something about the wetback problem. As one of the gentlemen from California suggested previously, this is a very old problem. It was with us when I went to the Legislature of California over 15 years ago. It involves, as well as foreign labor, migrant workers who are not from Mexico. The conditions under which these people work are deplorable and if I had time enough to describe them I am certain the factual description would shock the conscience of every Member of this House. These unfortunate people have to live under deplorable conditions without medical attention or the most elemental necessities.

I am for bringing in the contract workers where it is necessary, where you cannot get local help. It is one way to help solve a problem but I do want the emphasis to be on legal contract workers and I favor the amendment which would make it hazardous to employ those who come in illegally.

There is also an element of good faith involved in this amendment. The senior delegate of the United States in his negotiations with the delegates of the Republic of Mexico promised the Mexican delegates he would sponsor American legislation to place a penalty upon the hiring of wetbacks. I will say for him that he has at least introduced that kind of legislation over in the other body. If all of these arguments are valid; if you cannot identify these people; if you cannot separate Americans from Mexican nationals how could that promise to sponsor this legislation have been made in good faith?

I believe these arguments are specious, I think they are made by people who want to hire the wetbacks and who do not want to be forced to rely exclusively upon legal contract labor. Mind you, if they are willing to rely exclusively upon contract labor they do not have to worry about the penalty for use of wetbacks because it will not affect them.

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

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

Mr. McCARTHY. I have a memorandum from the Ministry of Foreign Relations, Government of Mexico, which expresses great concern over the news report that the House Rules Committee had refused to report favorably on S. 984.

Furthermore, the statement shows that the Ministry is so concerned over the apparent desire of some Ameri-

can farmers to use wetbacks they announce the possibility that the Government of Mexico would refuse to permit illegals to come back into Mexico. In other words, there are 500,000 or more over here, and when they come back to the border the Mexican Government says, "Prove that you are a Mexican citizen."

Mr. YORTY. I thank the gentleman. The point is this: Having made that promise to the Mexican delegation, can we, in good faith, when we have an opportunity to carry out our promise, refuse to do it, and on the specious ground that maybe the committee did not have jurisdiction.

I submit to you, if you look at the Reorganization Act under "Committee on Education and Labor" you will find that this is a matter that falls within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Education and Labor. So this whole subject, if properly dealt with, in my opinion, should have gone to that committee. Unless we are going to refer legislation on the basis of who employs the particular labor involved, then this legislation should have been considered, in the first place, by the Labor Committee. So I say, at this time, we should keep our promise to the Republic of Mexico. We should put a penalty on the hiring of wetbacks and force the employers to rely on local or legal contract labor. This whole situation arises from a defect in our laws. We already have a law which we thought prevented the harboring and concealing of aliens illegally in this country. In United States against Evans the Court pointed out that the language of the statute was very ambiguous. The Court was not sure just how to apply the penalty provision of the act or what penalty to apply, and therefore they ruled that the matter should be referred to Congress for clarification. In discussing the definition of the penalty that was meant to apply for harboring and concealing, the Court said in that opinion:

We agree that Congress meant to make criminal and to punish acts of harboring and concealing.

So the plain intent of Congress could not be carried out by the Court because of the ambiguous wording of the penalty provision of the statute. We are, by the pending amendment, simply trying to clarify the statute, at least as to the so-called wetbacks.

I agree with General Eisenhower, who was shocked by this particular situation. Most of you know that General Eisenhower wrote to Senator FULBRIGHT and quoted from the revealing articles by Gladwyn Hill which appeared in the New York Times. He cited our use of wetbacks as an example of our decadent ethics and morals.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to direct the attention of the House to the following three telegrams which I have just received. I am not acquainted with the senders of the messages. I feel, however, that the Members will be interested in what they have to say about the pending bill.

CORPUS CHRISTI, TEX., June 27, 1951.
HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY,
House of Representatives,

Washington, D. C.:

The League of United Latin-American Citizens, a national organization covering five Southwestern States—Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, Colorado, and California—and representing more than 3,000,000 Spanish-speaking people of the Southwest United States, in its annual national convention, held in Laredo, Tex., on June 23 and 24, adopted the following unanimous resolution pertaining to wetback and imported labor:

"1. That Congress provide civil and penal punishments for persons who employ wetbacks (Mexicans who enter the United States illegally to find work).

"2. There should be no certification of a shortage of domestic labor to bring in braceros (Mexican workers) under contract unless domestic labor has been offered the same wages and working conditions as that required in importing alien workers.

"3. Wetbacks should be deported before any contract labor is imported.

"4. Alien labor should not be used to suppress wage scales and prevailing wages paid wetbacks should not be considered for any purpose in determining wage levels."

HECTOR P. GARCIA, M. D.,
American GI Forum of Texas.

CORPUS CHRISTI, TEX., June 27, 1951.
Representative SAMUEL W. YORTY,
House of Representatives,

Washington, D. C.:

The American GI forum of Texas joins with forum groups in Corpus Christi and surrounding towns of Sinton, Taft, Odem, Rivera, Robstown, Bishop, Kingsville, Alice, Woodsboro, Gregory, Laguna Acres, Molina, Refugio, Rockport, Aransas Pass, and many other places in Corpus Christi area in demanding investigation of request by the Corpus Christi, Tex., Employment Commission for certification of alleged need of 30,727 Mexican braceros for this Corpus Christi area.

Veterans groups and families in above-mentioned places strongly and emphatically oppose any importation of labor from Mexico into this area because there is enough local labor available here. Certification of labor shortage by local office is grossly inaccurate and phenomenally exaggerated. There are many thousands of American workers of Mexican origin here waiting for crop harvest but if labor is imported they will leave this area and migrate to Northern and Western States. Use of imported labor in this area will perpetuate mistakes of previous years when imported labor brought wages and wage rates downward to a point where semislavery wages prevailed. Local citizen populace now suffering results of imported labor as shown by undernourished, underfed, and poorly clothed children and families living in slum areas and falling easy prey to all sorts of killing diseases like tuberculosis and infant diarrhea.

Imported labor into this area will only perpetuate and increase the suffering and exploitation of our workers here who are waiting for agricultural jobs.

HECTOR P. GARCIA, M. D.,
Chairman, American GI Forum of Texas.

CORPUS CHRISTI, TEX., June 27, 1951.
HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY,
House of Representatives,

Washington, D. C.:

The American GI Forum of Texas, representing 50,000 veterans and their families with the lowest standard of living in Texas, strongly favor the Douglas amendment to the Poage bill, which would penalize persons who knowingly employ wetbacks, thereby

hurting the economic, social, and educational status of these veterans and their families who are now fighting a siege of death of diarrhea and polio due to lack of proper housing, plumbing, and sufficient nutrition. These wetbacks decrease the earning potential of the veterans who served and sacrificed themselves in the last war and of many who are now serving in Korea in order to make this country a better place to live in. The use of wetbacks is an act of treason to these veterans and their families and to the American economy. The Douglas amendment in its original form must, in any case, be a part of any treaty with Mexico regarding use of imported labor. Herewith follows a copy of resolution adopted by the forum at its latest convention at Corpus Christi, April 29, 1951:

"Be it resolved, That we, the undersigned citizens of Texas, do, by the inscription of our signatures hereto, endorse the action recommended in the following resolution circulated by the American GI Forum of Texas:

"Whereas Texas, and especially the Rio Grande Valley of Texas, is subject to the constant illegal immigration of aliens known locally as wetbacks; and

"Whereas laboring citizens of the United States are injured grievously competing with these illegal aliens for laboring jobs; and

"Whereas the practice of hiring illegal aliens has a further detrimental effect upon the economy of the valley, particularly in lowering purchasing power at the retail level; and

"Whereas the Government of the United States is charged with the responsibility of preventing illegal immigration; and

"Whereas a tremendous expense is entailed in the maintenance of a veritable army of border guards and, recently, of an airlift into the interior of Mexico; and

"Whereas the continuing illegal immigration of said aliens is fostered and encouraged by a ready market for low-cost labor; and

"Whereas the presence in Texas and the valley of these illegal aliens in great numbers constitutes a pool of cheap labor with which resident valley laborers cannot compete; and

"Whereas only cessation of the practice of employing illegal aliens will effectively stem the tide of illegal immigration: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the Congress of the United States enact such legislation as is necessary to deter effectively the nefarious practice of hiring illegal aliens at un-American wages while citizens of the Rio Grande Valley and Texas are forced to travel great distances to earn livable wages doing the same type of work for which they are hopelessly underbid at home; be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this letter be sent to the following: Vice President Alben Barkley; Secretary of State Dean Acheson; Speaker of the House Sam Rayburn; Representative Lloyd M. Bentsen, Jr.; Senator Tom Connally; Senator Lyndon Johnson; Senator Herbert Lehman; Senator Wayne Morse; Secretary of Labor Maurice J. Tobin; and to the Bracero Pact Commission.

"HECTOR P. GARCIA, M. D.,
"State Chairman, American GI
Forum.

"JOE ZAPATA, Secretary."

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, there is one similarity between the arguments of the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] and the gentleman from California [Mr. YORTY]. They are both sufficiently far removed from the scene of the employment to be misinformed. They live in areas where there are many slums which they are

unable to see and where there are many aliens whom they are unable to count. The largest farm in either area would be a window box and the principal agricultural product would be wild oats.

If I may, Mr. Chairman, let me give a few facts. The entire area that we are talking about, from Mexico to the Oregon border, once belonged to Mexico, and the original people in that area were Mexican people who left many of their relatives and descendants there. The Mexican border, like the Canadian border, is an open border. There is no way in which you could stop a Mexican citizen from coming into the United States, provided he had a visa from the Mexican Government and provided he was in good health and did not have a criminal record.

The gentlemen from the highly populated cities of the country wish to eat the products we raise, but also wish to take from the area the labor that has been used in the methods under which we have farmed for 150 years.

When you talk about 600,000 people, which is entirely too large a figure—wetbacks—having been put back across the line, it is much less than that, what we do is to put the same Mexican back across the line, probably every week, maybe every day, and he comes back again. He sleeps at home and he comes back to work the next day. So the Immigration Department takes credit for one additional wetback on each trip. Can you picture in your mind, Mr. Chairman, a relationship like the State of Maryland and the District of Columbia? What you are asking us to do is to say that a man in the District of Columbia, who employs a man who is a resident of the State of Maryland, is subject to a fine of \$1,000, and is to be accused of a felony—or misdemeanor I think, in the gentleman's somewhat modified amendment. How can you tell whether the man lives in Maryland? How can you tell whether he lives in the District of Columbia?

In the area where I live the same people have picked crops for years and years. Why have they done it? Because we pay four times as much in the United States for agricultural labor as is paid in Mexico. The reason the wetback comes across is not because the American farmer desires him to come across as a wetback but because the conditions in Mexico are such that it is cheaper for him to come across a nonexistent line, than to pay the demands made of him by his own country. The Mexican laborer, from time immemorial has harvested these crops, so he comes across and harvests them and goes back. Every time he is taken back instead of going back on his own power, the Immigration Service takes credit for another wetback sent back across the line. These men rarely go a distance from the border. Whenever they go from the border, there are immigration roadblocks.

I sincerely hope, Mr. Chairman, that we will not write into this bill the amendment suggested, perhaps through misunderstanding, by the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] and

through less excusable misunderstanding, by the gentleman from California [Mr. YORRY], who ought to know. I hope we will not write in an amendment which, while the Department of Agriculture asks for a 60-percent increase in cotton and a 40-percent increase in food because of the war emergency, will take away not merely the agricultural labor which has always harvested the crops but which will impose a burden upon every person in the United States who speaks Spanish, who looks Spanish, and who has not a birth certificate you can depend upon to prove that he is an American citizen. Even though his children may have served in the American Army and even though his children may be married to American citizens, you do not know whether he will come under the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York. This is not cheap labor, Mr. Chairman. That will be brought out in the discussion. It should also be brought out that the system is advantageous to the Republic of Mexico, which profits in cash money, put in circulation, and by knowledge of improved farm methods.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS].

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I had not intended to speak on this amendment or upon this bill, but when I hear some of these pseudo farmers in this House, such as the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] standing in the well explaining how to farm and the processes of it I am beginning to think that if ignorance is bliss they should probably be the happiest men in Congress.

I happen to know a little bit about agriculture. I make my living that way. I heard someone yesterday expounding upon the art of dairying. Then later he said that anyone could put a milking machine on a cow. I am inclined to think that if he were to put one on, it would probably act like a stomach pump.

This thing is pretty fundamental. I have heard a lot of remarks about helping agriculture. I do not know what the situation is as far as helping agriculture in Texas is concerned, but if any Member from Ohio says this bill is going to help agriculture in the State of Ohio he just does not know what he is talking about.

We do not employ any Mexicans from Mexico in Ohio but we do employ Mexican-Americans occasionally who are displaced by wetback labor. If you will go up into the fields of northwestern Ohio where they employ stoop labor they will tell you that those people come up there hunting jobs and say they cannot find jobs down where they came from because there are too many illegal en-

trants who are working for lower wages and who are taking jobs away from the people who have long lived there.

We also find that there are problems when they come up into Ohio as far as living conditions are concerned, as far as living in slums is concerned, and as far as not wanting to send their children to school is concerned. The farmers who have employed them have found that they are a problem that is not worth the nuisance that is involved in comparison with the labor they get from them.

During World War II we employed same labor from Jamaica, but they were brought in under legitimate contracts where at a specified time the employer had certain specified responsibilities which he had to assume and which he was willing to assume.

When the season was over he was under some obligation to see that those people were sent back home where they came from, and that they did not become a problem.

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

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. HOPE. The gentleman states that farmers in the State of Ohio would get no particular benefit from this bill. I have no doubt that is true. Farmers from the State of Kansas would get no particular benefit from it either. In fact, the bill, as I understand it, will affect only 18 States, so far as farmers are concerned. But the people of the State of Ohio have to eat and the people of the State of Kansas have to eat, and people from every other State have to eat.

Does not the gentleman think that a bill which makes it possible to bring in some labor to help harvest the crops is going to be a good bill for the people of Ohio as well as the people of every other State?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I do not say that you should not bring in any labor. But I am getting a little bit tired of Members of Congress trying to keep the potential employers of this labor from assuming any responsibility whatever for the labor that is brought in. If the employer wants to bring in the labor, and certainly to profit from it, he should be willing to comply with certain terms and with the provisions of the contracts. He should assume certain responsibilities for seeing that that labor is returned whence it came when he is through with it and when there is no employment for that labor.

Some of these arguments are more than specious, they are just a little bit foolish, because some of the people who have been standing in the well of the House here worrying about the poor Mexican workers are some of the same people who have fought civil rights ever since I have been in the Congress. So, as I see it, it is just a question of whether they can get something for their own territory or their own State, without too much responsibility to the people of the United States. I agree with you that the situation in agriculture is such that there is a need for

labor—yes—but I do not agree with you that it is so bad the Federal Government should step in and assume all the responsibilities and let the employer who is going to profit from it assume none of the responsibility. Certainly, if I want labor, I am willing to assume some responsibility for it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING].

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, my feeling is that it would be desirable to write into this bill some legislation along the line of that suggested by the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER]. I am sympathetic to the objectives sought by the gentleman. I have no doubt there have been abuses by many employers and that their participation in illegal acts should be punished. However, I believe that the amendment offered by my colleague, despite its adoption in the other body, is fatally defective, and no court in the country would ever sustain the wording of this particular amendment.

I call attention particularly to the language of the amendment that an operator who employs a person whom he knows or has reasonable grounds to believe or to suspect is an alien, then becomes subject to criminal penalties. In my judgment the Supreme Court has never in the past and would never in the future sustain such a penal provision as that. Criminal statutes must be written with clarity and definiteness to be valid. I say this with the utmost deference to the chairman of my committee, and with the utmost deference to the Member of the other body who offered the amendment there.

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

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. CELLER. Has the gentleman any change in the language in mind which might be consonant with his views on this matter?

Mr. KEATING. I would suggest the elimination of the words "or suspect" in both cases where they appear. My inclination would be, if those words were eliminated, to support the amendment of the gentleman from New York. I am certain that with those words in the amendment it is fatally defective.

Mr. CELLER. I would be glad to accept the gentleman's suggestion.

Mr. KEATING. I have no power to make that change. If the gentleman from New York would attempt to make it, it would be entirely acceptable to me.

Mr. CELLER. Why does not the gentleman ask unanimous consent to have the words eliminated?

Mr. KEATING. I suggest that the author of the amendment would be the appropriate person to ask for unanimous consent to do that. I shall certainly not oppose it; indeed, will welcome the change.

Mr. CELLER. Will the gentleman yield to me for that purpose?

Mr. KEATING. I am happy to do so.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the words mentioned by the gentleman from New York

[Mr. KEATING] be deleted from the Celler amendment to the Polk substitute amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER]?

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, at the outset I would like to correct an impression which seems to prevail in the minds of some of my colleagues who have spoken. In the first place, my district does not contain any great plantations such as those pictured by the gentlemen from Illinois and New York State. Mine are for the most part small farms and very few are operated except by or under the direct jurisdiction of the owners themselves.

I also wish to comment particularly on the description of the living conditions as set forth by some of these same gentlemen. The itinerant Mexicans live under the same conditions in all respects as native American workers. Their houses are clean and sanitary and in all probability they live far better here than in their native land.

Since the offering of the Celler amendment yesterday, I have been checking into the history of any similar measure ever to be proposed or considered in this Congress. Certainly none has ever been enacted and I doubt if one was ever offered.

If this amendment prevails, it will set a precedent which will eventually affect every employer who may in the future consider hiring a foreign-born person. This amendment says in effect that if a job applicant speaks with an accent or if he has a dark complexion, the prospective employer must check into the antecedents of the applicant and satisfy whoever it is who would administer this strange new law that the applicant is in America legally.

True, this amendment applies only to Mexicans. However, once the principle has been established by the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, presumably in the interests of fairness, he will introduce a similar measure to embrace all aliens. What such a law would do to his own New York, where countless thousands speak broken English, is hard even to imagine.

I think the author of this amendment knows perfectly well that if he proposed any such measure in the form of a new bill, it would never pass his committee. His only chance of getting a foot in the door with any such drastic measure is by the present means of urging it on the House of Representatives when the House has had no time to study it. In any event, if the House votes down this

amendment, the author of it may still introduce a bill which will provide for it, and he can make it all-inclusive, or discriminatory as he sees fit.

I hope the committee will reject the amendment and then I shall watch with great interest to see whether such a bill is introduced.

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

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I want to ask a question which relates to the statement made by the gentleman who preceded you. Suppose you have a farm out here and three or a dozen of these workers are brought to your farm at 6 o'clock in the afternoon. They are handed to you and you place them in a nice house—and I mean that literally—and they ask you for forty or fifty dollars to buy a grubstake and you advance the funds. You get up the next morning and they are all gone. What are you going to do about it?

Mr. KEATING. I am afraid you would have to ask someone who has had more experience along that line.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I use that as a simple illustration which happens very often, to indicate that the gentleman from Ohio does not know much about farm labor.

Mr. KEATING. So far as I know, we do not have any of these Mexican migrant laborers in my particular territory.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. This is an exceedingly complicated matter as we have found out in the last few hours. Does not the gentleman think the place to thrash this out is in the Committee on the Judiciary rather than on the floor of the House?

Mr. KEATING. Yes; I do; I agree. I think that all such legislation relating to immigration matters should be passed upon by the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Could not this be killed on the floor and then perhaps the chairman of this committee or the gentleman from New York could bring it out later in the form in which the committee itself approves?

Mr. KEATING. I am in favor of consideration by the Committee on the Judiciary of legislation similar to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York. I would be strongly inclined to favor a measure along those lines which is carefully drawn and thoroughly digested.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired, all time on the amendment to the amendment has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. POLK].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CELLER) there were—ayes 55, noes 125.

So the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McCARTHY to the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. POLK]: On page 3, strike out paragraph (2) of section 502 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(2) to reimburse the United States for essential expenses, not including salaries or expenses of regular department or agency personnel, incurred by the United States under this title. Direct expenses for transportation and subsistence shall be assigned, by the Secretary of Labor, to individual employers to the extent possible, in an amount not to exceed \$20 per worker. The Secretary of Labor shall determine on January 1, 1952, and on each succeeding January 1 during the life of this title, if such payments fully reimburse the United States for the essential expenses (as defined in this paragraph) incurred by it under this title. If the Secretary of Labor finds that the United States is not so fully reimbursed, he shall prorate the remaining amount due the United States among all employers in accordance with the number of man-hours of labor received by such employers from workers made available under this title. For the purposes of this paragraph, the Secretary of Labor shall determine the essential expenses (as defined in this paragraph) incurred by the United States per man-hour of labor provided under this title, and employers shall keep such records as the Secretary of Labor deems necessary to determine the amount of reimbursement due the United States under this paragraph."

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is simply to carry out what was declared as the intent and desire of all the farmers in the West and in the Southwest, namely, that there should be no subsidy involved in this. If you will read the terms of the Poage bill you will find that it provides that the farmer shall pay up to \$10 of expenses. The Senate bill carried \$20. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] has practically admitted that it would cost more than \$10 for the Government to carry out this thing, but he said, "We want to discourage their spending too much."

I want to prevent the payment of a subsidy and I want to call to your attention statistics and figures of what it cost to bring in farm labor during the war. In that period 309,000 foreign workers were brought in at a cost of about \$76,000,000. Figured out on a per capita cost it amounts to \$214 per man. That is over \$200 more than the amount the gentleman from Texas proposed that the farmers pay.

More immediately, if we take the question of cost of transportation and subsistence, the most recent report of the Farm Replacement Service indicates it would cost \$34.90 per man for transportation and subsistence. If we are going to have to take care of the problem of getting the foreign worker who skips back to Mexico, then the cost is increased on the average by another \$33 per man. So in effect what we have here is a program to subsidize the farmers of the Southwest and of the West, even though they protest that they want no subsidization.

My amendment carries out what certain representatives of farm groups asked from the committee. The farmers came in and said, "This is what we want." The committee said, "We will give you what you want and more."

Mr. Bailey, legislative consultant, National Grange, said in the Senate hearings on the question:

We would suggest that the entire cost of farm labor program be put into one pool, and if you brought in a hundred thousand workers, you would divide the cost by 100,000 and apportion that to everybody, because this is a national farm labor program to the benefit of all the country.

The CHAIRMAN. Would you be more specific and tell us what extent you think the Government should share any of these costs of transportation and sustenance of labor in transit?

Mr. BAILEY. We believe in no subsidy whatever for the program.

My amendment does not go that far. It provides that the direct expenses which can be determined shall be assigned to the individual farmer in whose behalf they are incurred up to \$20. All of these other incidental expenses that we cannot determine at this particular point will be added and on January 1 following the end of the crop season a determination will be made. If an employer had a hundred thousand man-hours of labor under this contract, and the Government finds it cost 2 cents an hour to provide that labor to him, the farmer will then be assessed that amount and will be expected to pay it into the Treasury of the United States. There will be no subsidy if my amendment is adopted. If it is not adopted, then the cost depends on how many men may be brought in. The more we bring in the more it will cost the Government. Remember it cost \$214 per man to provide these laborers during the only period in which we had any experience.

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

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HOPE. May I ask the gentleman if he understands the provisions of the House bill which limits the amount to \$10, and the Senate bill which limits it to \$20, to cover anything more than the travel expenses and the subsistence in bringing these Mexicans from Mexico to the centers in this country from where they will be sent out to the farmers?

Mr. McCARTHY. I understand that and also that the penalty bond which used to be in force requiring each employer to put up \$25, which was forfeited if he did not return to Mexico, has been eliminated and the Poage bill now provides that if a worker is not returned and later is apprehended, then the employer shall pay to the Government what it would have cost to take the worker from the farm to the reception center. If the worker gets away and is never caught, the employer does not pay anything. If he had to pay \$15 transportation in the first place, he could give the Mexican \$5 and say: Get lost, and you save yourself \$10. That is exactly what is permitted in the bill. It gives an incentive to skipping. The immigration

people estimate that if the Poage bill passes 50 percent of the contract labor will likely skip. At the present time about 20 percent skip, even with the \$25 penalty in force.

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

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

Mr. KEATING. Does the gentleman's amendment include a prorating of the expenses of administering the program, as well as the actual costs for transportation and subsistence embodied in the specific clause we are discussing?

Mr. McCARTHY. Excepting those expenses that would be part of the regular administration of the Department of Labor Immigration and Naturalization Office.

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

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was not objection.

Mr. KEATING. Would the gentleman give us again the estimated cost per operator regarding which this substitute requires reimbursement by the employer of only \$20?

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senate bill provides \$20; the Poage bill \$10.

Mr. KEATING. And the actual cost is estimated at what?

Mr. McCARTHY. The actual cost is estimated at \$34.90 for transportation and subsistence plus \$33 which it costs to apprehend skips on the average. The actual program, when in effect during the recent war, cost on an average \$214 per man per year.

Mr. KEATING. I am sympathetic with the gentleman's amendment. As a matter of fact, I prepared one myself with relation to the original bill, striking out the words "not to exceed \$10 per worker." The effect of that would be to require the employer to reimburse the Government for its actual expenses without this limitation. I see no reason why this Congress should vote a subsidy to any group of our population for this type of program.

I agree entirely, if I understand fully the gentleman's amendment, that the purpose he is seeking to achieve is desirable. In fact, unless this amendment or something similar to it to protect the Government purse is adopted, I do not see how I can support it.

Mr. McCARTHY. We have consulted with the departments in charge and they say it can be worked out, and that the matter of keeping the record of man-hours, and so forth, will not be an undue burden. You must remember that only about 100,000 or 125,000 growers use this contract labor, anyhow.

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

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

Mr. PHILLIPS. I should like to ask the gentleman if the large figure he gave for World War II did not include a great

many other items in this cost for bringing these people in from countries outside of the United States.

Mr. McCARTHY. These are foreign workers.

Mr. PHILLIPS. That was the complete transportation cost.

Mr. McCARTHY. I said of foreign workers.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Would it not be better to send this to conference and work out a better bill?

Mr. McCARTHY. We can still confer on this question because it is not in the Senate bill. I think the House should not take the position of subsidy to secure labor for a few farmers in one section of the country. As to subsidies on food, those of you who oppose subsidies ought to be opposed to subsidizing the producer. If you subsidize one and not the other, you do not have much of a case.

Mr. POAGUE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Minnesota has just stated that we should not pay a subsidy to American farmers. I fully agree with him. That has been one of the objectives of the subcommittee that wrote this bill, from the very beginning. We do not propose to pay a subsidy to anybody. We have made in provision in this bill to prevent any subsidy.

The question involved here is not a question of subsidy; it is a question of extravagance of Government as compared with the ability of private operators to handle their own business on a businesslike basis.

The gentleman pointed out that the United States had squandered, had wasted, had poured down a rat hole some two hundred dollars per worker during the war, when it included the payment of housing, transportation, and all kinds of extravagant expenses.

I want to quote to the House actual figures, not something that somebody estimates, not any \$34 per worker but the actual figures showing what has been paid this last month to bring workers from Mexico to the United States and to provide for their subsistence while bringing them here.

I have before me the affidavit of C. W. Wood, prepared on May 28, 1951, in which he testified that he brought certain Mexican nationals from Monterrey to Hidalgo, Tex., at a transportation cost of \$2 per person and two meals per person at 50 cents, making \$3 per person for bringing them in.

I have the affidavit of George A. Graham, who testified that on May 16, 17, and 18 he recruited 1,067 Mexican workers at Hermosillo, Mexico, and transported them to Nogales, Ariz., and the transportation expense between those points was \$2.10 per man.

I have affidavits here from many others. They averaged out less than \$2.50 cost of transportation from the Mexican centers to the American border, including the payment for food on the way. That means less than \$5 a round trip. That is what these people are actually today paying and what the

actual cost is, not what somebody estimates. It is actually being done for less than \$5 round trip right now.

Now, I submit when it is being done for \$5, and when we allow the Government to charge \$10, that we are being quite liberal with the Government, and we are not subsidizing any farmer when we are providing that the farmer can be called upon to pay twice as much as he would if he did it himself.

This limitation is put on here not for the purpose of subsidizing the farmer but for the purpose of requiring the extravagant agencies to live within the bounds of reason and to exercise some reasonable care.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I want to ask the gentleman if one of the affidavits in question does not refer to an affidavit made by a group from Mississippi, where the cost was listed as no more than two-dollars-and-some-cents for transportation for the worker.

Mr. POAGE. That is right.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I happen to personally know the gentleman who made that affidavit, and I can personally vouch for the facts involved in those costs. I think any effort we make to restrict the amount that is allowed for the individual cost will go a long way toward restricting the Government agencies from squandering funds.

Mr. POAGE. We want to give the Government agencies the opportunity to recoup all the costs, so we say they can take twice the cost, but we do not want to pay more than is needed to these Government agencies. We do not propose to let them just spend without limit; just throw the money away because we are going to collect it from the farmers.

The proposal by the gentleman from Minnesota is to put no limit upon the expenditures of the Government agencies, and if you have been in Congress 6 weeks you know that if you do not put a limitation on every one of these Government agencies that they are going to go on a spree worse than any drunken sailor.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. O'TOOLE. According to the farmers' affidavits they spend more on the transportation of pigs than they do on these poor humans.

Mr. POAGE. I do not know what it costs to transport pigs from Mexico. Does the gentleman from New York know?

Mr. O'TOOLE. No.

Mr. POAGE. Then the gentleman does not have any right to come here and say what it costs to transport pigs when he does not know.

Between the three Mexican contract centers and the American border we do know what the first-class bus fare is, and it averages less than a dollar.

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

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I think an effort is being made to hamstring this legislation. They say in effect, "Now, we will put it on the farmer, yes; we will charge him \$20 to transport these Mexicans some 150 miles from these three recruitment points in the Republic of Mexico—Hermosillo, Chihuahua, and Monterrey—and move them to where the farmer can get them at the Mexican border.

"Yes; we will take care of them; we will put \$20 in there. We are going to insist that the Government of the United States collect \$20 from that farmer. We will dress him up so he cannot farm." This seems to be the attitude of those who oppose the Poage or committee bill.

Let us see what the facts are. I hold in my hand an affidavit made by a man from my district who has made trips down there repeatedly to get labor for the cotton farmers in my section of Arkansas. He says the average cost to the association for processing a worker, feeding him, and transporting him to Laredo, Tex., amounts to \$1.74 per worker. Multiply that by 2 to get him back home when he has completed his contract, and that is the total cost for these items. It is \$1.74 each way. He is an expert in doing this thing apparently, because he has been there so much he knows how to do it economically.

Here are many letters I have received regarding costs and the great need for this labor.

One letter states:

This spring we recruited our labor from Mexico at a cost of \$6.62 per man.

This person refers to the total cost from Monterrey to his farm. His cost to the border reception center was only a fraction of that amount. The expenditures from the border to the farm and return are not included in the \$10 or \$20 provision now under consideration.

Here is a letter that says it cost \$1.35 per worker, making the total cost \$2.70, to get him back home at the conclusion of his contract.

Here is a letter showing that the cost is \$1.77 per man for transportation, pictures, and food, to get the Mexican national up to the border.

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

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

Mr. BAILEY. How could you transport somebody from Arkansas to Mexico for \$1.35?

Mr. GATHINGS. I said that this letter came from Arkansas through the mail.

Mr. BAILEY. Is the gentleman talking about the cost of procurement up to the border?

Mr. GATHINGS. The farmer after he gets him at the border has to pay for the transportation and subsistence of the worker to the farm. This \$1.35 is the cost the farmer pays to get him from one of the three centers in Mexico which are about 150 miles from the bor-

der, up to the reception center, at or near the border, where the farmer gets him.

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

Mr. GATHINGS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SABATH. If the amount is so small, why cannot these large farmers or planters that need this labor and derive the benefit of their labor assume the cost themselves?

Mr. GATHINGS. They are doing it right now. They are paying this cost. Even when these men abscond and are apprehended in this country, when they go up to the city of Chicago to see the country and happen to be picked up there, the farmer pays the cost of transporting them back to Mexico. They have done it every time. Whenever that bill is submitted to the farmer, the farmer pays it. He pays every nickel he is obligated to pay under the contract.

Mr. SABATH. Why is it that it is worth so much to the Government to import and deport these Mexicans?

Mr. GATHINGS. The Immigration Service has its men in the field regardless. They have these fellows, enforcement officers, all around over the country.

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

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

Mr. COOLEY. Let me make this clear: There is no subsidy contemplated by this bill. It is contended that the farmer shall do just what the gentleman has indicated he should do, that is, to pay all the cost incurred from the time he takes him from the reception center until he is returned there.

Mr. GATHINGS. That is right. I do not want to see a punitive proposal come in here to make him pay up to \$20. If you put \$20 in the bill the farmer is going to have to pay \$20. In addition to his transportation, the farmer pays medical fees, his food and lodging, a place to live, an insurance policy, and the prevailing wage in that particular area. This is expensive labor.

Mr. SABATH. I am not in favor of the Government's recklessly spending the money of the poor farmers who hire these thousands of Mexicans.

Mr. GATHINGS. That is fine. I thank the gentleman so much, and appreciate his support in opposition to this amendment, that ought to be defeated.

Mr. SABATH. I think this is a step in the right direction.

Mr. GATHINGS. The farmer has a hard enough time as it is. I trust that this committee will not penalize him further by such an amendment as this.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, you have listened to some wild-eyed statements from some of the proponents of this legislation. You have noted the presentation of certain affidavits from interested parties as to the cost of this transportation.

I am dealing with the cost here and the procurement of these Mexicans south

of the border and bringing them to the border. I am going to give you an itemized breakdown supplied to me no later than this morning by the Farm Placement Service, in an analysis of S. 984, which is the Senate bill. This is the average cost and it does not apply to some particular individual from whom these affidavits were presented. This is the average cost based on the experience of the Farm Placement Service, from the migration center in Mexico through the United States Reception Center at or near a port of entry and return: recruitment, 75 cents per individual; transportation \$15.65; subsistence, \$6—a total of \$22.40.

Reception processing, assignment, re-assignment, and return to Mexico, 50 cents; subsistence at the center on the border, \$12—making a total of \$12.50, or an over-all total of \$34.90.

The Poage bill, the House bill presented by the gentleman from Texas, would fix the figure of \$10 to reimburse the Government for this expenditure. The Senate bill would fix the total at \$20. Why not take the actual cost applied by a responsible bureau of the Government as to the actual cost involved for the average of those procured?

Why not write into the bill the proposal of the gentleman from Wisconsin and allocate it on a pro rata basis? Or why not write into the bill the actual cost of \$35, instead of \$10 or \$20?

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

Mr. BAILEY. I yield briefly.

Mr. COOLEY. I was just wondering if it is not possible that the \$34 figure included transportation for a greater distance than that which is contemplated by this program? I know that at one time they were recruiting laborers from 800 miles south of the border. We do not contemplate that at all.

Mr. BAILEY. You are going to get them any place that you can get them, and you know you are.

Mr. COOLEY. No.

Mr. BAILEY. And you are going to reimburse the Government \$10 for bringing them in from Mexico City. Do not try to kid the committee.

Mr. COOLEY. I am not trying to deceive or mislead the committee, or even the gentleman who is now addressing us. I am of the opinion that those figures are inflated because of the great distance involved for transportation.

Mr. BAILEY. Are they as likely to be inflated figures coming from a regular bureau of the Federal Government, than the figures of some private affidavit submitted on the floor here?

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

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

Mr. McCARTHY. I think the members of the committee are quite certain if the demand for these contract laborers increases, as we have had indications here that it will increase, the Mexican Government has said that they are going to set up their recruitment centers much farther south of the border and this \$34 which the Department of Labor, or the

Immigration and Naturalization Service says it will cost is based on the quite certain possibility that we are going to have to go 500 or more miles into Mexico in order to recruit them.

The Mexican Government does not want these recruiting centers up near the border because you will have more Mexicans coming there, and if they cannot come in legally and if they are not given the legal right to come in as contract workers, they will just start moving north and thus you will have more wetbacks.

Mr. BAILEY. I thank the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. Chairman, let me carry this cost situation just a little bit further. The official figures of the Labor Department are that 579,105 illegal aliens were reported during the year 1950, and that 98 percent of them are Mexican wetbacks. If you take that figure between the House bill and the Senate bill of \$10 and the actual cost of \$35 alone, the Federal Government is going to have to pay \$25 on each one of them. Suppose you bring in the 125,000 laborers they say they need in southern California and the approximately 200,000 that they say they need in the Delta States, and probably another 100,000 in the State of Texas, why, I can figure here by just saying that if you bring in more than you brought in last year, it is going to cost the Government \$16,500,000 on that one item alone.

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

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. No matter how thin you slice it, if the gentleman's figures are accurate, the House bill calls for a subsidy of twenty-four-dollars-and-some-cents per worker, and the Senate bill for a subsidy of fourteen-dollars-and-some-cents per worker.

Mr. BAILEY. Correct. That is correct.

Mr. Chairman, I insist that the committee either take the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota, or I shall offer an amendment to put in the exact figure of \$35.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, we are confronted with a very critical time in the history of this Government. Downstairs in the Committee on Appropriations we are considering a bill which would provide \$60,000,000,000 for additional national defense for the coming fiscal year. Munitions of war are important, but, of course, there are many other things essential if we are to measure up to the requirement that America be strong at this time. You have to have guns and airplanes, but you have to have food and fiber just as well. For example, the Quartermaster General is asking Congress to appropriate \$300,000,000 to create a pool for supplies of cotton duck and cotton webbing that will be used in the military effort. But if we are to have these fibers we must be able to grow them and harvest them. It is absolutely essential in

my judgment in the interest of national defense that this Poage farm-labor bill be passed. The committee worked on it for weeks; they considered all aspects. I was up there and testified before the committee; I saw the committee at work. They have brought in a good bill. I think it would be unfortunate to adopt the amendment now pending or any other amendment. Let us go to conference with the Senate on the basis of the House bill. It is different from the Senate bill which is now being offered as a substitute to the Poage bill. In conference the differences between the two bills can be ironed out. I trust the House bill will prevail in conference.

It is absolutely necessary that the so-called Douglas amendment, which would require the farmer to know whether the Mexican laborer were a wetback or not, be entirely eliminated from the bill. Such an unfair amendment would wreck the bill and injure the farmer, the laborer, and the national defense effort.

I would like to speak for a moment about the cost of bringing these laborers into the United States from Mexico. The figure set in the Poage bill, \$10, seems to be a reasonable and accurate figure and I see no reason why other statistics not submitted in the hearings should be accepted here on the floor now.

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

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. POAGE. I would like to call the attention of the gentleman from Texas and the attention of the membership generally to the actual transportation figures of the public carriers, the bus lines at the present time. These are not imaginary figures but they are what it actually costs today. These figures are sworn to. The fare from Hermosillo is almost exactly \$1. The bus fare from Monterrey to Laredo, Tex., is 66 cents. The bus fare from Chihuahua, Mexico, to El Paso is \$1.15. These are rates charged by common carriers today.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is correct, and the Members of the House should understand that the farmer must pay the transportation, not the Government, after the man gets into this country. This \$10 seems to be abundantly adequate and I do trust that the House bill may be adopted with that figure, that the substitute bill may be defeated, and that we can send this bill to conference as soon as possible, because it is extremely urgent that the bill be enacted into law at the earliest possible moment—it would be difficult to exaggerate the importance of this legislation.

Let me say further that these citizens from the Republic of Mexico will not be treated like peons, or worked for nothing. When they come to the district which I represent, where we will harvest perhaps 3,000,000 bales out of the 16,000,000 bales that we hope will be produced in this country, they will be treated well. They will take hundreds and hundreds of thousands of American dollars back to their homes in Mexico and their wage rates will be abundantly high, and the living standards will be

satisfactory. This is no case of sweat-shop labor, but this is a case of giving the people south of the border down Mexico way an opportunity to participate in American prosperity and at the same time help the American farmer and contribute to the defense effort. They will be adequately and almost fabulously paid in some instances for the labor they perform in the cotton fields of the country, particularly in west Texas. The bill has adequate safeguards to prevent any injustice to laborers from the Republic of Mexico.

There are a number of other matters with respect to the farm-labor situation which I think should be said to the House at this time. The passage of the Poage bill now before us will go a long way in helping provide labor from the Republic of Mexico. In other words, the Poage bill will do one thing. Another thing should be done. The House should pass House Joint Resolution 208 which I introduced on March 19 or similar legislation. The point is the Senate amendment with respect to child labor which became the law in 1949 has brought about a great injustice both to the farmer and to the children and families involved. Congress should enact legislation which would leave to the States the matter of determining age limitations and school attendance of families engaged in agriculture. I have collaborated with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ROGERS] in preparing an amendment which will be introduced by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ROGERS] later in the day. I wish to appeal to the House to join with Mr. ROGERS and me and with other Members of Congress from agricultural areas in seeking to repeal or modify existing law which makes it impossible for many children to participate in the harvesting of basic farm crops. It is not that we wish to exploit children. The contrary is true. The Mexican children from south Texas who help gather the cotton crop in west Texas, for example, accompany their parents to the cotton-producing areas and these families earn relatively large incomes during the period they participate in the cotton harvesting and are thereby enabled to greatly improve their economic condition and earn the funds which enables them to attend school after the cotton harvest is over.

In short, Mr. Chairman, I trust that the House will today approve the Poage bill and that approval may likewise be secured today or in the not too distant future of legislation required to further improve the farm-labor situation.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, yesterday—and I am sorry the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL] is not on the floor—he and I had a little colloquy over the milking of cows, and he made the assertion at that time that many Members of the House probably would not know the producing end of a cow and, before revising his remarks, inferred that I might be one of them. Now, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD], one of the leading farmers in the

State of Maryland, says he has some cows, including a Guernsey and a Holstein, and he has offered to stage a milking contest. If the gentleman from Colorado will accept this challenge, I will be glad to furnish him with convincing evidence that I do know something about the milk-producing end of a cow.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask members of the committee a few questions about this bill. I should like to know first of all how many people will be brought in from Mexico?

Mr. POAGE. That depends on when you pass the bill. We could have used probably a half-million earlier in the season, but the number will be less now.

Mr. GROSS. How many such employables are there in the Republic of Mexico.

Mr. POAGE. In the Republic of Mexico there are about 23,000,000 people. I would assume the male adult population is all employable.

Mr. GROSS. Are they all unemployed?

Mr. POAGE. No.

Mr. GROSS. How many?

Mr. POAGE. I do not know how many are employed.

Mr. GROSS. I would like to know how many Mexicans you intend to bring into the American labor market.

Mr. POAGE. We have to bring in enough to harvest the crop. It will be impossible to process that many now. You cannot process more than 7,000 a day as a physical proposition. The immigration authorities cannot process them today to exceed about 7,000 a day. The result is that the number that would come in during the season is limited by the number that can be processed. Had we been able to get this bill passed 2 or 3 months earlier, we could have processed more workers, we could have brought them in here legally, we could have processed and screened them for the work that should have been done.

Mr. GROSS. I cannot yield further for a speech. I would like to get some questions answered.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? I will answer his questions.

Mr. GROSS. I want the Committee to answer them. How many of these people are adults that you are bringing in here?

Mr. POAGE. We do not bring in anybody but male adults.

Mr. GROSS. Mexico is a member of the United Nations?

Mr. POAGE. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. How many troops has that country sent to fight in Korea?

Mr. POAGE. The gentleman will have to ask the Armed Services Committee about that. That is not under the jurisdiction of the Agricultural Committee.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman knows they have not contributed any troops?

Mr. POAGE. I do not know. You can testify to that. I thought the gentleman wanted to ask me a question?

Mr. GROSS. You are going to take the skilled labor off the farms and out

of the processing plants of this country, bring in Mexicans to do the work and draft American into the military. The gentleman knows what the draft law says, that farmers and processing workers are not deferrable if they are replaceable.

Mr. POAGE. So what?

Mr. GROSS. So I am against this bill. Let some of these Mexicans go over and do some of the fighting and dying in Korea.

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

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

Mr. McCARTHY. I do not think the gentleman should criticize too much the gentleman from Texas who, as the gentleman knows, has advocated that we have our fighting done by the Japanese and Germans. Now he wants to bring in the Mexicans to do our work, so the rest of us will not have very much to do.

Mr. GROSS. I wonder why he does not advocate that Mexicans join in the fighting? I have heard of no proposals for importing foreign doctors, bankers, lawyers, and so forth, so that Americans in these fields, who might otherwise be deferred, can be drafted into the Armed Forces.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Michigan who is also an eminent farmer in Maryland [Mr. CRAWFORD] made some sort of hypothetical statement about giving three people a house and \$40 to buy a steak, then having them leave before they have done any work. He used that then as a basis to try to show I did not know anything about farming.

I admit, Mr. Chairman, I never had that happen to me, just possibly because I am not so miserably difficult to get along with that potential employees leave before they do any work.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. McCARTHY) there were—ayes 47, noes 85.

Mr. McCARTHY. 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 62, noes 149.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BAILEY to the amendment offered by Mr. POAGE: In the last line of paragraph 2 of section 502, strike out the figure "\$20" and insert in lieu thereof the figure "\$35."

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, some question was raised as to the proposal of the gentleman from Minnesota as to a pro rata arrangement on this cost. Here we are dealing with the actual

costs of approximately \$35 each as compared to \$10 in the House bill and \$20 in the Senate bill.

I am offering this amendment primarily for the purpose of calling attention to the fact that there is some bad faith being exercised by the proponents of this legislation. I have heard several of the proponents of this legislation say that they have the approval of the Farm Bureau and the National Grange for this legislation. They have a conditional approval from the Farm Bureau and from the National Grange, and they are not carrying out their part of the agreement. I want to read the testimony. This was the testimony offered by Mr. Matt Triggs, assistant director, Washington office, American Farm Bureau Federation, before the Senate committee in the consideration of this legislation. Mr. Triggs said:

The basic policy of the American Farm Bureau Federation in this connection is that the problem is one that should be handled to the maximum feasible extent, by farmers themselves. We believe that Government's place in the picture should be primarily one of "opening doors" so that farmers and their organizations can do the job for themselves. We are opposed to any significant degree of subsidization of farm-labor recruitment and transportation by the Federal Government. * * * We are opposed to the payment by the Federal Government of any portion of the transportation of either foreign or domestic workers within the United States.

In the testimony of Mr. Fred Bailey, legislative consultant of the National Grange, the chairman said:

Would you be more specific and tell us to what extent you think the Government should share any of these costs of transportation and sustenance of labor in transit?

I quote Mr. Bailey's reply:

We believe in no subsidy whatever for the program.

I want to quote to you from the testimony before the same committee of Mr. J. C. Baird, Jr., representing the Agricultural Labor Users of the United States, Indianola, Miss.:

Mr. BAIRD. * * * We want to pay the actual expenses of it.

The CHAIRMAN. That is what is intended by this bill.

Mr. BAIRD. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Nothing but actual expenses on an average basis.

Mr. BAIRD. Yes, sir.

Mr. Baird further testified:

The group from our area generally has opposed the theory of the payment of any transportation costs by the Government, either for foreign workers—for foreign workers, because we are limiting this to a foreign labor bill. At our meeting in January with the National Farm Labor Advisory Committee, there was quite a discussion on the payment by the Government of all transportation costs over 500 miles. Up to 500 would be paid by the employer. We scaled off here on the United States map that even Dallas would qualify for a certain payment of Government expense.

Now the States who were particularly opposed to any type of subsidization are Georgia, Mississippi, Alabama, Arkansas, and Louisiana.

Yet their Representatives in Congress are here today offering to those farm people these subsidies in violation of their agreement, in violation of the wishes of the American Farm Bureau and the National Grange; yet they say the Grange and the Farm Bureau are supporting it.

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

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

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman speaks about an agreement that someone seems to have made with the American Farm Bureau and the Grange. Does the gentleman suggest that the House Committee on Agriculture or the Senate committee has entered into any agreement with anybody about the legislation we have under consideration?

Mr. BAILEY. That may be so. In reply to the gentleman from North Carolina, may I say that the names of the Farm Bureau and the Grange have been used as proponents of this legislation. I say that is a falsification and a misstatement. There is no truth in it.

Mr. COOLEY. That is quite a different thing from suggesting we had an agreement.

Let me ask a further question: The gentleman quoted from a statement in the Senate hearings. Did the Senate hearing develop any figures which the gentleman would be willing to accept with regard to the cost of transportation?

Mr. BAILEY. I am offering the exact cost, which is \$35. That is the language of my amendment.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman did not get that figure from the Senate hearings.

Mr. BAILEY. I got it from the Labor Department, from the Farm Service.

Mr. COOLEY. I still suspect that those figures include transportation from 800 miles south of the border.

Mr. BAILEY. That is the average cost, and approximately that figure will be the average cost under this bill.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to call attention to a negligence on the part of the gentleman from West Virginia in his reference to the testimony in regard to this bill. His negligence leads to statements in the well of the House that are in error.

He made reference to the statement of J. C. Baird, of Indianola, Miss.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? He has used my name. I am going to put Mr. Baird's testimony in the Record. It is taken from the Senate record.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I want to read Mr. Baird's testimony.

Mr. BAILEY. I propose to put it in the Record.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I call attention to page 87 of the hearings on this bill before the House Committee on

Agriculture. The statement begins on page 86. Mr. Baird says:

We are in favor of Mr. POAGE's bill, H. R. 3048, except for the following minor changes.

We suggest this limitation because the \$10 figure is much above the expenses normally incurred by employers.

In other words, Mr. Baird said \$10 would be all right, but \$10 was above the normal cost. As long as you are going to bring the names of people into these matters, you should at least cover their testimony fully. In other words, Mr. Baird testified that the cost of transporting these workers was normally far below \$10, but he asked that the bill be changed to provide not more than \$10 to take care of any possible foreseeable cost in the transportation.

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

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I yield.

Mr. POAGE. Is it not a fact that the Department of Labor suggested they would like to have authority to go down in southern Mexico and recruit labor way down below Oaxaca and bring them up to the United States border? Our committee took the position that it was utterly unreasonable to do that sort of thing because there are plenty of Mexicans available at the recruiting centers that the Republic of Mexico had set up.

In other words, all this amendment proposes to do is to give the Government officials the money to carry on the wildest kind of social reforms in Mexico to allow them, if they decide that it would be advantageous to Mexico, to go clear to Guanajuato, and pay the way of Mexicans all the way across the Republic, instead of using those Mexicans available who want to come into the United States somewhere near our borders.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. The primary purpose of this provision in the bill is to limit the cost to the taxpayers. In other words it would limit the amount of money that these agencies can use in carrying out the functions of this law. We would not ask for a limit if it provided any cost to the Government.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I yield.

Mr. POAGE. The purpose of this bill can be carried out and yet keep the cost within \$10, can it not?

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Of course it can, and very likely the average cost will be well below \$10.

Mr. POAGE. All this limitation does is to impose upon the Government officials the exercise of some reasonable, ordinary, common horse sense in requiring them to use some discretion, rather than to go hog-wild about it.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. This bill provides that the Government shall be reimbursed to the extent of not more than \$10. We hope that the Government officials will not spend more than \$10 in getting this labor transported.

Mr. POAGE. Of course, the Government has been moving people by airplane. Of course, if the Government proposes to move these Mexicans in here

by airplane, they can spend \$35 or \$50 per individual.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Of course.

Mr. POAGE. But if they propose to use common carrier or busses—common-carrier busses, the kind that haul ordinary people, they can bring them in for \$1 apiece.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. The gentleman is right.

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

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I yield.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I simply wanted to say that if the immigration people feel it is cheaper to move them out by airplane, it might be cheaper to move them in by airplane.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I do not care about the mode of transportation. I just wanted to make it clear that every past experience shows that the workers can come in much cheaper than \$10 and to show the statements were made contrary to the testimony given before the committee. The cost should be below \$10, and the limit should be \$10.

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

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. The \$15.65 figure that the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] used could very well be for air transportation because our information is to the effect that the bus fare from those centers ranges from 66 cents to \$1.15.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. POLK].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BAILEY) there were—ayes 26, noes 81.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. POLK].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. POLK) there were—ayes 34, noes 85.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. POLK and Mr. POAGE.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 44, noes 137.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JACKSON of Washington: On page 2, strike out lines 3 to 8, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"2. To establish and operate for such workers such reception centers in the continental United States as may be necessary to accomplish the purposes of this title."

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I am offering this amendment for two reasons. First, the State of

Washington has a need for emergency farm labor help. I may say at the outset that Oregon and Washington pay the highest farm-labor wage in the United States. We need outside of our domestic labor supply, from information I have received through the Bureau of Employment Security of the State of Washington, between five and six thousand imported foreign workers.

Second, under the terms of the bill now pending before the committee, the reception centers will be located along the Mexican border. If we are going to have legislation on this subject it ought to be on a fair and equitable basis. It should be possible for farmers throughout the United States who are short of help on the farms to get help on the same basis that the States along the border obtain them. After all, there is a subsidy in this bill and if we are going to provide assistance, it should be fair, just, and equitable to every farmer in the United States where a need exists.

At the present time under the existing bill the people along the border will be able to get farm-labor assistance. The people in the North, East, and West will have to pay an inordinate share of the cost of transporting the farm workers to their particular section or State.

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

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Does the gentleman have any idea what the cost would be if the amendment which he has offered were adopted?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I do not have an estimate, any more than the gentleman has an estimate on what his bill is going to cost.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman knows that under his amendment they could recruit two or three hundred thousand works south of the border and transport them to reception centers in the State of Washington.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. If you are going to bring labor into the United States why should not each State be entitled to get that labor on the basis of equality of cost?

Mr. COOLEY. The farmers in the State of Washington can get this Mexican labor by going to the reception centers at the Mexican border and paying the charges.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. The obvious effect of the legislation is to give an advantage to the States along the border. You do not have to study this bill 5 minutes to come to that conclusion.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman knows they are the States where the problem really exists.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. In my State of Washington, where we pay incidentally over one dollar an hour for farm help, after the exhaustion of all of our domestic farm labor we will need between five and six thousand imported laborers. Why should they not get some assistance under those circumstances?

Mr. COOLEY. Why should not your farmers pay the cost?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Why should they pay a greater share of this bill that is now before the Congress than the people along the border?

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman's amendment puts a subsidy in this bill. Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HORAN. We want equity in this, and that is all the gentleman's amendment calls for. We want fairness in the parceling out of the available excess labor, and we need them, too. We are already handicapped with high wages and high transportation costs away out in the State of Washington.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Is not this a bill to provide farm labor assistance to all 48 States if it is needed? If so, then the cost ought to be borne equitably. That is just common sense.

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

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HOLMES. In connection with the demand for this labor that we have in the Pacific Northwest, the transportation charges for some 1,500 to 2,000 miles to the Mexican border, combined with the high rate we pay for agricultural labor in the Northwest, the highest in the United States, makes the burden greater on the farmers of the Northwest and favors those close to the border of Mexico, is that not right?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. The gentleman is absolutely right.

Mr. COOLEY. The logic of the gentleman's argument is to the effect that we should have reception centers in all of the States and that such reception centers shall be exactly the same distance from every farmer's farm.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Obviously not. The reception centers should be in the same general areas where they were located during World War II. I am not asking that they be established in every State; but the gentleman has a bill now before the House that has only one obvious purpose and that is to provide preferential treatment. That is the effect of his bill. It is not spelled out in so many words but that is the effect in actual practice. It gives the farm employer located close to the Mexican border an advantage over farm employers in the North, West, and East. It hurts the employers that are paying the highest farm-labor wage.

Mr. COOLEY. Have the farmers in your State been dependent upon Mexican labor to harvest their crops?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Yes; they have.

Mr. COOLEY. How have they arranged for the transportation cost up there?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. During the war they had a reception center not far away. As I recall, I believe it was Portland, Oreg., and they paid the transportation cost from that point.

Mr. COOLEY. And they were not Mexican citizens altogether. They recruited them from many States and paid the transportation cost.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. That may be true to a certain extent, but we had a large amount of Mexican help.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the House will vote for this amendment.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to call attention to the fact that if this amendment was to have been offered it should have been offered before we settled the question of cost in this bill. The \$10 limitation or the \$20 limitation or a \$30 or \$40 limitation probably will not take care of the expense if you are going to establish centers in the places proposed by this amendment. I suggest that if we adopt this amendment we should reconsider the question of the application of these costs, otherwise there is going to be a big farmer subsidy in this bill.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, in the event this amendment is adopted, I will offer an amendment to take care of the additional cost that would be involved.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, may I point out that a great deal more is involved in this amendment than the question of whether or not the Government is going to pay the transportation of some Mexican workers to the Pacific Northwest. I can understand and I can sympathize with the problem that confronts the people of that section of the country, because they do face a most difficult problem. They are a long way from the source of labor. However, I think if you will but reflect a moment you will realize that if you were to adopt this amendment and establish the principle that we were going to undertake to pay the transportation of foreign workers within the United States, that you could not escape the logic of the argument that you should then extend that same principle to domestic workers who wanted to go from one State of the Union to another.

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

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

Mr. COOLEY. Was not that very thing discussed fully in our committee?

Mr. POAGE. It was. It was discussed at great length in our committee room, and everybody agreed, the opponents and the proponents, who came before our committee. I think it is fair to say that most had to agree that they could not, with one side of the mouth, ask that we guarantee the transportation cost of Mexican workers across the continent, and with the other side of the mouth say that if a man from Arkansas wanted to go out to California to work that we would not guarantee his transportation.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I will say to the gentleman, if there is a finding that there is no domestic labor now available, then it is certainly proper to call on outside assistance. If the gentleman wants to be logical about this, then I would say that he should not ask for any kind of subsidy. You have subsidy from inside of Mexico to the border.

Mr. POAGE. We have discussed that matter of an alleged subsidy, and this House has found by its vote that there was no subsidy involved in this bill, and that is a correct finding. I do not propose to go back into that question. This bill is very plain. It does not pay a subsidy to anybody at the present time.

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

Mr. POAGE. I yield for a question.

Mr. BAILEY. The gentleman is setting aside the provisions of the Internal Revenue Act—

Mr. POAGE. I yielded for a question and not for a speech.

Mr. BAILEY. Are those not subsidies?

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I yielded for a question and the gentleman did not see fit to ask a question.

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

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Are not the cotton farmers of southeastern Missouri about as far from the labor supply as the Pacific Northwest is?

Mr. POAGE. Almost as far, but not quite.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I suggest the gentleman look at the map.

Mr. POAGE. It is about 1,100 miles to the Pacific Northwest, and about 900 miles to southeastern Arkansas. There is about a 200-mile difference. I do not have any quarrel with the people of the Pacific Northwest or the cotton farmers of Arkansas. They are both fine folks, but I do not believe in the proposition of having the Government guarantee the transportation of everybody who wants to ride all over this country. We had an experience of that kind during the war. When a man from Arkansas decided he wanted to take a job in California. All he had to do was to go out there, and they paid his food on the way, and then when he decided he did not like to work, they paid his way back.

Now, there is a considerable group of people in the United States who believe in that sort of philosophy. I do not believe in it. I do not believe in the Government's assuming obligations to provide transportation for everybody who wants to ride all over this country, and that is what we will inevitably come to if we pass this amendment.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by my colleague from Washington, and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I think all we are trying to do here is be fair to every American. I take the floor today to appeal to you that the bill as it now stands is not fair to the Pacific Northwest. I know this Committee wants to be fair. I hope the amendment is accepted. Some of the rough spots in this bill are going to be worked out in conference. So I hope an effort is made to be fair to the people of the remoter parts of the United States who need farm labor and who are going to be quite a distance from these reception centers. The amendment is sufficiently wide, I think, to permit adoption by the Committee and perhaps modification in conference.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman's arguments, of course, would also apply as far as Minnesota is concerned. What I should like to know from my colleague on the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations is, how many additional millions of dollars will this amendment add to this bill?

Mr. HORAN. I do not think you are going to have a bill like this and feel you will not have it cost something. When we went to war with Korea and put our available migrant labor to work in the defense plants, we found we had crops to harvest and we had to get help from someplace. Last year at the hearings of this committee, and I want to give the committee full credit, for I attended some of those hearings, the United States Employment Service said, "you do not need a farm labor bill, we can supply the needs." During the summer I contacted the State officials in the State of Washington and they said, "We can take care of the situation." But when it came time to harvest our apple crop, the Governor of the State of Washington had to call on General Wedemeyer and he gave extended furloughs to the Army. They came in and helped us get our apple crop in.

We are in dire need of help now. I say I want you to be fair with us, because we have high freight rates. They have gone up 67 percent since the end of World War II. We in the State of Washington in order to attract farm labor have upped our hourly pay to an average of \$1.01. That is the average as of April 1 of this year. We do that to attract workers, but we still cannot attract enough of them.

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

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

Mr. COOLEY. I want to compliment the gentleman on his interest in this matter. I recall that he came to the committee and discussed the matter very thoroughly and earnestly. While I sympathize with the fact that labor is needed in the gentlemen's section of the country, I think the gentleman will agree with me that if this amendment is adopted it could very reasonably involve a cost running into the millions of dollars to the Government, unknown millions.

Mr. HORAN. I think this bill is going to cost the Government millions of dollars. We do not want to kid ourselves.

Mr. COOLEY. Further, we would then be faced with paying Mexicans' transportation across the country and refusing the same consideration to our own people.

Mr. HORAN. No, we are going to recruit Mexican nationals under a contract. They have no similarity to the domestic people, who have the freedom of the United States.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman knows that when he was in our committee room there were those there who advocated that we pay the cost of the laboring men working on the farms.

Mr. HORAN. No, we are merely asking you to be fair to us.

Mr. COOLEY. I know the gentleman did not ask us to pay for domestic labor transportation, but others did.

Mr. HORAN. I am only talking now in support of this amendment. I do not want to be dragged off the trail.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. It is true that the bill does provide for the Federal Government to pay the cost of transportation from Mexico to the reception centers in the United States.

Mr. HORAN. That is right.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. So if the gentleman from North Carolina wants to be logical and consistent, then that transportation ought to be borne and all the costs of the bill ought to be borne by the farmers.

Mr. HORAN. When we argue economy and turn down justice to all of the people, and we are going to need Mexican laborers, we are adding just one more straw of inequity on the backs of the farmers I represent. It can ruin them.

Mr. COOLEY. Have not the gentleman's farmers been using Mexican labor in the past?

Mr. HORAN. We used Mexican labor during World War II and it turned out very well.

Mr. COOLEY. Who paid the bill?

Mr. HORAN. The Government paid the bill to the reception center, and our farmers paid part of the transportation from a point equidistant.

Mr. COOLEY. They had these farm workers working on a city street, Columbia Avenue, in Portland. They had been transferred from 800 miles south of the border, and the Government was paying the entire cost, medical care, child care, and so forth. That is the reason the figure went up to \$200 or \$300.

Mr. HORAN. You are in charge of this bill. You are writing this bill. I am not asking you to do those things. But we do want you to consider an equitable amendment here so that the farmers can be treated right. You are going to write this bill in conference. Do not tell me what happened in the past. I do not agree with that, either. It is your responsibility to be fair with us.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Whose money established the reception centers in Texas and California?

Mr. HORAN. That is Government money.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to take a minute to state that it is my opinion that this amendment will cost the Government a good many additional millions of dollars. There is no telling how many millions. I think the acceptance of such an amendment will result unfortunately in killing the bill itself on final roll call.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. If the gentleman followed my amendment, of course, he would see that it simply requires reception centers to be located equitably throughout the United States. It would apply to the States of Minnesota and Maine, as well as the State of Washington.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Has the gentleman any idea whatever as to what his amendment would cost?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I do not.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. That is one good reason why the amendment should be defeated.

Mr. STAGGERS. I represent a great farming section in West Virginia, the main farming section of my State, and I agree with my colleague, the gentleman from Washington. If we are going to be fair to the people of the United States, we should be fair to all the farmers of the different States. We have an apple-growing section in my district in which all of the orchardists are raising heck because they cannot get apple pickers.

The sons of these farmers and orchardists have been called into the armed services and now they cannot get help. Down below our border, Mexico, a member of the UN, has not sent one soldier to the Korean front. Yet they have hundreds of thousands of workers who are idle and should be put into the service to fight for liberty and freedom for mankind, but they choose to let them come into this country to take the jobs of these American boys who are fighting for their welfare.

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

Mr. STAGGERS. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman has put his finger exactly on the thing that ought to be emphasized here—that Mexico has not contributed a single ounce to the fighting and dying in Korea while we are putting our American boys on the auction block in this deal.

I thought we had ended auction blocks with the Civil War.

Mr. STAGGERS. That is true.

I just want to say that to be fair—we are not going to write a fair bill on the

floor of the House—no—but the members of this committee can be fair when they go to conference table in seeing that there is some equity given. I am saying this ought to be considered. That if cheap labor is made available to one section of the nation it should be made available to all sections. In the first place, I do not believe in any foreign labor being brought into this country. It has a demoralizing effect upon our own people. Let them take out citizenship papers, if they wish to come to the United States.

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

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

Mr. COOLEY. We did consider it very carefully, and the members of the committee considered it very carefully. We considered it was not feasible.

Mr. STAGGERS. It may not be feasible. I have heard the word "sympathy" used here. Each member of the committee said they sympathized, and so forth. Sympathy does not do anything for the people. The Congress is here to enact laws equitably for every citizen of the United States and not for one section, and you cannot answer that argument in any other way.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman said that we should consider it, and I say we have considered it.

Mr. STAGGERS. That is all right—your responsibility as a Congressman is to consider, not your section or anyone else's section, but every section in the United States.

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

Mr. STAGGERS. I yield.

Mr. BAILEY. Do you not think that we ought to have equality under the revenue laws and under the social security laws when certain groups get certain benefits and everybody else takes it on the nose?

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I said I was not going to take the full 5 minutes, but I suggest that we should consider the boys who are in the service right now and who are doing the fighting for this country before we bring in outsiders to do our work. Do you want to bring them in? If so let us bring them in as nationals. Let them become citizens of the United States. Do they not want citizenship in the United States? What is the trouble? You have been talking about costs. It is a matter of principle. There is not a man in the Committee of the Whole here who can say it is a matter of cost. It is a matter of principle.

I think when we search our own consciences we will find that it is not a matter of cost with any individual because the citizens of my section of the country and the citizens of the United States are going to pay for this and they will have to bear the burden whatever the end results might be.

If we must bring them in, let us make their services available to all the farmers of the Nation. Let us do away with sectionalism.

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, after sitting through this debate on the Poage farm labor importation bill I want to say that I am extremely happy with the broad discussion which has been allowed and which has prevailed up to this point. I want to take occasion to thank the very able and affable gentleman from North Carolina for allowing the debate to be on such a broad basis today.

I do not come from a farming section. I come from San Francisco, which is strictly a city area. Possibly someone will ask, if I am not from a farm, or do not live in a cotton-growing or melon-growing area, such as are in my home State of California, why should I interest myself in this legislation? My answer would be that I have an interest in this legislation because I do not subscribe to the idea that we are elected to the Congress of the United States only to take an interest in legislation which affects our districts, or with which we may have some personal connection. In addition to that I have an interest in human beings, and I have seen with my own eyes some of the human problems which have developed as a result of the wetback situation in the State of California.

Before I touch on that, may I say that contrary to the impression held by some of the Members here, there is no concerted desire, no move to block enactment of proper legislation on this subject. In fact, there is a real recognition of the problem faced by the agricultural industry in this country at the present time—a knowledge of the fact that there is a shortage of labor because of the emergency in which the country is involved. I do not want to use the word "sympathy," so I will say an "understanding"—an understanding of the fact that a shortage of labor could mean a shortage of food to the Nation and its fighting forces and to other nations throughout the world who depend upon us for our help, assistance, and, at times, generosity. I know of no opposition to finding an acceptable and fair solution to that problem—one that will be fair to both the farmer and the farm laborer, and also to whatever imported labor it may develop is necessary to bring in.

Mr. Chairman, it had been my very sincere hope that the Polk substitute amendment, the Senate bill, would be adopted by the House as a substitute for the Poage bill. That bill had certain restrictions set up in it which make it far more acceptable, far more practical, to those who completely understand this problem—to the fair-minded farmer, to those from the field of labor, from business, from big cities, and particularly to myself—than the Poage bill which seems to be championed by those who come from the Southwest and from my own State, and who have displayed on the floor that their primary concern is with the limited interests involved in their own particular problem.

To substantiate my statement that we who are in opposition to the Poage bill

are not opposing the idea of bringing labor in when necessary, to substantiate my statement that we are aware of the problem, let us go back over some history. This wetback and Mexican labor problem is not new; it has been with us for many years, since long before World War II. Because of the fact that in World War II our young men moved to the service, the factories, and the metropolitan areas, a shortage of agricultural labor developed and the proposal was made that we set up machinery for bringing in groups of agricultural workers from the neighboring Republic of Mexico to help solve the problem. Representatives of the workers of this country, representatives of the Government, the State Department and the Labor Department and the Immigration Service, and representatives of the growers' associations sat together with members of like organizations of Mexico, and a program was worked up and the people were brought in.

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

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHELLEY. A great many of those people came into the States, and the agricultural labor problem of the country was to a great extent solved. There was no objection at the time to what was recognized as a wartime and emergency necessity. However, as a result of that program, and since that program was first developed, certain weaknesses have developed and certain objections have been recognized, which we feel should be corrected before authorizing any extension or continuation of it. The Ellender bill, as passed by the Senate, would have taken care of some of those weaknesses. I had hoped to see it perfected in the House with further amendments. Our only chance now to correct those weaknesses in the program, and to protect the interests of our own farm labor, our other labor groups who have been hurt by the infiltration of Mexican workers, and the country itself which is presented with a terrific social problem, is to adopt some of the perfecting amendments to the Poage bill which we are now considering.

A great many of those Mexicans who were brought in and are being brought in at the present time never return to their own country, and they have been a recurring problem not only in certain agricultural areas, but in industrial areas as well—not only in the border States, but in other States throughout the country ever since. The Poage bill eliminates the bonding requirement formerly required of employers of Mexican contract labor to insure their return to Mexico. That elimination promises to cause a multiplication of the problems connected with the Mexicans who remain in this country illegally, and it should be reinstated.

Even greater than the difficulties caused by the contract nationals who remain here are those resulting from the hordes of wetbacks, illegal Mexican entrants who stream across the borders. The problems which they bring with them have increased tremendously. The press and magazines of this country have brought the disgraceful conditions in the Southwest to everyone's attention. The President's Commission on Migratory Labor called for a correction of the conditions. The wetbacks move from agricultural areas into the metropolitan areas, not only in the four States along the Mexican border but in many States much farther north. They have created new impacts, new sociological situations, in the metropolitan sections of many States. Yet the Poage bill actually legalizes the presence of these people, for it states "Those who are temporarily here" in talking of contracting for their employment, without specifying how they may have come here. It is an open invitation of more thousands of them to pour into the country. Without the amendment to the Poage bill which the Senate included in their bill, imposing strict penalties for the employment of wetbacks, and without the amendment restricting contracting of Mexicans to those who have legally entered the United States, I cannot in good conscience vote for this measure. To do so would be to accept part of the blame for the deliberate violations of our immigration laws which are now encouraged, and to accept part of the guilt for the shameful peonage under which these Mexican workers exist.

There is abundant evidence that Mexican contract workers have been brought into this country when there is no real need for them. The Poage bill places the responsibility for certifying that a need exists on the Regional Director of the Bureau of Employment Security rather than on the Secretary of Labor, as provided in the bill passed by the Senate. Proof has been given on the floor of the House during this debate that Mexicans have been contracted for when there is a large number of unemployed Americans looking for work in the same area. To avoid that condition the determination that there is no American labor available should be made on some uniform national basis. There is no question in my mind but that the Bureau of Employment Security local officials have not done a good job of canvassing all possible sources of labor before certifying to a shortage, and for that reason I am firmly convinced that the responsibility should be given to the Secretary of Labor. Continuance of the present system will just insure that our local domestic labor will continue to be done out of jobs in favor of imported Mexican citizens. I believe that the Poage bill should be tightened up so that will no longer be possible. There is no reason why our own people should be on the welfare rolls while we are bringing in others to take their jobs. And in this respect I refer particularly to the plight of American citizens of Mexican descent

who are now finding themselves displaced and unemployed by Mexican nationals and wetbacks who are working cheaper. Under the terms of the Poage bill the use of imported Mexican labor is not restricted only to our farms. Under the definition of agricultural employment which it now contains, Mexican nationals can be imported to work in our canneries and packing houses anywhere in the country. That certainly is not the type of "stoop labor" which Americans will supposedly not do. It will inevitably lead to a lowering of wage standards for which American workingmen have had to fight so strongly. Without a strict limitation of the type of work which these people may be imported to do, I certainly cannot vote for passage of this bill. It would be directly contrary to everything for which I have fought during my whole adult life—the protection of the American workingman and the improvement rather than the destruction of the American standard of living.

Another factor in the practically unlimited use of Mexican labor which has developed as a result of the present system of importation and use of Mexicans, legally or illegally, is the terrific downward pressure on wages and piece rates paid to farm workers. The prevailing wage to be paid the Mexican worker or offered to the native farm laborer is set by the growers themselves, usually acting through their associations. The Poage bill provides nothing to alter that system. It leaves the way clear for continued payment of near-starvation wages to farm workers who must accept what is offered, or get no job at all, since if the American worker does not take what the farmer chooses to pay it can then be certified that domestic labor is not available, and Mexican nationals can be contracted for. Without a formula for impartial determination of what the prevailing wage should be, the Poage bill is only a device for holding wages down and is not acceptable to me or the great majority of right-thinking people who are more concerned about the welfare of the American wage earner than they are about the profits which the large corporation farmers of this country squeeze out.

Mr. Chairman, my time is running short. The faults which I have cited in the Poage bill are not all, by any means. The amendment now under consideration would help remove this bill from the class of legislation intended for the benefit of a limited few. The Poage bill, as a whole, will throw the doors wide open, and in voting against the amendment presently under consideration you will be definitely establishing it as sectional legislation which plays into the hands of those border States which are close to the centers along the Mexican border.

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

Mr. SHELLEY. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. How can the gentleman say that the Poage bill throws the doors wide open? The gentleman must know, if he knows anything about it at

all, that these people come here under contracts, and this bill in no way affects the Mexican border.

Mr. SHELLEY. Because the labor coming in at the present time comes in under an agreement between the Republic of Mexico and the Government of the United States, which expires on June 30, and because the Government of Mexico has said it will refuse to continue that contract or that agreement between the two countries unless this Congress adopts legislation which will protect their nationals coming in here and which will bring an end to exploitation of these human beings of Mexican nationality who, the RECORD shows, are being exploited by some of the large farm operators. I say to you that the Poage bill makes no contribution to that end.

Mr. COOLEY. Does not the gentleman think that the Mexican Government was right in insisting upon American farmers not exploiting the laborers of Mexico?

Mr. SHELLEY. I most assuredly do.

Mr. COOLEY. Does not the gentleman think Mexico was right in insisting that their nationals be protected in this country? That is what we are trying to do.

Mr. SHELLEY. That is the responsibility of the Mexican Government. However, I am sorry, although that may be the gentleman's version of what he is trying to do, it is not my version of what the Poage bill will accomplish. I maintain that the Poage bill does not set up standards which will permit that to happen.

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

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JACKSON].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JACKSON of Washington) there were—ayes 47, noes 97.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CELLER: Add a new section:

"Sec. 512. Notwithstanding any other provision of law to the contrary and without regard to section 3709 of the revised statutes, the Attorney General is authorized to purchase, construct, lease, equip, operate, and maintain on either Government-leased or Government-owned land such detention facilities as may be necessary for the apprehension and removal to Mexico of Mexican aliens illegally in the United States. Appropriations made to the Immigration and Naturalization Service shall be available for expenditures to carry out the purposes of this act."

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I wish to read briefly a statement submitted to me by the Bureau of Immigration and Naturalization. That language of the amendment is not mine. It is language

submitted by the Bureau of Immigration and Naturalization. Accompanying the suggested amendment, they wrote to me as follows:

There is an urgent and immediate need by the Immigration and Naturalization Service for a detention camp at Brownsville, Tex., for the assembling and processing for removal to Mexico of Mexican aliens who have entered the United States illegally. Hundreds of these illegal entrants are being apprehended by the border patrol daily, and the Immigration and Naturalization Service anticipates that beginning in July illegal entries in the Lower Rio Grande Valley area will increase by tens of thousands. As the Service does not have an adequate detention facility, it can neither properly carry out its duty under the immigration laws nor give effect to the requirement of the international agreement with Mexico that Mexican nationals who are in the United States illegally be apprehended and removed to Mexico.

Additional detention facilities are also required for the same purposes in the State of California.

In a word, all this does is to allow the Immigration Service to erect detention camps at various important places along the border so as to facilitate the removal of all those aliens who came in illegally and that they are able to detect. It does no more than that, and I do hope that those who are interested in this bill will not object to the amendment.

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

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HOPE. Can the gentleman give us any figures as to the cost of these detention buildings?

Mr. CELLER. I have no exact figures as to cost. The Immigration and Naturalization Service said that the cost would be inconsequential, that the camps that would be built could be cheaply constructed, and that the cost would be out of appropriations usually allotted to the Immigration and Naturalization Service. It may be that there would be no additional cost beyond the appropriations usually granted to the Immigration and Naturalization Service, but they were quite certain in their statement to me that the cost would not be of considerable consequence.

Mr. HOPE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CELLER. The debate on this bill has at times been rather acrimonious. Apparently the proponents seemed to resent opposition. Some of the advocates of the bill seemed to lack adequate answers to some of the views in opposition, and they adopted the policy, "If you cannot find adequate answer, stoop to abusing personally the opponent." I resent some of the abuse addressed to me. However, those attacks were like one spitting in the wind. Those who thus attacked merely bespattered themselves.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I renew my point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman please state the grounds of his point of order?

Mr. COOLEY. First, that it broadens the scope of the legislation under consideration. It is not germane, and it actually constitutes an appropriation. In the last sentence of the amendment we find this language:

Appropriations made to the Immigration and Naturalization Service shall be available for expenditures to carry out the purposes of this act.

Now that certainly would be broadening the powers of former appropriation bills and would confer upon the Attorney General the right to actually acquire property and to build buildings and to maintain and operate such buildings either on land owned by the Government or on land leased by the Government.

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

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

Mr. CELLER. I would be perfectly willing to strike out any reference to appropriations. Would the gentleman then agree to the amendment?

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, if I may be heard another minute, I think that this particular amendment would appropriately come before the Committee on the Judiciary. I do not think that under any stretch of the imagination it could be referred to the Committee on Agriculture. It is foreign entirely to the matters which come within the jurisdiction of our committee, and I think it is a matter which the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary could well afford to consider in his own committee. Actually, I have no real objections to what the Attorney General proposes to do or what this amendment proposes to do, but I do object to accepting an amendment or having an amendment adopted here which actually is not germane to the matter under consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York desire to be heard further on the point of order?

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, this bill affects aliens who come in from Mexico, and the purpose of the amendment is to erect stockades or detention camps that would facilitate the operation of the Immigration and Naturalization Service in sending back aliens who are in the country illegally. I believe that the amendment, since it facilitates the activity of the Immigration and Naturalization Service in their operations concerning these aliens—and this bill concerns these alien foreign laborers—is eminently sound and proper and comes within the four squares of the aims of the purposes of the bill in question.

I offered the amendment at the suggestion of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, and I understood that the gentlemen on the Committee on Agriculture were going to accept it. I would be perfectly willing to strike out all verbiage and language that has to do with appropriations, but other than that I think the amendment is in order.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the following language be deleted from my amendment:

Appropriations made to the Immigration and Naturalization Service shall be available for expenditures to carry out the purposes of this act.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object: As I said a moment ago, I personally have no objection to the amendment. However, I do not think it is appropriate for it to be attached to the bill under consideration, and therefore I must object.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

The gentleman from New York offers an amendment to the bill before the committee and the gentleman from North Carolina makes the point of order against the amendment on the ground that it is not germane and that it contains an appropriation.

The Chair has had an opportunity to study the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York. As the Chair understands the bill before the committee, H. R. 3283, it applies to certain Mexican aliens as a class and as described in the bill. The amendment offered by the gentleman from New York broadens the group to include Mexican aliens illegally in the United States, beyond the class described in the bill. The amendment also proposes to appropriate funds for a certain purpose described in the amendment.

For these two reasons, the Chair is constrained to sustain the point of order.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROGERS of Texas: Add a new section to be numbered 511 and to read as follows:

"For the purpose of further assisting in such production of agricultural commodities and products as the Secretary of Labor deems necessary, and notwithstanding any of the provisions of this act or the provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, the Secretary of Labor is empowered to authorize and shall authorize the employment in agriculture of employees under the age of 16 years, while such employees are not legally required to attend school."

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment, but will reserve it so the gentleman may present his amendment.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I want to urge the adoption of the Poage bill, as it is legislation that will be of great help to the farmers of this Nation. The amendment that I offer at this time is offered as a further aid to the farmers and an aid to migrant workers of this country, and for the purpose of correcting an injustice that is now present in existing laws. This injustice that I refer to was brought about by a Senate amendment to the Fair Labor Standards Act in 1949. The wording of the amendment operated to prevent and prohibit the employment of the

children of these migrant workers. The result is that the migrant workers who are following the harvest in order to earn a living cannot use their children to assist them. In many cases these workers have large families, that is 9, 10, or 12 children. All of these children who are under 16 years of age cannot work in the harvest if school is in session in the district in which they desire to work. This creates a situation where the children of these migrant workers must be left to roam the streets or find something to do while their parents are working in the field. The law does not require them to attend school in those districts but prohibits them from working in those districts while school is in session. My amendment merely provides in effect that these children may work so long as they are not legally required to attend school. It does not in any manner permit anyone to engage in unfair child-labor practices nor condone sweatshop tactics. I would not under any circumstances acquiesce in unfair child-labor practices nor in existence of sweatshops. This amendment does not allow a child to do any work that he is not allowed to do under the present law. It merely clarifies ambiguous and misleading language now existing in the law that has created a serious problem and will continue to do so. The migrant worker with a large family who is not allowed to use his family while work is available is forced to appeal to the relief boards in order to provide a living for his family while he is working and following the harvest. This has resulted in a serious social problem, and unless this law is corrected it will operate to contribute to child delinquency and in many cases to crime. The reason that many of you are not familiar with the problems of which I speak is because the enforcement of this law began only last year, and the full force of its bad effects will not be felt until the harvest season of this year.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I yield.

Mr. MAHON. I want to thank the gentleman from Texas and commend him for offering his amendment. It has been my pleasure to collaborate with him in drafting the amendment and in seeking support for it. I wish to urge that no point of order be made against it.

Is it not true that the amendment offered by the gentleman should be incorporated in this bill and, if it is held to be subject to a point of order, should it not be incorporated in a separate bill? With the farm-labor situation as it is, we need not only the Poage bill as written but a provision in some form which would meet the situation described by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Rogers].

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. That is exactly right. The reason this amendment is offered now is that we are fast approaching the harvest season. People in the farming districts all over this country are going to feel the pressure of this matter this year more than they have ever felt it before. I urge the

adoption of this amendment. Let us put it in this bill, so that the farmer can be helped in harvesting crops and in producing the agricultural products we so badly need.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. FISHER. The amendment offered by the gentleman is absolutely sound, whether it meets the parliamentary situation or not. The gentleman has a bill pending, and so do I and the gentleman who just spoke, Mr. MAHON, before the Committee on Education and Labor now on the same subject. As it now stands, a terrible injustice is being heaped upon the migrant laborers themselves, because they are not permitted to pursue their normal livelihood and accumulate money to buy food and clothing and so forth during the school year which follows immediately after the harvest.

The gentleman is to be commended on bringing this up and for presenting the reasons for it. I am hopeful that we will have a hearing, if the amendment is not placed in the bill, and that legislation correcting this injustice can be brought in soon.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I thank the gentleman.

There is one particular situation I have in mind, and I can bring you isolated cases by the dozen. A boy finished high school when he was 15 years old. Because he was under 16 he could not work in agriculture under the present law.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SHELLEY. Does not the bill before us only contemplate the bringing in of male adult workers?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. That is exactly true, but the people I am trying to help are not the children of the aliens but the children of the people that live in this country and have to make a living by following the harvest.

Mr. SHELLEY. So in addition to bringing in these Mexicans under a wide open thing we want to take the American migrant workers and destroy all our child-labor standards as applied to them.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. You are not destroying any child-labor standards. If the gentleman knew anything about the Fair Labor Standards Act, he would know that statement was not true.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. As I understand the amendment, it does not interfere with any of the children attending school during the school term?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. That is exactly right.

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

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentle-

man may proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] renew his point of order at this time?

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I will withhold my point of order further.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Here is what happened: Under the previous provisions of section, I believe, 13 (c), of the Fair Labor Standards Act, there was a provision that children could work in agriculture. It was not in those exact words, but it was to the effect that they could work in agriculture so long as they were not legally required to attend school. That was amended in 1949 by a Senate amendment, and the language was changed at the insistence of the Secretary of Labor. It read this way, that those children could not work in agriculture so long as school was in session in the district in which the employee was living at the time of the employment.

So the result is that you are not creating a new pool of child labor. The children are allowed to labor right now under those exemptions, but you are prohibiting a child who is legally out of school in one district to work and help in another district where school is in session.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The gentleman represents one of the great districts of Texas, does he not?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. That is right.

Mr. CRAWFORD. A district where the children of families in that district attend universities and are college graduates and live on the ranches and on the wheat farms and grow cattle, and all of them, I would venture to say, in all of the families which the gentleman represents, who live on the farms, the children start work at anywhere from 5 to 7 years of age and work right on through? Is that not true?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Yes, sir. I did when I was that age. The situation under the present law is that a man who owns a farm and has four or five children can keep his own children out of school to harvest his own crop, but a man who is not fortunate enough to own land himself—

Mr. CRAWFORD. But who works in agriculture.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. That is right—he cannot keep his own children out to work another man's harvest.

Mr. CRAWFORD. It is a case of destroying the child and destroying his future to live within the concepts of some crazy law that Congress has passed.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. That is right. In many instances it seems to be the order of the day to use every available means to teach a child how not to work and to pass laws making it a penal offense for anyone to show a child how to work. This is not the kind of principle upon which this country was founded and it is not the kind of practice upon which this country will endure.

I want to express my deep appreciation to my distinguished colleagues from Texas, Mr. GEORGE MAHON, Mr. CLARK FISHER, and Mr. OMAR BURLESON, for their untiring efforts in seeking relief from the injustices of the present law, and I am sure that they join with me in the observation that our efforts will continue to remedy this situation should the point of order be sustained and this amendment not be made a part of this act. The outstanding work of these gentlemen toward a solution of this problem is well recognized by all the Members of this House.

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

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I renew the point of order.

The amendment is obviously not in order, since the author of the amendment clearly indicates it is an effort to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act, which is not before the House at this time at all.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be heard on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I do not care to be heard further on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be glad to hear the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that there is an amendment to the Fair Labor Standards Act already in the bill, and it would seem to me another amendment to the same effect would not constitute a serious obstacle.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. MILLS). The Chair is ready to rule.

The gentleman from Texas offers an amendment to which the gentleman from North Carolina makes a point of order on the ground that it is not germane to the bill before the committee.

The bill H. R. 3283 refers to a certain class of Mexican nationals, as described in the bill. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas does not relate to this group described in the bill, but to an entirely different group of individuals—American citizens and residents of the United States. The amendment therefore is beyond the purview of the bill H. R. 3283, and the Chair sustains the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. GORE). If there are no further amendments under the rule, the Committee rises.

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, pursuant to House Resolution 257, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. GROSS. Unqualifiedly.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies.

The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. GROSS moves to recommit the bill H. R. 3283 to the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 240; nays 139; answered "present" 1; not voting 52; as follows:

[Roll No. 90]

YEAS—240

Aandahl	Church	Grant
Abbitt	Cole, Kans.	Gregory
Abernethy	Cole, N. Y.	Gwinn
Albert	Colmer	Hagen
Allen, Calif.	Combs	Hale
Andersen,	Cooley	Halleck
H. Carl	Cooper	Hand
Anderson, Calif.	Cotton	Harden
Andersen,	Cox	Hardy
August H.	Crawford	Harris
Andrews	Crumpacker	Harrison, Va.
Arends	Cunningham	Harrison, Wyo.
Armstrong	Curtis, Mo.	Harvey
Ayres	Curtis, Nebr.	Hays, Ark.
Barden	Dague	Hébert
Bates, Mass.	Davis, Ga.	Herlong
Battle	Davis, Tenn.	Hill
Beamer	Davis, Wis.	Hillings
Beckworth	Deane	Hinshaw
Belcher	DeGraffenried	Hoeven
Bennett, Fla.	Dempsey	Hoffman, Ill.
Bentsen	Denny	Hoffman, Mich.
Berry	Devereux	Holmes
Betts	D'Ewart	Hope
Blackney	Dolliver	Horan
Boggs, Del.	Dondero	Hunter
Bolton	Dorn	Jackson, Calif.
Bonner	Doughton	Jackson, Wash.
Bosone	Eaton	James
Boykin	Ellsworth	Jenison
Bramblett	Engle	Jensen
Brooks	Fellows	Johnson
Brown, Ga.	Fernandez	Jones, Mo.
Brown, Ohio	Fisher	Jones,
Brownson	Ford	Hamilton C.
Bryson	Forrester	Jones,
Budge	Frazier	Woodrow W.
Buffett	Fugate	Judd
Burdick	Fulton	Keogh
Burleson	Gamble	Kerr
Burton	Gary	Kilburn
Bush	Gathings	Lanham
Butler	Gavin	Lantaff
Burns, Wis.	George	Love
Camp	Gore	Lucas
Chelf	Gossett	Lyle
Chenoweth	Graham	McConnell
Chipperfield	Granger	McCulloch

McDonough
McGregor
McKinnon
McMullen
McVey
Mack, Wash.
Magee
Mahon
Mansfield
Martin, Iowa
Martin, Mass.
Meader
Miller, Md.
Miller, Nebr.
Miller, N. Y.
Mills
Mitchell
Morano
Morris
Morrison
Morton
Moulder
Mumma
Murdock
Murray, Tenn.
Nelson
Nicholson
Norblad
O'Hara
Ostertag
Passman
Patman
Patten
Phillips

Addonizio
Angell
Aspinall
Bailey
Baker
Bakewell
Baring
Barrett
Bates, Ky.
Beall
Bender
Bennett, Mich.
Bishop
Blatnik
Bolling
Bow
Brahm
Burnside
Byrne, N. Y.
Canfield
Cannon
Case
Celler
Chudoff
Clemente
Clevenger
Corbett
Coudert
Crosser
Delaney
Denton
Dollinger
Donohue
Donovan
Doyle
Eberhart
Elston
Fallon
Feighan
Fenton
Fine
Fogarty
Forand
Furcolo
Garmatz
Golden

Pickett
Poage
Potter
Poulson
Priest
Radwan
Rains
Reed, Ill.
Reed, N. Y.
Rees, Kans.
Regan
Richards
Riehlman
Riley
Rivers
Roberts
Robeson
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Mass.
Rogers, Tex.
Sadlak
St. George
Schwabe
Scrivner
Scudder
Seely-Brown
Shafer
Sheppard
Short
Sikes
Simpson, Ill.
Smith, Miss.
Smith, Wis.
Springer

NAYS—139

Goodwin
Granhagan
Green
Greenwood
Gross
Hart
Havener
Hays, Ohio
Hedrick
Heffernan
Heller
Herter
Heselton
Hess
Holfield
Howell
Hull
Jarman
Javits
Jenkins
Jonas
Karsten, Mo.
Kean
Kearney
Kearns
Keating
Kelly, N. Y.
Kennedy
King
Kirwan
Klein
Kluczynski
Lane
Latham
Lesinski
Lind
McCarthy
McGrath
McGuire
Machrowicz
Mack, Ill.
Madden
Marshall
Mason
Miller, Calif.
Morgan
Multer

Stanley
Steed
Stefan
Stigler
Stockman
Taber
Tackett
Talle
Teague
Thompson,
 Mich.
Thompson, Tex.
Thornberry
Towe
Vail
Van Pelt
Van Zandt
Vaughn
Vinson
Vursell
Walter
Watts
Wharton
Wheeler
Whitaker
Wickersham
Williams, Miss.
Willis
Wilson, Tex.
Winstead
Wolcott
Wood, Ga.
Wood, Idaho

O'Brien, Ill.
O'Neill
O'Toole
Patterson
Perkins
Philbin
Polk
Price
Prouty
Quinn
Rabaut
Ramsay
Rankin
Reece, Tenn.
Rhodes
Ribicoff
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rooney
Roosevelt
Sabath
Sasser
Saylor
Scott,
 Hugh D., Jr.
Secret
Sheehan
Shelley
Sleminski
Sittler
Spence
Staggers
Taylor
Tollefson
Welch
Welch
Widnall
Wier
Wigglesworth
Williams, N. Y.
Wilson, Ind.
Withrow
Wolverton
Yates
Yorty
Zablocki

Preston
Reams
Redden
Scott, Hardie
Simpson, Pa.

Smith, Kans.
Smith, Va.
Sutton
Thomas
Trimble

Velde
Vorvys
Werdel
Whitten
Woodruff

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Whitten for, with Mr. Kelley of Pennsylvania against.

Mr. Boggs of Louisiana for, with Mr. Buckley against.

Mr. Jones of Alabama for, with Mr. Flood against.

Mr. Carlyle for, with Mr. Dingell against.

Mr. Auchincloss for, with Mr. Anfusio against.

Mr. Adair for, with Mr. Irving against.

Mr. Preston for, with Mr. O'Konski against.

Mr. Norrell for, with Mr. McCormack against.

Mr. Werdel for, with Mr. Powell against.

Mr. Evins for, with Mr. Woodruff against.

Mr. Trimble for, with Mr. Velde against.

Mr. Durham for, with Mr. Murphy against.

Mr. Redden for, with Mr. Gordon against.

Mr. Smith of Virginia for, with Mr. Dawson against.

Mr. Larcade for, with Mr. Breen against.

Mr. Chatham for, with Mr. O'Brien of Michigan against.

Mr. McMillan for, with Mr. Carnahan against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Allen of Louisiana with Mr. Merrow.

Mr. Sutton with Mr. Murray of Wisconsin.

Mr. Kilday with Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Elliott with Mr. Leonard W. Hall.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, on this bill I voted "nay." I have a live pair with the gentleman from Arkansas,

Mr. NORRELL. If he were here, he would vote "yea." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts changed her vote from "nay" to "yea."

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (S. 984) to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, 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

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

McCormack

NOT VOTING—52

Adair
Allen, Ill.
Allen, La.
Anfuso
Auchincloss
Boggs, La.
Breen
Buckley
Busbey
Carlyle
Carnahan
Chatham
Dawson

Dingell
Durham
Elliott
Evins
Flood
Gillette
Gordon
Hall,
 Edwin Arthur
Hall,
 Leonard W.
Irving
Jones, Ala.

Kelley, Pa.
Kersten, Wis.
Kilday
Larcade
LeCompte
McMillan
Merrow
Murphy
Murray, Wis.
Norrell
O'Brien, Mich.
O'Konski
Powell

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 termina-

tion of employment: *Provided*, That no workers shall be made available under this title to, 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 on 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. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. COOLEY moves to strike out all after the enacting clause of S. 984, and insert the provisions of H. R. 3283, as passed: "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. 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, 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. 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 503, 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. No workers shall be made available under this title for employment after December 31, 1953."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

By unanimous consent, the proceedings by which the bill H. R. 3283 was passed were vacated, and that bill was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who desire to do so may revise and extend their remarks on the bill (H. R. 3283) to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949.

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

There was no objection.

DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1951

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 281, providing for the consideration of H. R. 3871, a bill to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950, and for other purposes, 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. 3871) to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 5 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the bill shall be considered as having been 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. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, because of a clerical error on the resolution, I ask

unanimous consent that the four words "considered as having been", on page 1, line 10, be stricken out.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes of my time to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] and yield myself such time as I may use.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, this legislation amends the Defense Production Act of 1950, and if enacted into law, without damaging amendments, will greatly stabilize our war effort and reduce the cost of living.

This is an open rule and calls for 5 hours' general debate, after which amendments can be offered under the 5-minute rule.

When Soviet Russia, acting through Communist China, attacked South Korea last June, it served notice on the free world that its first step toward Communist global domination had taken place. Had the United States, along with the other democracies in the United Nations, not taken military action in Korea, other free nations in Asia and Western Europe would now be receiving the whiplash of communistic aggression. Had we not acted in Korea, America would soon be the only free nation in a sea of world communism.

We must also not forget that most of the democratic nations belonging to the United Nations have not as yet recovered from the devastating bombings and repercussions of World War II. Consequently, upon the United States fell the duty to spearhead the drive against communistic aggression.

After June 25, 1950, our country was compelled to change from a peace to a wartime economy. Already billions have been expended and billions more will be spent not only to reestablish our own military power and defenses, but to aid our allies to rebuild their military strength to resist possible Communist aggression.

Unfortunately, a percentage of the American public and too many Members of Congress have failed to realize that our domestic economy is now in the preliminary stages of a devastating inflation unless something is done at once to stop it. Too many of our public officials and some of our large newspapers and prominent radio commentators are playing politics not only with our war and defense effort, but with inflation. We all realize that it has been highly popular to criticize the war and defense effort and to ridicule the necessity for economic controls while a percentage of corporations and individuals are wallowing in war profits and the cost of living is soaring day by day. The American people are gradually realizing that the time has arrived when desperate efforts must be made to groove our production and regulate the cost of living on a wartime basis. This is the responsibility of the Congress and if inflation

gets beyond control, the American public will lay the responsibility where it rightly belongs.

President Truman; Charles E. Wilson, Director of Defense Mobilization; Eric Johnston; General Eisenhower; General Bradley; and all responsible leaders of our war effort are asking for legislation which will give them authority to proceed unhampered by economic problems in their fight for an effective war and defense program.

Some of our legislators still think that the American people will not submit to wartime sacrifice and inconvenience unless our own country is attacked. These people are being misled by self-seeking politicians and profiteers who in their mad rush for political and financial advantage, are gradually bringing our private enterprise economy to the brink of ruination. Since last January, military orders have been placed at an average rate of one billion a week. More than twenty-seven billion has been obligated for military requirements since the outbreak of hostilities in Korea. It is estimated that by July 1, 1952, at least an additional \$60,000,000,000 will be spent and obligated.

SMALL BUSINESS

Iron and steel production will increase over 16,000,000 tons in the next 18 months. Aluminum, copper, manganese, and dozens of other strategic metals and other necessities must be grooved into a priorities and allocation system in order to make our wartime program effective. Failure to secure equitable distribution of basic materials could not only ruin small business, but hamper our production effort. This legislation provides for these regulations.

Many small-business enterprises, unable to meet increased prices for necessary materials, are already forced out of business and numerous others are on the brink of collapse. Competition for skilled manpower in an already tight labor market would be certain to force wages, and thus prices, upward. In the absence of a stabilization program, it would be foolish to control the disposition of essential materials if prices are allowed to soar. Secretary of Defense Marshall has pointed out that since Korea, the increased cost of military items alone has risen approximately \$7,000,000,000 through inflation.

WAGES AND PRICES

We are beginning to witness devastating tie-ups by strikes throughout the country. Ninety percent of the wage problem today is brought about because of high living costs and ineffective price control. It is unrealistic to talk about trying to stabilize wages at a time when our over-all economy is not stabilized and prices and profits continue to soar. High prices and the cost of living have soared deplorably since the Korean trouble started. The vicious circle has been expanding since 1944. In 1944, industry and business considered their annual profit satisfactory, but during the last 7 years, profits have increased 97 percent and wages increased, on the

average, only 26 percent. In other words, profits have increased three and one-half times beyond wages. The Government has clamped controls on wages. Sellers of manufactured goods are guaranteed the same margin of profits they made before controls. Sellers of labor are rigidly limited to a 10-percent increase. This does not apply to millions of unorganized workers. Prices soar, but wages are dormant for millions. Everyone admits that there should be equality of sacrifice in the war effort. Very few of our employers and statesmen will agree to place this equality in practical operation.

PROFITS

Ten years ago we had only two large corporations with gross incomes of one billion or more. Today we have 19, topped by General Motors with an annual income of seven and one-half billion; A. T. & T., three and one-third billion; Standard Oil, A. & P., and Sears, Roebuck, around three billion, and on down to Gulf Oil with one and one-half billion income. I am not complaining against an industry or business just because it is large, but these institutions should not be opposing legislation which would aid millions of consumer families. Today millions cannot enjoy even the simplest pleasures and conveniences because of wartime inflation.

Stabilization and control legislation is absolutely necessary in industrial areas or our war production in these areas will be wrecked. The industrial Calumet region of Indiana is but one of many metropolitan centers throughout the United States wherein thousands of workers have come from other areas of the country to work in the steel mills, oil refineries, transportation companies, and factories of all descriptions. The cost of living for meats, groceries, clothing, and rents has leaped immeasurably since June 30, 1950. Hundreds of steel workers in my district have not been able to provide a steak for their families in months. Their pay check is expended the day it is received and numerous families have already disposed of their war bonds in order to buy the bare necessities of life. In my last two visits home, committees and individuals have informed me of this serious situation.

POST OFFICE WORKERS AND RETIRED CITIZENS

Postal employees are resigning because they cannot support their families on their postal salaries in that high-cost-of-living area. Postal service in Hammond, Gary, and East Chicago, Ind., has greatly deteriorated because over 50 percent of the postal employees are new and inexperienced. This situation is brought about by reason of the resignations of the regular postal workers.

School teachers and office employees have the same complaint. Retired folks and older people living on pensions and retirement income cannot stretch their paltry income on the present inflationary prices. We are spending billions to curtail communism, but unless the cost of living is reduced we are creating millions of discontented and unhappy citi-

zens upon whom the communistic agitators can find a fertile field to add memberships to their cause.

BEEF AS INFLATION EXAMPLE

The rapid rise of the cost of beef is an example of inflation in a wartime economy. In January 1950 cattle were selling at 115 percent of parity. In April of this year the price of beef stood at 152 percent of parity. The ceiling after the first roll-back represents 135 percent of parity. After October 1, if the third roll-back is allowed to take place, cattle prices should be between 120 and 125 percent of parity.

Figures of the United States Department of Agriculture show that in the past 11 years feeders in the Corn Belt have made an average \$20.83 profit for each head of cattle they sell. Their profits in the past 12 months have been the highest in history—\$68.54 per head. This is \$25 more profit per head of cattle than in the plush 1946-47 season, after OPA price controls were killed. The 10-percent roll-back of May 22 has cut back profits per head of cattle to \$47.69, according to the Government's agriculture experts. Yet the story the cattlemen tell the public is that they are losing money. What they mean is that instead of making all-time record profits they are earning 129 percent more than the 11-year average profit per head. In other words, if the Government roll-back is not carried out meat foods of all kinds will disappear from the tables of the working families of America.

RENT CONTROL

Rent control is provided for in this legislation. Shelter is the second most important expenditure in the family budget. At military establishments and in industrial defense areas the housing crisis is deplorable. On May 4, when this Congress reduced the number of defense housing units to 5,000 annually, it struck a body blow to tenants in the above-described areas. For 15 years the real estate lobby stated they could provide low-priced housing. They have failed miserably. At least 135,000 low-priced public housing units should be built annually so workers and their families could leave trailer camps, shacks, and slums.

It is estimated that in the industrial area of northern Indiana and south Chicago, over 100,000 defense workers and their families live in trailer camps and dilapidated shacks. Furthermore, owners of these shacks and run-down apartment buildings are charging outrageously high rentals.

Mayor Eugene Swartz, of Gary, Ind., recently testified before the Banking and Currency Committee that during the last war, thousands of defense workers in this area slept on cots in store buildings. These cots were rented three times in 24 hours to workers on the various shifts in the steel mills. The steel mills in this area provided old pullman cars in the switching yards for additional sleeping quarters for defense workers.

When this Congress refused the public housing legislation a few months ago,

it threw another wreath around the real estate lobby's neck and relegated millions of workers in urban and industrial areas throughout America to live under abhorrent conditions. Defeat of legislation of this kind will eventually bring dissatisfaction and discontent and lead on to strikes which will greatly hamper our war effort.

In decontrolled cities in my district, I have received numerous letters and telegrams where rents have increased 50 to 150 percent. On the other hand, I have received letters from landlords who have not profited in this housing crisis. These landlords should be given every right to receive a reasonable income on their investment and it is so provided in this legislation. Rent control in these critical areas should be immediately abolished when the housing crisis relaxes.

IMPORTS AND DEFENSE PROPERTY

This legislation will also regulate the importations of manufactured products of any raw material upon which domestic priorities or allocations are in effect.

It also provides for authority to acquire property by condemnation or by purchase, donation, or other means of transfer. The Defense Production Act at present provides only for the requisitioning of real and personal property for defense needs. Under these provisions, agreements by the Armed Services Committee of the House and Senate will be necessary for the acquisition of any real property for the use of the military.

Provisions are also set out in this legislation for the protection of the small-business man.

AUTO AND CONSUMER CREDITS

Provisions are also made for the relaxation of regulation W. Automobile dealers and car purchasers in my district, as well as other areas throughout the country, have been greatly curtailed on the sale and purchase of used and new automobiles because of the unreasonable high down payments and short-time credits on the sale of cars. The automobile is no longer a luxury. The breadwinner of every working family in America needs an automobile to go to and from his employment and for other personal and family purposes. Under the present regulation, the average worker cannot comply with the large down payment and limited time credit required for an automobile.

TAXES AND INFLATION

Last week the House passed a large tax bill which was necessary in order to pay for the largest defense and military war cost in our history.

Seventy-four cents out of every Federal tax dollar goes to pay for war and defense. Approximately five and one-half billion is expended every year for interest on our national war debt. Almost eight billion is expended for benefits, hospitalization, and so forth, for the veterans of past wars. The billions that have been spent to rehabilitate France, Italy, Greece, and Turkey in the last few years has saved all western Europe from communism. Paul Hoffman, Eric Johnston, Generals Marshall, Bradley, Eisen-

hower, and other nonpolitical leaders have testified that this has been our greatest investment. It has not been a question as to whether our country can afford it, but the fact is America could not afford to refuse this expenditure. The future of the free world, including ourselves, depends upon it.

Unless this stabilization and price-control legislation is enacted into law, millions of our citizens will not have the cash to pay the taxes called for in this war and defense effort. Uncontrolled inflation could ruin our economy and also our war and defense effort. Every true American is looking forward to the day when controls of all kinds can be eliminated, but we must undergo sacrifice when we are preparing our country in a Herculean effort to curb the spread of communistic dictatorship. After all, the price paid by the ordinary civilian is small compared to the sacrifice our boys are making at the front in fighting the battle against the fanatical Communists.

With equality of sacrifice on the part of everyone—business, agriculture, labor, and all other groups—we can win this fight and return to our normal peacetime economy.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Did I understand the gentleman to say that labor had received only a 26-percent increase since 1940?

Mr. MADDEN. That is right.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. What authority does the gentleman cite for that?

Mr. MADDEN. I got this from the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I am sure the gentleman wants to examine those figures very carefully.

Mr. MADDEN. I will recheck on it.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Because the cost of Government has increased about 500 percent.

Mr. MADDEN. I might say that in my area thousands of postal workers, school teachers, and white-collar workers have not received even that much. I am referring to the grand average of all groups.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I think the over-all increase for labor has been far more than 26 percent.

Mr. MADDEN. That was the general average.

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

Mr. MADDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. FELLOWS. The gentleman said that 52 percent of the postal employees had left their positions.

Mr. MADDEN. In my area, yes.

Mr. FELLOWS. And that that was to seek a better job.

Mr. MADDEN. That is right.

Mr. FELLOWS. Does the gentleman know where they went?

Mr. MADDEN. No, I do not.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCGREGOR].

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio? There was no objection.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, on June 20, Secretary of Defense General Marshall submitted a request to the Congress authorizing the additional appropriation of \$6,561,262,387 for expansion and construction of military installations.

Incorporated in this request was one installation located in the Seventeenth District of Ohio which it is my honor to represent in Congress. This request was for \$13,237,000 for the Shelby—Eight Hundred and Thirty-first—USAF Specialized Depot, Shelby, Ohio. I am in complete accord with any request that is absolutely needed and essential to the war effort, which will give the necessary material and equipment to those in the armed services in order that they might defend their lives and the liberty of our country. I am definitely opposed to any expenditures, either civilian or military, that are not necessary.

This request of \$13,237,000 for the Shelby Depot might be essential and needed, but I want to be shown that such is the case:

I have written Secretary Marshall asking for complete information so that I can determine whether or not this Shelby Depot expenditure is necessary. I call upon every member of Congress to carefully investigate the projects in their districts which might be included in this \$6,500,000,000 request and see if we can safely reduce this enormous expenditure.

The taxpayers are heavily burdened and no expenditures should be made on any projects regardless of whether or not they are in our own districts, that are not essential and absolutely necessary to our war effort.

Let us forget selfish interests and remember that unnecessary expenditures lead to increased debt and higher taxes and will destroy the freedoms for which our boys are fighting. Economy should begin at home.

I hope every Member of this Congress will join me in a complete investigation of General Marshall's request.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRIEST). The Chair will count. [After counting]. One hundred and twenty-eight Members are present, not a quorum.

Without objection, a call of the House is ordered.

There was no objection.

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

[Roll No. 91]

Adair	Boggs, La.	Cox
Allen, Calif.	Breen	Crosser
Allen, Ill.	Buckley	Davis, Wis.
Allen, La.	Busbey	Dawson
Anderson, Calif.	Carlyle	Dingell
Anfuso	Carnahan	Durham
Auchincloss	Celler	Elliott
Bentsen	Chatham	Engle

Evins	McMillan	Beams
Flood	Mack, Ill.	Redden
Gillette	Marrow	Regan
Gordon	Morrison	Scott, Hardie
Gossett	Morton	Smith, Kans.
Hall	Mumma	Stockman
Edwin Arthur	Murphy	Sutton
Hall	Murray, Tenn.	Teague
Leonard W.	Murray, Wis.	Thomas
Hart	Norrell	Trimble
Hinshaw	O'Brien, Mich.	Velde
Irving	O'Konski	Vorys
Jones, Ala.	Passman	Werdel
Kelley, Pa.	Patten	Wharton
Kilday	Powell	Whitten
Lantaff	Preston	Wilson, Ind.
Larcade	Price	Wood, Idaho
LeCompte	Ramsay	Woodruff

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On this roll call 356 Members have answered for their names, a quorum.

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

DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1951

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADSEN] has so ably explained, House Resolution 281 makes in order the consideration of H. R. 3871, to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950, and for other purposes, under an open rule with 5 hours of general debate. H. R. 3871 is perhaps one of the most important measures which will come before the Congress at this session, because it deals with the economic life of the Nation and provides for the continuation of many of the Government controls over business, industry, agriculture, credit, and housing, which have been in effect since the President issued his proclamation under the Defense Production Act of 1950 last January.

The bill, House bill 3871, was brought before the Committee on Rules early this week, after some 6 or 8 weeks of careful consideration by the House Committee on Banking and Currency. The measure does not contain, I am very happy to say, all of the suggestions or requests for additional powers and authorities submitted by the executive branch of the Government to the House Committee on Banking and Currency.

As this bill has been reported under this rule, it consists of the original law, or the Defense Production Act of 1950, with some 57 amendments. I wish to impress upon you, if I can, that this measure comes to the floor of the House in a rather unusual manner, under rather unusual conditions. The usual procedure is for a legislative committee to consider a piece of legislation and to amend it in the committee and then to report a clean bill, so that the measure, as it comes before the House, is actually the original bill as amended by the committee. Under such a method it would require adoption of amendments to change the final content of the bill as reported by the committee. However, in the case of this bill, the House must adopt 57 amendments in order to finally put the bill in the form the committee desires.

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I wonder if the gentleman learned in the presentation before the Committee on Rules whether or not the Committee on Banking and Currency as a committee would back these various so-called committee amendments that are contained in the bill.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Yes. It is my understanding, from the testimony that was given before the Committee on Rules, that each of the amendments contained in this bill, as reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency, will be offered as committee amendments. And that is just the point I hope I may make very clear to the membership of the House.

Under the peculiar conditions surrounding this measure as it comes to the floor, each of the 57 amendments adopted by the committee will have to be offered first, of course, by the committee, presumably by its chairman, in the Committee of the Whole, and considered separately there. That action will come, of course, after the 5 hours of general debate, when we go into the Committee of the Whole and proceed under the 5-minute rule. This means that each of these 57 amendments submitted by the committee will be subject to debate, under the 5-minute rule, and possibly subject to amendment, or to the offering of substitute amendments.

As I read the bill and the amendments, and I listened to the discussion in the Committee on Rules, I came to the conclusion that at least 35 to 40 of the amendments which will be offered by the committee to this bill, or to the original 1950 Defense Production Act, are controversial, and will be subject to considerable discussion on the floor of the House.

In addition, I would like to remind you that each and every Member of the House of Representatives is entitled, under the rules, to offer any amendment to the measure he may see fit. Many of these amendments, which are to be submitted, or will be submitted, by the Committee on Banking and Currency, are indeed very, very controversial. Let me just mention a few of them for your consideration.

There is one amendment which provides, or I believe it provides, for consumer subsidies. There is considerable controversy, seemingly, within the Committee on Banking and Currency itself, as to whether or not that provision or amendment does actually provide for the payment of consumer subsidies. But the issue of whether or not consumer subsidies should be paid is indeed an important one and certainly a very controversial one. That issue will, first of all, have to be decided here on the floor of the House, as to whether the amendment does provide for consumer subsidy payments. Then next, we must decide whether we want to have consumer subsidies paid as a matter of policy and principle. Then, of course, we have in here a number of other amendments to the bill which are controversial.

Let me mention as an illustration, the amendment dealing with rent control, and as to under what terms rent control should or should not be extended.

We also have in this bill the question of credit controls. Regulation W will be involved in that discussion. That seemingly is a very controversial issue.

We will have before us the question of increasing the amount of money which can be expended or loans which can be made under certain provisions of the Defense Production Act. We have the question of price roll-backs. I think perhaps some of the Members of the House have been well informed in recent weeks on the question of the roll-back orders that have been issued on meat, for instance. However, this question involves other questions as well in connection with the roll-back of prices, or the authority or the right to roll back prices.

We have another important question involved in this legislation in which every farmer is interested, and that is the one of parity prices; whether they shall be fixed once a year or seasonally, or how. I think perhaps we may have a slight amount of discussion on that subject when this bill is read under the 5-minute rule. Then there is the amendment dealing with Presidential authority to condemn property or to enter into Government operation of certain industrial plants.

Why am I calling your attention to these particular provisions of the bill, and the amendments I have mentioned, the 57 committee amendments, plus, of course, the many other amendments which may possibly be offered on the floor of the House by the membership? Simply for this reason:

The Defense Production Act of 1950 expires at midnight on June 30. That is this coming Saturday night. This rule provides for 5 hours of general debate. But we have other legislation scheduled this week. So, whether we can consider 57 important committee amendments to this bill, as contained in the measure as it is reported by the committee, each of which will be subject, as I mentioned, to debate under the 5-minute rule before Saturday night is indeed questionable. And remember this, if these 57 amendments are adopted in the Committee of the Whole each of the 57 will also be subject to a roll-call vote when we get back into the House. While I am willing to vote on each of these amendments on the record, I sort of shudder and become a little weak when I think of the possibility of answering 57 roll calls, and perhaps more if other amendments are offered and adopted, plus, of course, a roll call on a motion to recommit if somebody makes such a motion, plus a roll call on the passage of the bill. The physical strain alone will be almost unbearable even if we can find the 24 hours or more of time such roll calls would require.

It seems to me the situation is such that if this legislation is to be thoroughly debated, discussed, and considered by the House of Representatives, all the amendments voted on, the final House decision made, the measure sent over to the other body, a conference committee appointed, the conferees reach an agreement, the conference report brought back here and agreed upon here,

and the measure reaches the President by this coming Saturday night, midnight, that we are going to be mighty, mighty busy here in the House during the next few days. No one, even the most critical constituent, will be able to claim the Congress has been doing nothing this week, at least.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I shudder along with the gentleman from Ohio, but I wonder where in the world those in charge of this legislation have been all the time that they should have brought this up just a few hours before the legislation expired. Here we are on the brink of the close of the fiscal year. We are now discussing the question of putting this thing over. When do you expect to resume consideration of this legislation after you have gone along and extended it temporarily? I assume you are going to attempt to extend it temporarily and then take it up later.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The gentleman and I have discussed privately, at times, the very grave and important question as to whether or not each of us is our brother's keeper. In this particular instance, I do not believe or feel that either of us are our brother's keeper. I certainly do not want to assume the responsibility and shall not assume it, of the majority leadership of this House. I certainly do not think the Republican minority can or should be held responsible for the flow of legislation to the floor.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I think the responsibility rests elsewhere. So I believe your question should be directed elsewhere.

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. The gentleman has referred to the rather unusual manner in which this bill has been reported, that is, instead of reporting out a so-called clean bill containing the provisions as finally adopted by the committee, each of the committee amendments has been reported separately. Does not the gentleman agree with me, as he has pointed out, that considering the debate which will be involved and the probable calling of the roll, that this method of presenting the measure for action in the House has undoubtedly added 4 or 5 days to the time necessary for completion of action on the measure?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I agree fully with the gentleman from Indiana. I would like to point out at this time that it is not the responsibility or the fault of the Committee on Rules that the bill is here in its present form. The Committee on Rules could not decide whether this should be a clean bill or the type of bill that it is. I have listed the different amendments and some of the different issues and questions which will be involved when this bill is under consideration, simply for the purpose of impress-

ing upon you, if I can, what appears to me the utter hopelessness and impossibility of the task which confronts us; and that we cannot accomplish that which we are supposed to accomplish as a legislative body in the few hours which now remain to the House for consideration of this bill prior to the date the act itself will expire, on midnight, June 30.

Therefore it seems to me if we are going to legislate wisely and well on the issues involved in this measure we will have to find some method of getting more time. Yet at the same time I certainly do not want to continue, or see continued, any of the many inequities which have crept into the administration of the Defense Production Act of 1950.

There are a great many Americans who are demanding, as I believe they have a right to demand and should demand, prompt relief from the unfair and unworkable administrative orders and regulations which in too many instances have been issued under the provisions of the 1950 act which is now in existence.

So we do have the grave responsibility of deciding how to best meet this particular situation which confronts us. I say, in justice to the House, that we have been placed in an untenable position where it is impossible to do that which we are called upon to do, and we must find some other solution to the problem.

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DOLLINGER. The gentleman has stated that it will be impossible to complete the bill because of the shortness of time. Does not the gentleman agree that this bill is so important we should work day and night in an effort to see if we can dispose of it before we make a determination that we can put the thing over, or should put it over?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I agree fully with the gentleman, but I regret—and you know I have the greatest affection, sir; for you personally—that your committee did not see fit to start earlier and to work longer hours on this legislation.

Mr. DOLLINGER. Our committee did work night and day.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Oh, yes; for the last few days, I am sorry to say. I would feel much better if we did not have so many Members of the Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday Club here in the House and if we had a little better attendance in the House, and a little more attendance in our committee, so that this and similar jobs could have been taken care of as they should have been taken care of long ago.

Mr. DOLLINGER. May I point out that of course the gentleman is not referring to me.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Oh, no; I am not referring to you personally. Of course I would not refer to the gentleman personally. Indeed I would not refer to anyone personally on the floor of the House.

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. I think the gentleman would agree with me that the failure of the Committee on Banking and Currency to get this measure here prior to this time, the last week before the expiration date of the act, is completely inexcusable and indefensible. The fact of the business is that this measure should have been here weeks ago. Everyone knew that the time was running out on the measure. I, for one, cannot understand and cannot see any adequate reason why it should not have been here weeks and weeks ago in order that we could have acted upon it in a careful, orderly fashion.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I agree fully with the gentleman. I call the attention of the House, and the attention of the gentleman from New York, that another reason why it is going to be difficult to complete this legislation is the fact that it is going to be necessary to take some action in the next day or so to continue the appropriations needed to run the Federal Government after midnight of June 30, simply because the Committees on Appropriations of the House and of the other body have not yet completed the work which has been assigned to them.

We have not yet put through this Congress and sent to the President a single major appropriation bill, after having been in session for practically six full months. So I insist that the House of Representatives as such, and the great membership of this body as a whole, should not be held responsible for the situation in which we find ourselves. We should not be held responsible for something we cannot help. We should not be expected to accomplish the impossible in the next few hours or the next few days.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Replying to the gentleman from Indiana I wish to state that practically everybody in the United States wanted to be heard for or against this bill, and we heard many, many witnesses. It took us 6 weeks to get to the point where we could write a bill that we thought was workable and present it to the House.

I resent the implication that the Committee on Banking and Currency was doing nothing.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I have not time to yield further, but I want to be fair. The gentleman from Georgia bears a splendid surname. I know that he was here working on the job as a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency and that he endeavored to the best of his ability to get a clean bill reported by his committee to meet the present situation. Nevertheless, the fact remains that we have before us a bill, and a situation, that is impossible to meet and care for properly between now and June 30.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I do not think anybody is going to be

opposed to this rule; we all realize we have got to give consideration to this bill, and I imagine that the rule will pass without any real trouble.

I was disturbed when the matter was brought to the Rules Committee by the report on the bill. Under the Ramseyer rule the report is required to contain a comparative analysis of the bill proposed and existing law. The bill that was proposed has been shot full of holes, but this compliance with the Ramseyer rule is tied to the original bill. It therefore does not mean anything, and you will find it most difficult to understand from the report of the committee what changes are actually taking place.

The chairman of the committee very kindly at my suggestion has had a committee print made that complies with the Ramseyer rule as tied to the bill after it was amended as the committee amended it; so, through the cooperation of the Committee on Banking and Currency, you can have both the report of the committee and the committee print in compliance with the Ramseyer rule as tied to the bill as amended. You can therefore look at the committee print and see just exactly what changes have been made in the bill. I think that will relieve a good deal of the difficulty, and I am very glad that the committee so willingly complied with that suggestion. I would suggest to Members who are interested that they ask the chairman of the committee to supply the desks here with the committee print so that we can understand the contents of the bill.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The gentleman will agree, I believe, as a very able parliamentarian, that the parliamentary situation as I described it actually exists with these 57 amendments.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Yes; it exists and is unusual. However, the Committee on Banking and Currency had the right to do it, and did do it, and it was a pretty shrewd parliamentary way to do the thing from the standpoint of certain members of the committee, and I do not have any criticism of them; I probably would have put it across myself if I had been on that side and on the committee.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE].

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I was not in the Chamber and I did not hear the debate upon the resolution; however, I think I heard the gentleman from Ohio, a member of the Rules Committee, taking to task the Banking and Currency Committee because it reported a bill with amendments. In my opinion, it is not within the province of the Rules Committee to dictate to legislative committees in what form they should report their bills. I do not think any committee including the Rules Committee is the keeper of the conscience and the judgment of other committees.

I was for the committee bill being reported with amendments. That is why

the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is printed, that is why the doors of the gallery are always open—in order that the public may see its representatives at work and know how they vote.

Should any criticism result from reporting a bill that will assure to our constituents this right?

Then the question came up as to the Ramseyer rule. The Ramseyer rule did not apply to the amendments. So we had the staff of the committee file a supplemental statement which shows the history of these amendments that gives full effect to the Ramseyer rule.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. May I say to the gentleman that we have not questioned the right or the privilege of the committee, and I did not criticize the committee but explained what the parliamentary situation is.

Mr. SPENCE. I am glad to have the gentleman's statement. I suppose it came with some praise, but it did not seem to me that it was the voice of commendation when I came into the room. That is the reason I have taken the floor at this time for a few minutes to explain to the House that we reported the bill with amendments. I was deeply interested in them and I assume all the blame for it. If it is hard on gentlemen to make their positions known, I am sorry, but I felt that those we represent should know where we stand, what we are for and that that was a good way to do it.

I like to treat my colleagues with every consideration and courtesy, I like to help make their lives pleasant here, if I can, but I do feel in this particular case it is very desirable to have everybody show where he stands on this very great piece of legislation that means so much to the future happiness of the people of America and the stabilization of our economy.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SADLAK].

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, the unusual procedure under which House bill 3871 comes before us and a listing of some of the controversial amendments has been mentioned by members of the Rules Committee, among them the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] who has yielded me this time.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that there is also another unusual amendment in the bill which should be specifically listed in the highly controversial category. It is section 305 on pages 12, 13 and 14, actually commencing at line 7 (e) on page 12 and is a new section of title III of the Defense Production Act of 1950.

I reiterate my contention that if it had not been considered controversial, heretofore, it will be very much so by the time we begin general debate and take up the amendments now incorporated in the measure. Realistic consideration of section 5 by my colleagues which is earnestly invited during the interim before this part of the bill is reached will,

I hope, convince each of you to my belief that it is illogical, uneconomical, and a detriment to our national defense and should be removed from the bill.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. DEMPSEY].

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate very much the kindness of the gentleman from Ohio in giving me 3 minutes. I tried to get time from my own side of the aisle, but it was already allotted and for that reason I could not obtain it.

Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purpose of calling the attention of the committee to a matter which it may desire to take into account and amend in this bill. A few days ago in purchasing an automobile, and exchanging my old one for the new one, the salesman asked me if I needed a spare tire. Well, I would not drive a car without a spare tire. I said, "Certainly; is there not one on the car? Have you not charged me for it?" He said, "No. The manufacturer is only permitted to provide four tires with a new car. That is due to the regulations of the National Production Authority."

He said, "I can sell you a tire, but unfortunately, it will cost you more money because we are only permitted to allow you \$18 in lieu of your fifth new tire. That is the price the General Motors Co. would have to pay to buy a new tire and put it on there; but I have to sell to you at retail, so I am charging you \$34.60."

I said, "Do you mean that in the manufacture of some 6,000,000 cars this year, every person who buys a car is going to be penalized that much?"

I assumed this was because of a direct shortage of rubber. He said, "There is no shortage of rubber. I wish you would give me an order for a thousand tires, and I will have them at your home before you get there."

So I consulted the National Production Authority. The rubber question had nothing whatever to do with this regulation.

Now, if the committee wants—and I do not think that it is their desire—to penalize the purchasers of automobiles to the extent of from \$110,000,000 to \$125,000,000 a year, then let this regulation stay in, and that is what you are going to do. But remember that in doing so you are not helping this defense effort one dime's worth. You are simply taking that much money away from the people at a time when we are trying to stop inflation. I am going to offer an amendment to relieve this situation if the committee does not. I would much prefer that they would do so, because it is not that I take any pride in calling this to your attention. But every person I have spoken to about the spare-tire situation believes that we are making some little sacrifice to the war effort when, as a matter of fact, rubber is going to be a drug on the market. We are going to reduce the number of cars we manufacture by reason of the steel situation. Rubber has nothing to do with

it. Mr. Larson is about through buying for the stockpile.

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

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

Mr. AYRES. I come from a rubber city, and I can confirm what the gentleman has said. Information has come to me, both from the workingmen in the factories running the storerooms and the warehouses and the officials of the company, to the effect that there will be no shortage of tires.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I do not have time to go into detail about the reason for this, but there is no reason for it at all, and we are not doing anything except adding to inflation, putting another burden of from \$110,000,000 to \$125,000,000 on the purchasers of cars. Considering that after the tax bill we passed, it is just about the last straw on the camel's back, in my opinion.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MITCHELL].

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I am very definitely in agreement with the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] that this is a very important bill coming before the House on this rule. Certainly, I agree with the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE] that each of us, as individual Members of this body, has a very definite responsibility to determine whether the majority of the Committee on Banking and Currency reached conclusions in the best interests of the consumers of this country.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. O'TOOLE. I just want to comment that I am very happy that the gentleman from Washington did not go down to the well of the House, because if he had spoken from the well of the House, he would have been up to his ankles in crocodile tears over the fate of this bill, as explained by the gentleman from Ohio and the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, if the American consumer is to be protected and if our national economic strength is to be maintained, improved price and production controls must be enacted by Congress. The day following the outbreak of the conflict in Korea, I called for the enactment and enforcement of across-the-board price, rent, and production controls. History certainly will prove that that action should have been taken on June 26, 1950. It must be taken now.

During this past 1 year, the consumer and taxpayer has been forced to bear the brunt of unnecessarily high prices and spiraling inflation. The millions of American families who have carefully and traditionally set aside a portion of their monthly income have watched with fear and alarm while the value of their savings has constantly depreciated. A symptom of this is the fact that redemp-

tion of E bonds in the first quarter of 1951 exceeded sales by \$258,000,000. Those people now living on pensions and fixed incomes find it more and more difficult to obtain even the basic necessities of life.

In the last year inflation alone has added \$10,000,000,000 to the cost of our Nation's defense program. This means that for every \$6 the taxpayer invests in his Government and national defense, he must pay \$1 for inflation.

No one faces the facts of inflation more frequently than the American housewife. She does not care about the intricacies of economics. She wants only one thing: lower and reasonable prices.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics figures are a good indication of what has happened to prices. The BLS index climbed constantly and precipitously in the months immediately following Korea and did not leave off until price controls were put into effect in January. The Bureau's daily spot market index of the prices of 28 basic commodities which reflect over-all prices, rose 47 percent from mid-June 1950 to January 25, 1951, in spite of all the pleas for and promises that prices would be "voluntarily controlled." The Wholesale Price Index has risen from 170 percent of the 1935-39 average in June 1950 to 184 in February 1951.

These statistics, shocking though they are, are so general that it is difficult to visualize what they mean in terms of specific items for which the housewife must pay day after day. I have, therefore, to secure actual dollar-and-cent prices on a few representative items for my home city, Seattle, Wash.

A quart of milk that cost 17 cents in June 1950 cost 19 cents in April 1951; bread sells for 1.3 cents more than its June 1950 price; coffee has advanced in price from 76 to 91 cents; round steak from 98 cents a pound to \$1.07.

The story on clothing is similar. The wool suit that cost \$57 in May 1950, cost \$60 in February 1951 and \$62.50 in May 1951. Overalls sold at \$3.01 in May 1950, went up to \$3.83 in February 1951. Prices for women's rayon slips, men's street shoes, and bedsheets, to take typical examples, rose drastically from May 1950 to February 1951, and since price controls have been put into effect the prices have not advanced. The same story could be told for every city in the United States from New York City to Seattle.

Rents are another important item in family budgets. Many cities have seen rent controls relaxed in recent months. Rents in Seattle rose 2 percent between the Korean outbreak and February 1951. This was somewhat less than the increase in most cities, and can be credited to existing rent ceilings in Seattle. In March 1951, the local rent-control board approved a 22- to 25-percent increase in rents, over the level of maximum rents existing in 1942-46. This meant that dwellings which had already had a voluntary lease increase of 10 to 15 percent, could get a further increase, in some cases making a total

increase of as much as 25 percent over the 1942-46 level. Preliminary estimates of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, based on a survey of Seattle rents, indicate that in the two months following this action, about a quarter of all rental dwellings reported more than 10 percent increases, with a typical increase of about \$5.50. Rent increases of this magnitude have not taken place in every city in the United States; in many, local rent-control boards have permitted less liberal rises; in others rent control has been lifted and rents have skyrocketed.

I have mentioned food, clothing, and rent. These are not items on which the average family can economize by doing without. Most people look for the most inexpensive, not the most extravagant, housing available. To most families, a rise in food prices means a lowering of nutritional standards.

As Members of Congress we must face up to the problem. We know only too well what controls are not popular or pleasant, but every conscientious Member here realizes they are required if our people and our economy are to be protected from ruinous inflation.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

FOR STRONG PRICE-CONTROL BILL

(Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include statements and excerpts.)

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I expect to vote for a strong and effective price-control bill, even stronger than the committee presented. I am not taking this time to discuss the bill, because I have only 5 minutes. But I do want to invite your attention to two amendments which I am very much interested in, and I hope that you are interested in. One is the defense-plant amendment which 254 Members of the House have become coauthors of. It is a good amendment. It is similar to the Smaller War Plants Act in World War II. It will give the smaller concerns of this country a real opportunity to get contracts along with the larger ones, and I think it should become a law in this bill.

GOVERNMENT BONDS SHOULD BE SUPPORTED AT PAR

The other amendment was not presented to the committee, because I was unavoidably detained last week and could not be here at the committee's executive sessions. But I had prepared and expect to present from the floor of the House, an amendment to require and to compel the Open Markets Committee of the Federal Reserve Banking System to support direct Government obligations at par at 100 cents on the dollar. I think it is absolutely a shame and a disgrace that our great Federal Reserve Banking System would let direct obligations of our country go down to 96 and 97 as they are today. One insurance company has already gone broke. An insurance failure, as I read here, resulted from the drop in Government bonds,

which was the final straw that brought about the action in New York. That one company has already gone broke because the bonds were permitted to go down below par. Many veterans throughout the country, as well as thousands who are not veterans, who would like to build small, modest homes, are unable to get the money because the insurance companies would have to sell their bonds below par in order to let them have money, and they are not going to do it. Therefore, we will have less housing in this country as long as that rule prevails.

WILL NOT COST PENNY FOR FEDERAL RESERVE TO SUPPORT BONDS AT PAR

So I hope the amendment I have to require and compel the Federal Reserve Banking System through its Open Market Committee to support these bonds at par will be adopted. I can assure you, too, that it will not cost the Government of the United States one penny. It will not cost the taxpayers one penny. Remember that. Without cost of any kind the bond market can be supported as it has been in the past up until recently.

We owe an obligation to the people who bought these bonds. Preceding the financing of World War II we made a commitment through laws passed by this Congress that we would not permit bonds to be sold on the market, as they were after World War I, down to 82, \$18 below par. The people lost up to \$18 on a \$100 bond after World War I. Lots of people lost that. I see some people right here now that had that experience. We promised the people that would not be done during and after World War II. We kept that promise up until the last two or three months, when the Open Market Committee, composed of the 7 members of the Federal Reserve Board and 5 representing the private bankers of the country, got together and agreed that they would not support the Government bond market any longer, thereby violating that sacred obligation that Congress made and refusing to redeem those bonds 100 cents on the dollar.

I hope you give consideration to the amendment, and that when it comes up on page 45 of the bill you will vote for it.

The amendment is as follows:

Amendment by Mr. PATMAN: Page 45, after line 16:

"(c) Title VI of the Defense Production Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"Sec. 605. In order to (1) maintain market stability for Government obligations, (2) maintain a stable and adequate money market to enable the Government to finance the mobilization program, and (3) assure an adequate source of mortgage funds for the financing of homes for defense workers and veterans, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and the Federal Open Market Committee of the Federal Reserve System are hereby directed to conduct open-market operations so that any marketable direct obligation of the United States which is issued at its par value shall at all times have a market value of not less than the par value of such obligations."

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, it is with amazement that I listened to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN]. He gave us a terrific indictment of his party, the new Fair Deal. He told us a terrible story. He charged that this Government, under management of his party for 18 years, sold bonds to the people, people who had confidence in the Government, and they so mismanaged its business, to be charitable, to put it mildly if not accurately, that those bonds are not worth what they ought to be; that the price has dropped; that they are worth less than face value.

Who is at fault? Who has been in charge of this Government, and who has so conducted our affairs that we are bankrupt, our bonds are not worth par? Who other than the gentleman's party? Who but the leader of the gentleman's party have spent and wasted our national resources? Who but the gentleman and his party are responsible for a policy which causes him to come here and ask that these bondholders—and most of the bonds are now held by large corporations and banks—be protected from the loss growing out of the maladministration of the Nation's affairs by his party? I wonder why the new Fair Dealers do not think about that a little some night when it is dark and quiet, and your conscience might be heard.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield my remaining time to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, as I pointed out earlier in the week, if you took the whole debt of \$26,000,000,000 incurred during World War I and threw it on the market at a 20-percent loss, as the gentleman from Texas has referred to, you would have a loss of only \$5,250,000,000, while those who hold the \$65,000,000,000 of savings bonds which are now outstanding have certainly lost 25 percent on the whole \$65,000,000,000 by reason of the drop in the purchasing power of the American dollar. They have already suffered a \$16,000,000,000 loss. The gentleman from Texas gets up here and makes a speech such as he has just made, and I am glad he raised the subject, because we will certainly have some debate on the proposition before this bill is approved.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I am very glad the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] made the remarks he did. He is going to present to the House an issue of transcendent importance to countless millions of people throughout the country. It was only a few months ago when the change in the policy of over 10 years took place. I remember I took the well of the House and made a speech at that time against it. We now see what has happened, with bonds down to 96 and 97. My friend, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] fails to remember history. After World War I our bonds were down to 82 and 83. Then those with plenty of money stepped in and made purchases. The

people who had bought them had to sell them. Those with money, and this is a statement of fact, purchased them when they were low in price, then when the bonds came back, sold them at 105 and 106. We now have the same situation occurring after World War II as a result of action outside of Government, and not by the Congress of the United States, action by a small group who determined the financial policies of great concern to our people. The amendment which the gentleman from Texas proposes is nothing new. It has been going on for 10 years without legislation by administrative action and agreement. We remember the controversy a few months ago between the Federal Reserve and the Treasury. The Federal Reserve prevailed and, as a result, our bonds have gone down below 100. That is what happened after World War I, and millions of persons who owned the bonds during World War I and sold them were the ones who suffered. Those who purchased them, being in a position to hold them, waited until the market came back and disposed of their bonds, in many cases, at anywhere from 106 to 110.

I hope we are not going to have the same story now which took place after World War I.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ESTELLA WOLFE

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution (H. Con. Res. 134) requesting the President to return the enrolled bill, H. R. 2349.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the President of the United States is hereby requested to return to the House of Representatives the enrolled bill (H. R. 2349) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue patents in fee to certain allottees on the Crow Indian Reservation; that if and when such bill is returned by the President, the action of the Speaker of the House of Representatives and of the President of the Senate in signing such bill is hereby rescinded; and that the Clerk of the House of Representatives is hereby authorized and directed, in the re-enrollment of such bill, to strike out in the paragraph thereof which relates to the issuance of a patent in fee to Estella Wolfe the phrase which reads "the northwest quarter of the southeast quarter," and to insert in lieu thereof "and the northwest quarter of the southeast quarter of section 28."

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

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do this to clarify what we are trying to do. This is simply a correction of a clerical error in the description of the land; is that not true?

Mr. MORRIS. That is correct. Yes, sir.

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

There was no objection.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONTINUING SUSPENSION OF DUTIES AND IMPORT TAXES ON METAL SCRAP

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 3181) to continue until the close of June 30, 1952, the suspension of duties and import taxes on metal scrap, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of the act of September 30, 1950 (Public Law 869, 81st Cong., ch. 1119, 2d sess.), is hereby amended by striking out "June 30, 1951" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1952."

EXPLANATION OF H. R. 3181

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, this bill would continue the exemption of metal scrap from import duties and taxes for another year, until the close of June 30, 1952. Import duties and taxes on metal scrap were suspended from March 14, 1942, to June 30, 1949, inclusive, under Public Law 497, Seventy-seventh Congress, and Public Laws 384 and 613, Eightieth Congress. The import duties on metal scrap were again suspended from October 1, 1950, to June 30, 1951, under Public Law 869, Eighty-first Congress.

The rates of duty on the principal types of ferrous and nonferrous metal scrap, suspension of which would be continued by the bill, are shown in the following table from a report of the United States Tariff Commission:

Item:	Rate
Ferrous scrap:	
Iron and steel scrap.	37½ cents per long ton plus additional duties on alloy content.
Relaying and re-rolling rails.	½ cent per pound plus additional duties on alloy content.
Nonferrous scrap:	
Aluminum -----	1½ cents per pound.
Copper and copper-base alloy.	2 cents per pound on the copper content. ¹
Lead (including antimonial lead).	2½ cents per pound on lead content.
Magnesium -----	20 cents per pound.
Zinc (including zinc dross and skimmings).	¾ cent per pound.

¹ Free of duty under the Tariff Act of 1930, Sec. 3425 of the Internal Revenue Code provides for an import-excite tax of 4 cents per pound on the copper content of copper and copper-base scrap, which was reduced to 2 cents per pound under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

According to the Tariff Commission, these rates are the equivalent of an ad valorem rate based on import values in 1950, as follows: Iron and steel scrap, 1.4 percent; aluminum scrap, 14.4 percent; copper scrap, 11.7 percent; brass scrap, 13.9 percent; lead scrap, 23.9 percent; and zinc scrap, 6.2 percent. Imports of alloyed iron and steel scrap were small, and the insignificant imports of relaying and rerolling rails and of magnesium scrap were not separately reported.

Favorable reports on the legislation have been received from the Departments of Defense, Commerce, and Treasury and the Office of Defense Mobilization.

In his report dated May 7, 1951, the Director of Defense Mobilization stated, in part, as follows:

The demand for metal scrap, both ferrous and nonferrous, exceeds available supply. Consequently, it is essential to the defense production program that the importation of metal scrap from overseas sources be encouraged to the maximum extent possible. Continuation of the suspension of the duties and taxes on metal scrap imports is an important factor for the accomplishment of this purpose. Accordingly, I urge enactment of H. R. 3181.

The Assistant Secretary of Defense, in his report dated May 11, 1951, stressed the importance of enactment of the bill, as follows:

Metals are generally in short supply to meet all the requirements in the United States. It is believed that metal scrap imports to this country can supply a considerable portion of the marginal needs beyond the current scrap production. The suspension of import duties on scrap provides a margin of cost which makes it feasible to market foreign scrap in the United States. In view of the urgent need for foreign scrap, and to facilitate its flow, the Department of Defense recommends enactment of H. R. 3181. Inflationary aspects of a reimposition of the duty as well as the inconsistency of such a charge in view of our need for scrap prompt this recommendation.

According to the Acting Secretary of Commerce in his report of May 11, 1951:

The situation with respect to metal scrap is critical at the present time, the requirements of the military, of the stockpiling program, and of essential civilian uses being far in excess of the available supply. Suspension of the import duties affects favorably the flow of metal scrap into this country from foreign sources, while the present and prospective shortages of these materials insures a stable market for domestic scrap.

The Treasury Department has advised that it anticipates no unusual administrative difficulties under the provisions of the bill.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of H. R. 3181, a bill to continue until the close of June 30, 1952, the suspension of duties and import taxes on metal scrap, and for other purposes. This important bill was reported out of the Ways and Means Committee by unanimous vote.

This extension is necessary during this emergency for the reason that this

country is desperately short of metal scrap, and has been ever since we furnished Japan all of our surplus scrap iron, steel, and metal scrap during the Japanese assault on China. It will be recalled that during the period from 1937 through 1940 we exported to Japan 8,000,000 tons of scrap iron, steel, and metal scrap, and also thousands of tons of other essential war material. I recall that it was in that very year 1937, when Japan opened war on China, our exports of scrap iron and steel amounted to 2,081,037 tons, or enough to build 20 battleships of 45,000 tons each, 200 submarines of 2,400 tons each, 10 aircraft carriers of 30,000 tons each, and 26 cruisers of 13,000 tons each.

The next year, 1938, our scrap iron and steel exports to Japan were 1,463,000 tons; in 1939, 2,179,000 tons; and in 1940, 1,248,000 tons. I mention this without going into further detail to show why we have been short of scrap iron, steel, and other war materials from 1940 to the present time.

This bill, of course, is to remove the tariff on these essential war materials to relieve the Government from paying duties and import taxes during the present Korean war.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE SCANDAL OF MIGRATORY LABOR

Mr. POLK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a portion of an article.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. POLK. Mr. Speaker, Archbishop Lucey, of San Antonio, Tex., a member of the President's Commission on Migratory Labor, in an article in the magazine, America, of May 26, 1951, under the heading "The scandal of migratory labor—We are tolerating the intolerable," wrote, in part, as follows:

THE SCANDAL OF MIGRATORY LABOR

(By Most Rev. Robert E. Lucey)

(Archbishop Lucey of San Antonio, Tex., was a member of the five-man President's Commission on Migratory Labor, which turned in its report at the beginning of April. The archbishop is episcopal chairman of the Bishops' Committee on the Spanish-Speaking and is a vice president of the Catholic Association for International Peace.)

A migratory farm laborer is a worker whose principal income is earned from temporary farm employment and who in the course of his year's work moves one or more times, often through several States. During the last 50 years migratory labor has been dealt with in many investigations and reports by Federal, State and private agencies. Few improvements have resulted.

Since there are more than 14,000,000 working farmers and hired workers one might reasonably ask why a special commission was appointed to study the 1,000,000 of the workers who are migrants. The answer is obvious. These people are human beings, largely defenseless against injustice. Their housing, food, and wages are often pitiful. The pattern of their economic life is unworthy of our Nation.

SUPPLY AND DEMAND

In 1949 only 5 percent of the migrants did farm-wage work for 250 days or more. Seventy percent of these workers had fewer than 75 days at farm jobs. Many migrants do some nonfarm work. During the year 1949 they averaged 70 days of farm work and 31 days of nonfarm work, making a total average of 101 days' employment. For farm work they received \$352 and for nonfarm work \$162, making a total average income of \$514 for the year.

A few months ago a Labor Department official stated publicly that 400,000 workers would have to be imported into the United States to meet the needs of agriculture this year. Another public servant, in an address to a growers' association, went all out with the statement that we will need 8,000,000 imported workers this year. Since a majority of migrant farm workers suffer from unemployment there seems to be no good reason why alien labor should be imported to make a bad situation worse.

Some will reply that we are at war; that this is a year of emergency. It is true that the Department of Agriculture has recommended a cotton-production goal of 16,000,000 bales. And we must produce more wool, feed grains, and livestock. But when we recall that in 1949 we produced 16,100,000 bales of cotton we will recognize that we need not get excited about cotton. And the use of migratory labor in the production of wool, feed grains, and livestock is insignificant.

The number of farm family workers remained almost constant during the World War II emergency. At the peak of the war effort in 1945, farm family workers were only 4 percent less than in 1940. In contrast, the number of hired workers declined sharply. Hired farm workers in 1945 were approximately half a million below 1940—a drop of almost 20 percent. Yet at this stage of the war emergency we were producing more crops and livestock than ever before. How did we do it? By bringing order into the chaos that is hired farm labor. On the average, the farm family and hired domestic workers together worked 10 days more a year at the height of the war emergency than they had in 1940.

Estimated farm output for 1951 is 3.6 percent above 1949. This additional production could be supplied by our present domestic labor force, including farm family labor, if each worker put in 6½ days more per year.

WAGES AND BARGAINING

Two things are expected of migratory workers: to be ready to go to work when needed; to be gone when not needed. Domestic family migrants sometimes find it difficult to be gone when not needed. Many farm employers prefer alien labor; it is cheap; it is docile. If the labor market can be flooded with migrants, domestic and foreign, wages would be reasonably low.

During 1949 some 65,000 Latin Americans left their homes in southern Texas to work in agriculture in other States. Wages in their home State are as low as 15 cents an hour. But in that same year Texas farmers imported 46,000 Mexican nationals to work in agriculture in Texas. And this does not include the thousands of Mexican workers illegally in this country and known as "wetbacks." It doesn't make sense. A comparison of more than incidental interest is the volume of the wetback traffic as compared to our admissions of displaced persons from Europe. In 1949, when we admitted 119,600 displaced Europeans, our wetback traffic was almost 300,000. In 1950, when we admitted 85,600 displaced Europeans, our known wetback traffic was between 500,000 and 600,000. The impact of this invasion on wages and employment can better be imagined than described.

Collective bargaining, or indeed any kind of equal bargaining, between migrants and farm employers is practically unknown. The farmers are organized. As members of growers' associations, and even as individuals, they can influence or determine wage rates. Through the foreign labor program, interstate recruitment and radio and newspaper advertising they can summon workers from far and near. When thousands of migrants converge on an area where only hundreds are needed it would be fantastic to mention collective bargaining. The illegal alien has even less chance to obtain justice than the domestic workers because the threat of deportation makes him take what he gets and say nothing.

Domestic migratory farm workers not only have no protection through collective bargaining but employers as a rule refuse to give to them the guaranties they have to extend to alien contract workers whom they import. These include guaranties of employment, workmen's compensation, medical care, standards of sanitation and payment of the cost of transportation. As these protections can be extended to alien contract migrants, it ought to be feasible to extend them also to domestic migratory workers.

HOUSING AND LIVING CONDITIONS

In recent years much has been written about on-job housing and home-base housing of migratory workers. The former consists of barracks, cabins, trailers, tents, rooming houses, auto-court cabins, shack houses, and not infrequently, a spot under a tree near a ditch. When units are grouped for several families they are usually called camps. Much, if not most, of on-job housing of migratory farm labor in the United States is below minimum standards of decency.

Housing is an aspect of labor supply. An employer who offers particularly bad housing has difficulty in holding his workers. They "skip" and he usually blames the workers for moving out. In the case of the Mexican wetback, he has to take what work he can get, housing or no housing. He often lives "in the brush."

Not infrequently a migratory worker finds that to get a job in an area of active seasonal work he must live in the employer's housing. Once hired he cannot retain the housing and work elsewhere. In some cases employers have threatened eviction even when the workers sought alternative employment only on idle days. In other words, job and housing are a "package" proposition.

Housing at the home base where migratory workers live for 6 to 8 months of the year is among the most deplorable in the Nation. Overcrowding, lack of running water, and use of pit privies are common. When 12 or 14 people, young and old, must live in one small room it is physically and morally unwholesome.

The director of a Florida county health department testified before the President's Commission on Migratory Labor:

"This is an actual observation. A sanitarian reports 180 people living in 60 rooms with only 1 toilet stool that works. This has been corrected somewhat by three additional stools which were added by the time of the last inspection. * * *

"One of our public-health nurses visited a nursery maintained on a private farm and found 48—I did not say 4, I said 48—infants on two double beds. I might add that two of the babies in that location subsequently died.

Members of the Commission personally observed the meager and unsanitary living conditions of migrants in many sections of the country. They were deeply disturbed by a realization that in many instances these conditions have persisted for decades without correction. The efforts of Federal, State,

and local governments and of agricultural employers during recent years, commendable as they were, have been ineffective and leave a great deal of remedial work still to be done.

The diet of migrant farm laborers is as insufficient to maintain health as is their shelter. A physician testifying before the Commission said:

"I can say from the reports of the nurses that we do have dietary deficiency diseases such as pellagra—and cases of that have come to my attention—due to a diet consisting of cornmeal and perhaps rice and very little else, with no vitamins. There are also evidences of merely ordinary starvation among many of these people. * * *

"A survey which I made and photographed in the Mathis, Tex., labor camps showed that 96 percent of the children in that camp had not consumed any milk whatsoever in the last 6 months. It also showed that 8 out of every 10 adults had not eaten any meat in the last 6 months. The reason given was that they could not afford it with the money they were making."

Regardless of future developments in American agriculture, the enormous injustices of the whole system of migratory farm labor must be stopped now. Some powerful employers will put pressure on Congress to protect them in their evil ways. Many of the findings of the Commission will be called communistic; social justice is often killed by an epithet. Only an informed and articulate public opinion can compel Congress to translate into the law the recommendations of the President's Commission on Migratory Labor. Meanwhile, we are tolerating the intolerable.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR TOMORROW

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute to inquire about the program for tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in response to the inquiry of my friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts, the business in order tomorrow will be the continuing resolution on the appropriations.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. That will probably last all day?

Mr. McCORMACK. I expect it to.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I understand that there is 1 hour on the rule and 3 hours for general debate?

Mr. McCORMACK. That is my understanding.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.] is recognized for 6 minutes.

WHY STAND WE HERE IDLE?

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, this is the first anniversary of our entry into the Korean war which for a little while was referred to as a police action, but which in time by virtue of its magnitude and the casualties involved, was recognized for what it really was, a very bitter and deadly war.

What is past is beyond recall and is useful now only in helping us to avoid similar mistakes in the future and perhaps in estimating the fitness of those charged with the responsibility for our national security.

On the day on which we entered the war the distinguished majority leader read to the House a statement which had just been made by the President indicating that the night before a decision had been made to throw this Nation into war. At that time I rose to say to the majority leader in this House that while it was gratifying to know that the State Department's policy in Asia had at last been invested with some abdominal fortitude, that I hoped our changed approach in Asia did not come too little and too late. Whether it did or not history will record.

The testimony before another body by the Secretary of State comprised several main points which I am going to review briefly for the purpose of setting the record straight and for no other reason.

The Secretary of State made the point that the Yalta agreement which he had defended as essential to bring in the Russians against the Japanese satisfied even Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek when it was made. The subsequent testimony reveals that this was totally untrue.

The Secretary of State testified that the proposition to bring the Chinese Communists and Chinese Nationalists together had the approval of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek, General MacArthur, Admiral Spruance, and General Wedemeyer. Subsequent testimony revealed beyond any possibility of successful contradiction that such proposition did not have the support of Chiang Kai-shek, General MacArthur, or General Wedemeyer. I do not at this moment recall the position of Admiral Spruance.

The third major point insisted upon by the Secretary was that the United States withdrew its troops from Korea at the request of the South Korean President, Syngman Rhee, after the Russians had moved their armies to the north, and on that point did not reveal the warning of many American military officials and a good many Members of this House, speaking especially at the time of the Korean-aid bill, that such removal would lead to the conquest of all Korea by the Communists.

The Secretary of State further made the point that the United States intervened in Korea in defense of collective security. That point is at least admissible. The State Department, according to the Secretary, further contended that the Department had proposed last November to various U. N. countries that United States aviators be permitted to continue hot pursuit of Red planes into Manchuria. That is admitted, but our failure to press our allies for consent to do so has never been satisfactorily explained.

The Secretary makes the final point that the United States objectives in Korea were to reject the aggressors, and to restore peace and security. Nothing is said about our announced policy of punishing the aggressors and nothing is said about unification of Korea, nothing is said about achievement of an over-all policy in the Far East, except to deny at this late date that these too were

among our objectives, a denial which contradicts earlier statements.

But all this is past. The Korean war has been a most severe war, more costly in casualties, men and matériel, and money than the war with Japan over a similar period.

In the first year of the war in Korea, as compared with the war against Japan, 8,000 men were killed in the Japanese war, 11,000 in the Korean war. Six thousand were wounded in the Japanese war, 48,000 in the Korean war. Forty-three thousand were missing in the Japanese war, 11,500 in the Korean War. The total casualties as of about 3 weeks ago were 57,000 in the war with Japan, 70,500 in Korea. They are now over 77,000. These, of course, are only the battle casualties and not the seventy-five-thousand-odd so-called nonbattle casualties also involved. The men involved of the Army and Air Force in the Japanese war were 347,500. In the first year of the war in Korea 350,000. Of the men involved in the Navy, there were 250,000 in the Japanese war, 60,000 in the Korean war and of the Marine Corps 78,000 in the Japanese war and 35,000 in the Korean war. These figures, of course, do not include other U. N. forces.

As far as cost goes, the cost of this war has run greater than the cost of the war against Japan, so far as can be allocated to that enemy.

Up to now our policy of a limited war has been based on the killer theory; that is, to kill enough of the enemy so that he will sue for peace. But there is evidence from Hong Kong and elsewhere, particularly from inside Red China, that she is building up her forces in Korea for new and bigger efforts, with special reference to a tremendous build-up of enemy air power now going on—and upon airfields we were not permitted to destroy.

We have received the so-called peace bid through United Nations channels which warrants the most careful examination, as no peace bid can be ignored or dismissed out of hand without every opportunity being given to determine the question of good faith and the possibilities of peace involved. We must at the same time be wary of the overtures of Mr. Malik, while we must hold open the door to a peaceful outcome. The vital question is why Mao should seek peace, rather than what Jacob Malik says, perhaps for propaganda purposes.

Malik knows we will not bomb Red China. We told him so. He knows we will not let the Nationalist troops attack because we told him so. He knows we will not cross the Yalu or bomb its bridges or bomb military installations in Manchuria or those in upper Korea, because we told him so.

Now, that is the record.

What have we gained at the end of the war? Some things of importance, surely. We have helped to apply, for the first time in history, the power of armed force in behalf of the principle of collective security. We have been forced to realize the magnitude of the

Communist menace, and we have been driven to build a big armed force and launch a program which we might otherwise not have undertaken until it was too late.

Now, until the Senate investigation the Truman administration, which some have called the "war deal," and I spell that w-a-r d-e-a-l and not as others have spelled it w-a-r-d h-e-e-l, although there might be some justification for the second spelling—the Truman administration had admittedly done nothing to bring about peace. It had no foreign policy for Asia, other than to let the dust settle. Settle it did, in Korea, upon the sightless eyes of our dead.

I recall on the floor of this House, back in the spring of 1944, saying to the Members of Congress that we had no foreign policy, or at least none which the people had been informed of, and none which the public could understand, and I said, "When we get out of this war, at the end of a long dark tunnel, will we have any friends left anywhere in the world? Will the Chinese be our friends? Will the Russians be our friends?" In the well of this House on March 21, 1944, I asked: "Will our foreign policy leave us any friends?" I said then: "We entered the war with numerous friendly allies. When we come out at the other end of the long, dark tunnel and return some day to the ways of peace, will we have any friends left? Who will they be? Russia? France? China? Italy? Argentina? Would anyone be so sanguine as to predict it?"

"What kind of a policy have the President and the State Department been following that we have come to this pass? Why will they not confide in the American people? What kind of people do they think we are? Have we a foreign policy? Whose? A people's foreign policy? Will our foreign policy be dictated by American public opinion? Not unless we get to work on it now by free and open public debate and discussion."

Personally, I think that was rather prophetic, because we did come out of the end of that long tunnel with very few friends, indeed.

Now, in the matter of our foreign policy, so far as it has emerged in Asia, if the speech of Dean Rusk means anything, and I hope it does, perhaps some gains have been made. But that, too, should remain for discussion on another day.

What I want to talk about is the possibility of peace in Korea. How can we bring about an honorable termination of the shooting war in order to free ourselves and disperse our forces in accordance with our choice of strategy for the best defense of America rather than to continue to be pinned down defensively when and where the Soviets elect to keep us trapped? When, in other words, can we gain and maintain the initiative for the security of America and the free world? It seems to me the plan offered by Mr. Malik is one on which Russia cannot lose, because under that plan it would assure the Communists political

control of North Korea indefinitely and would ease the economic drain on Russia which the Korean war has imposed on her, and for months and maybe years Russia would be in no hurry to discuss the issues raised by the Korean war, if the Russian proposal is simply for a cease fire along the present battle line and for nothing else. Under those circumstances Russia can use the threat of resumption of hostilities in Korea as a lever to compel concessions on European political questions. The Russians now are aware that any such settlement as that proposed would have to go through the Security Council and be subject to the Soviet veto, if the Russians did not like it, so that the Soviets cannot fail to control whatever was done, and in that light it is easier to understand Mr. Malik's proposal.

Perhaps also involved in the Malik proposal is the fact that Red China is being seriously injured. Perhaps also involved in the Malik proposal might well be the possibility that the Chinese Red leaders have said to Red Russia that they are long overdue on their promises to come in with tremendous air power and to strike the United States and United Nations with Soviet air forces thinly camouflaged as Red Chinese air power. Perhaps Mr. Malik has said to his Chinese leaders, Mao Tse-tung and others, "First we will try a peace proposal. It will give us the good will of all the people that we can propagandize, that we want to end the war, and the bloodthirsty American imperialistic warmongers want to continue it." Perhaps he has also said to them, "If this peace proposal fails, then we will unleash this terrific air power against the United States in Korea."

Bearing in mind these other considerations, is it not perhaps incumbent upon us here in the Congress, since few if any proposals seem to originate with the administration looking to the end of the war, since the administration theme so far has been that the pointless accordion, yo-yo-type war up and down the peninsula represents foreign policy, since many of us do not believe that manslaughter constitutes a policy, since many of us do not believe that stalemate is a policy, since many of us do not believe that loss of initiative is a policy, perhaps it is incumbent upon us to see what we would do if we were in a position, as I think we are, to suggest to a delinquent administration that the people of this country want them to exert their best efforts to stop this killing and to bring about a truce in Korea, if at all possible.

I had a letter from a Korean veteran today in which he said:

We still do not know what we are fighting for. We do not know what our objectives are. We do not know what we are over here for. When we fought the Germans we knew what we were doing. We had a purpose in mind. When we fought the Japanese we knew what we were doing. But when we are fighting these people over here we do not know what we are doing or why we are here or where we are going or whether we are expected to win or not.

Many of our soldiers are thinking that way. I was over there last fall and I

know they are thinking that. I talked to a good many of them.

What can we do about it? I think, first of all, we are obligated to a continued exploration of peace possibilities, possibilities of truce, cease-fire, possibilities of U. N. action. I think we ought to step up in the meanwhile our efforts to persuade our other allied members in the United Nations to give more help against aggression.

I think perhaps, remembering the failure of the proposed oil sanctions in Mussolini's Ethiopian war, which gave Mussolini the tip-off and the nerve to go into World War II, we ought to insist on an economic blockade which really works, and which is supported by the other members of the United Nations.

I think we ought to give consideration to the possibilities of a naval blockade, as testified to by Admiral Sherman, General Wedemeyer, Admiral Badger, and others, but while all these things are being done we ought also to concern ourselves with the possibility of peace.

I therefore propose that an American program of arriving at peace might be along these general lines:

First, a general agreement for a cease-fire along the present battle line in Korea, subject to acceptance of the following conditions: The withdrawal of troops from a 50-mile quarantine zone and the ceasing of all belligerent action, this to be followed in the third place by gradually progressive withdrawal of all non-Korean forces from the entire Korean Peninsula, to be replaced coincidentally with a United Nations peace unification force composed of a membership drawn from all nations who are members of the United Nations. You will note that that would include the Russians and would not include the Red Chinese.

Fifth, that all Korean forces, north and south, thereafter—that is, after the entry of such a peace unification force—lay down their arms, and that that disarmament be supervised by the U. N. Korean Commission.

Sixth, that this United Nations Korean Commission be authorized to recommend procedures for free elections to be held in all of Korea and for the establishment of that unified, independent Republic of Korea, which we promised them.

Seventh, I propose, most important of all, that all decisions governing the cease-fire, the withdrawal of present belligerent forces and substitution of a peace unification force, and the actions of the United Nations Korean Commission, all be under the supervision of the United Nations Assembly, where no veto is required, rather than the United Nations Security Council, where of course any true effort to achieve unification or peace or security in the Orient could be blocked by the Soviet group.

I assume there are many other ways of seeking to find a peaceful solution of the Korean war. I would like to think that this body and the other body will come up with some suggestions. Certainly we are probably going to end up by indicating that Mr. Malik's proposal is mere propaganda. Unless we seek here for

peace, unless the administration decides at last that its obligation as the Government of the United States in the executive branch requires it to do something about peace, unless the United States takes some lead in this, where will peace be found? In the United Nations?

To paraphrase Patrick Henry, gentlemen speak of peace, peace, and there is no peace. Little is to be expected from the United Nations unless leadership is exerted by the United States, and that leadership is too long delayed.

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

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. I want to commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania for his leadership in bringing this subject before us and for the practical, stimulating suggestions he has made. Surely one of our gravest dangers is to continue in a sort of state of paralysis on this subject, so that what we do or what we do not do is largely according to signals called by our enemy.

Would the gentleman care to comment on this: Does he himself believe that this Malik proposal is anything but a device to try to maneuver us into some position that will be advantageous to our enemies?

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Well hardly anything more than that. Mr. Malik would not have made the proposal unless he had felt there was some tactical or propaganda advantage to be gained from it. I do not believe the Russians are peacemakers. If they were, there were many previous instances when they might have made peace instead of limited war against us before this.

Mr. JUDD. Just because the gentleman believes, and I agree, that this is not a sincere effort to get peace and freedom for the peoples of Korea, that conclusion does not permit us to wash our hands of the matter and allow the Communists to appear before the world as if they genuinely seek peace, and we do not care about it, when as a matter of fact it is we and the free peoples of the world who are fighting only in defense of freedom who have most at stake by getting a genuine settlement that will end the ordeal of the people of Korea and of our own forces, and at the same time not put the Soviet Union in a position to begin her predatory activities in other areas which might be even more dangerous to us and to the world than is Korea.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Precisely, because the stupidity of our own State Department's attempt to arrive at a foreign policy boils down to this: They have told the rest of the world and they have told our soldiers in Korea that we have no program for victory in war; that we have no plan or objective by which the war may end either with victory or even with an honorable solution which may be somewhat less than total victory.

Now, if we reject the Malik proposal without coming up with a genuine suggestion as to how peace may be achieved ourselves, then we have rejected a pro-

Needs replacement

7291

7292

needs replacement

7292

being a deflationary device it is inflationary. You may push people around in this country, as we are trying to do in this regulation W, and you may hound them to death, and squeeze every ounce of blood out of them, but they will bounce back somehow. That is what they are doing. Regulation W says to the lower income groups that they cannot buy certain household necessities, like their wealthier neighbors. So what do these people do? They go out and borrow the cash. They borrow from their savings, they cash their bonds, they borrow from their relatives. They pour new cash into the already dollar-bloated streams of finance. That is inflation in its worse form.

PEOPLE ARE CASHING THEIR WAR BONDS BY THE MILLIONS, PUMPING ADDITIONAL NEW MONEY INTO THE ALREADY DOLLAR BLOATED ECONOMIC STREAM

Look at what happened to the cash situation in this country in the first 4 months of 1951:

In the first 4 months of 1951 the people withdrew \$450,000,000 more cash from their accumulated savings deposits than in the same 4 months of 1950.

They redeemed \$329,000,000 more of series E Government bonds than they bought for January, February, March, and April in this year. In fact, they actually cashed in \$1,478,000,000 worth of E bonds in these 4 months, while at the same time another group bought only \$1,149,000,000 worth of E bonds, representing a net loss to the Treasury of \$329,000,000.

They withdrew \$90,000,000 net from their Postal savings in the first 4 months of this year.

These are not my figures or those taken from the research department of some labor or business or political organization. These are the Federal Reserve Board's own figures. We have then the situation of the Government pushing down at one point in our economy and the money gusher breaking out at another point with the economic damage far greater than if they left it alone.

As a result of regulation W, there are still those in this country unable to obtain the things they need for decent living. Dammed-up inventories are rising at the rate of \$1,000,000,000 a month. The stuff just cannot be moved through the ordinary channels of business. It is piled high in warehouses from coast to coast. The financing of these huge inventories requires new money, which adds further to the inflationary spiral.

While the power to regulate the relationship between buyer and seller is inherently evil and repugnant to the American's love of liberty, the enforcement of this power is still more repulsive to decent citizens who labor under the delusion that we still have personal freedom in this country. The power to enforce regulation W has been turned over to the Federal Reserve Board because the plot to destroy installment credit was hatched there many years ago.

The Federal Reserve Board is not even a Government agency, although many people think it is. It is an independent

group, subsidized by assessments against banks that support it. They have unlimited funds and they do not have to go to Congress for permission to spend them. There is no Government audit on how these funds are spent or for what purposes.

Recently, for example, the Federal Reserve Board spent over \$145,000 for a fake study designed to show us that regulation W is a good thing and should be continued. The study was made by the University of Michigan and it was tailored to meet the needs of the sponsors of regulation W. The university's study made a good case against unlimited use of installment credit, which is exactly what the Federal Reserve Board knew it would do when they signed the contract for the study. It was a fraudulent study from beginning to end, using all sorts of phony statistics to bolster their case. But, they came up with the right answer: Regulation W should be continued which is exactly what the Federal Reserve Board wanted them to say. Funds spent for this study was money poured down a rat hole but, as I say, they have plenty of it.

FEDERAL RESERVE BOARD IS PUTTING OUT PHONY FIGURES ABOUT INSTALLMENT DEBT IN DESPERATE EFFORT TO GET CONGRESS TO CONTINUE REGULATION W

Before going further with the enforcement features of regulation W I want to point out parenthetically that the Federal Reserve Board is accustomed to phony statistics, so that the Michigan fraud is nothing new to them. The Board itself uses fake figures and has peddled them all over the country. The Board, for instance, tells us that the amount of outstanding consumer debt totals \$19,000,000,000. This is such a palpable falsehood that I wonder that anyone accepts it. Yet it is used in all of the arguments for cutting down the installment credit business. In this \$19,000,000,000 figure is contained four billion of outstanding automobile debt. Now, of the outstanding automobile debt, almost a third is for commercial purposes and has nothing to do with individual debt, or consumer debt, as they call it. About \$500,000,000 of telephone bills are contained in this \$19,000,000,000 figure, and this again cannot in all fairness be called consumer debt, or installment debt. Over \$200,000,000 of utility bills are contained in the figure and what the connection is between a utility bill and installment credit is something I cannot understand.

In the \$19,000,000,000 figure is also included \$4,000,000,000 that the rich owe on their charge accounts, which are not regulated. Finally, to show you how dishonest and how ridiculous the Federal Reserve Board can get in an effort to fool the public, the 30-day credit a farmer receives at the feed store to buy the horse's hay is included in the \$19,000,000,000 of outstanding consumer debt.

FEDERAL RESERVE BOARD AGENTS ARE HOUNDING THE PEOPLE—BREAKING INTO HOMES IN SECRET SEARCH FOR VIOLATIONS OF REGULATION W—JUST LIKE THE KU KLUX KLAN

While, as I say, regulation W violates our personal liberties and is contrary to

everything we have fought for, its enforcement is downright sickening. Hundreds of Federal Reserve Board agents are roaming the country, hounding the people into confessions that they were in collusion with neighborhood merchants in violating regulation W. These Government night riders are raiding the homes of private citizens in a secret search for violators of installment credit controls.

Innocent victims of these raids are shocked at the Government's "Ku Klux Klan" tactics. The robber uses a gun and the Ku Klux Klan a white hood to spread terror. Federal Reserve Board agents use Government credentials as a moral blackjack to strike terror into the hearts of their victims and to extract confessions of wrongdoing.

These legalized hoodlums violate every concept of American liberty by invading homes to determine exactly what down payments were made on the owner's automobile, refrigerator, vacuum cleaner, television, of furniture. They can break into American homes at any time of the day or night to check sales slips and to force terrified housewives into revealing where they got the cash for certain merchandise.

We spill American blood to guarantee liberty for oppressed Koreans, at the same time snatching liberty from our own people. How can we gain world respect when our own hypocrisy is so well-known?

The Federal Reserve Board's chief enforcer of regulation W is one Leonard Townsend, the attorney who has been after L. M. Giannini and his Trans-America Co. for almost a decade. This Townsend is plenty smart and he is one of those bureaucratic empire builders I mentioned a moment ago. He saw the Giannini case petering out some time ago. He jumped on the regulation W bandwagon. He knew he would have to have a new project to keep himself and his hundreds of snoopers on the payroll. Regulation W was the best break Townsend has had in years.

Townsend has been visiting the Federal Reserve district offices in an effort to inspire prosecutions for violations of regulation W. If one district does not have as many violations as another, Townsend gives them a nudge and tells them to get going. He wants complaints and prosecutions, because without them his job will fold up.

The Government night riders do not invade the homes of the middle classes, the upper middle classes, and the rich. They know that this group is not covered by regulation W. They know that individuals in this group can have three televisions in their homes, if they want them, all paid for in cash. It is the lower-income groups, the backbone of our Nation, who are being kicked around. They must buy their household necessities on the installment plan. They are covered, therefore, by regulation W. It is here that the Federal night riders look for violations.

By turning over these vast and dangerous powers to the Federal Reserve Board, Congress tells the country that

the lower-income groups are to be deprived of refrigerators, furniture, and household appliances, but that the rich can have all they want. This is discrimination of the rankest kind and this weakness alone in regulation W should be enough to have us abolish it.

REGULATION W IS REPUGNANT TO THE AMERICAN MIND, DISCRIMINATES AGAINST THE LOWER-INCOME GROUPS, IS HARMING THE SMALL MERCHANT WHO GOES TO BANK FOR ADDITIONAL CREDIT

While we here are being called on to extend the Federal Reserve Board's authority over installment credit—in other words to pass a law which is inherently repulsive to the American mind and is unfair and discriminatory in effect—we are playing into the hands of big business, another feature of the regulation which its proponents forget to tell the Congress and the President of the United States.

Small merchants all over the country are hard hit by regulation W. They are being forced to carry large inventories and to obtain bank credit to hold on. In addition to the fact that this bank credit is highly inflationary, which I have already pointed out, it is expensive to the small-town merchant who depends on a quick turn-over of his goods to remain in business. But, if regulation W is continued much longer I am afraid that many of these merchants will be gobbled up by their big-time competitors.

The truth is that I see nothing good and everything bad in regulation W. It is not, as its sponsors say it is, a credit curb. It could not possibly, therefore, have any effect on inflation, except to force people to cash war bonds, which adds more fuel to the inflationary fires.

The regulation is an evil design conceived by our domestic enemies to upset democratic capitalism. Its enforcement is part of the reign of terror, strife and division of class which the conspirators envisioned many years ago when they first dreamed up this plot to destroy us. They did not want to destroy installment credit. They wanted to destroy America.

In view of this I shall move at the proper time to have regulation W ripped from the statute books. It has no place in a free America. Then I shall be anxious to see the votes of the great majority of this Congress who daily contend that they represent the common man—the little farmers, laborers, and small-business men.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HARRIS). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE] is recognized for 15 minutes.

THE VOICE OF AMERICA

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, we are fighting against our own best weapon—the Voice of America. It cannot be the cost of this program—a program which could turn the scales for peace, because the full cost is only a fraction of 1 percent of the total we are spending to halt Communist aggression.

When a supplemental appropriation of \$97,000,000 was requested by the President on April 5, in order to expand

freedom's campaign of truth to a total of \$208,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, the request was slashed 90 percent by the Appropriations Committees of the House and the Senate.

The committees decided to paralyze the one weapon that would give us the initiative so that they could spite the State Department.

As a result, the men in the Kremlin are breathing easier.

They could not have done a much better job of sabotage themselves.

That is why I believe that the Voice of America should be merged into a new Department of Information, established as an agency of Cabinet level and reporting directly to the President. It should be the public-relations instrument of the Government in our dealings with other nations, patterned after the practice of all large corporations and organizations, an agency of sufficient prestige to cooperate with the State Department, the Army, Navy, Air Force, and other departments in the formulation of a consistent policy that will win congressional support.

George Washington, with an eye to the main chance, organized a propaganda bureau during the Revolutionary War. So important did he consider this effort that he picked men of the stature of Thomas Jefferson, John Adams, and Benjamin Franklin to provide it with winning ideas. They managed to get guerrilla pamphlets behind the British lines, and sold 6,000 Hessian troops on the advisability of deserting.

We need to be reminded that it was politics almost as much as force of arms that won victory in World War I. We drove a wedge between the Kaiser and the German people by dropping leaflets from planes and balloons that reassured the people as to our intentions. "Germany," said General Ludendorff, "failed in the fight of intellects."

When World War II broke out, we did not try to minimize the value of psychological warfare. With encouraging realism, we set up a full-bodied agency under the name Office of War Information, and staffed it with the best minds we could get. That it helped to soften up the enemy's aggressive will is beyond question.

Why is it that in the present crisis that will go on for a long, long time, whether it be hot, cold, or expediently under wraps, that we let communism hold the initiative? Up to now we have not acted but reacted. We dance to their tune, usually waiting for them to call the play before we adopt counter-measures.

All the while we are missing our one big opportunity.

By setting up an iron curtain around his vast heartland, Stalin has admitted his one great fear. It is that the truth reaching through to his own people will encourage them to take matters into their own hands and bring the prison wall of communism down into the dust.

Why do we hesitate?

Is American energy, intelligence, and imagination afraid of itself?

Military, economic, and diplomatic measures do not round out the formula necessary for survival as long as we omit

or neglect the compelling duty to contact the Russian people and convince them of the better life outside that is being withheld from them by their masters, of our earnest desire for peace and mutual helpfulness, and of the hard fact that we are rearming only to defend ourselves from the very same tyranny that now enslaves the Russian people.

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

Mr. LANE. I yield.

Mr. GATHINGS. The gentleman is making a very fine speech. I commend him wholeheartedly, especially on that part of the speech in which he stated that we ought to go behind the iron curtain and bring our American ideals to those people who live back behind the curtain, even in Russia.

Mr. LANE. I thank the gentleman from Arkansas for his contribution.

The Soviets use the forum of the United Nations to spread the big lie in the United States, but seal us off from all touch with the Russian people and deny us the opportunity to bring home our factual side of the story to them.

The free exchange of information is as vital to us in our dealings with the peoples of other nations as it is in promoting understanding among groups and individuals here in the United States.

When any government refuses to extend to us the rights that we grant to it, there is but one recourse left. We must deliver the news of our actions and intentions, by every conceivable means, directly to the people of Russia.

For that job the Voice of America needs more money for material, facilities, and skilled personnel.

More than that, it needs the status of an independent agency, with a voice of its own in the shaping of those policies that will win cooperation and friendship for us throughout the world.

Stalin is not scared by the strenuous efforts being made by an aroused United States to rearm itself and its allies. This fits in with his theory that we will suffer an economic breakdown in the process. But it does give him the jitters to think of a revolt by his own people.

In the years from 1921 to 1941, there were more than 30 separate uprisings against the Soviet regime. Although they were poorly organized and soon crushed, they were symptoms of chronic discontent. Even today there are some 15,000,000 Russians in the concentration camps of their own government. It looks like Stalin fears a lot of his comrades.

We cannot win the friendship of the Russian people, or the Chinese people, or any others unless we communicate with them, and the VOA is the one remaining lifeline by which we can reach through to them now and as far as we can see into the uncertain future.

Many others have gambled with their lives to escape the clutch of communism. These people are the ones who can speak for the free Russia that millions of their kin must long for. They can inspire and guide the anti-Communist underground because they speak for Russia and against the oppressors in the Kremlin.

The Voice of America is a light in the dark that beams news to the Russian people past every obstacle that is calculated to keep the people in ignorance. Hour after hour Mrs. Kasenkina jumped from a window of the Soviet consulate in New York, rather than return to the so-called Communist paradise, word-of-mouth chain reaction to the story was spreading through Russia, thanks to the VOA. Expand this by a continuing stream of facts, and the day will come when the Communist tyranny will be overthrown by the Russian people themselves.

We have the best product in the world to sell to the Russian people. It is the hope of help from the free world to liberate them and give them the opportunity to attain the kind of life that they want—at peace with themselves and their neighbors.

We have the potential apparatus to get this message across to them. We possess all the means and methods if we but use them.

What is stopping us?

The Voice of America is the victim by association of the suspicions which, rightly or wrongly, are directed against the State Department. It also suffers from its junior status because it is not consulted in the shaping of the high-level policy that it is supposed to implement.

Free the Voice of America by making it an independent agency. Give it an appropriation that will permit the use of highly competent personnel to win public support the world over, for the truths that will bring peace and dignity to man.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted as follows to:

Mr. GRANGER.

Mr. KIRWAN, and to include an editorial from the Youngstown Vindicator.

Mr. HOWELL, and to include a letter.

Mr. GATHINGS, in two instances, in one to include an editorial.

Mr. ANGELL, and to include an article.

Mr. WOOD of Idaho, and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ABERNETHY, and to include an editorial.

Mr. REED of New York (at the request of Mr. HALLECK), and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. VURSELL.

Mr. VAN ZANDT, and to include two editorials.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska, in two instances.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska, and to include a newspaper article.

Mr. FELLOWS, and to include an editorial.

Mr. JAVITS, and to extend and include certain material on the New York rent-control law, notwithstanding the fact it exceeds the limit and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost \$184.50.

Mr. JAVITS, and include extraneous matter.

Mr. REES of Kansas, and to include a newspaper article.

Mr. WIDNALL, and to include a newspaper editorial.

Mr. NORBLAD, and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. D'EWART, and include a speech by General Eisenhower.

Mr. JUDD, in three instances, in each to include extraneous material.

Mr. PHILBIN.

Mr. RIBICOFF.

Mr. MULTER, in four instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FURCOLO, and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MADDEN, and include a letter from Elmer Bailey, an automobile dealer of Gary, Ind.

Mr. JENSEN, and include extraneous material.

Mr. TACKETT, in two instances, in each to include editorials.

Mr. JONES of Missouri, to revise and extend the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole and include extraneous matter.

Mr. YORTY, to revise and extend the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole and include extraneous matter.

Mr. LUCAS, to revise and extend the remarks made in general debate on the Defense Production Act Amendments of 1951 and include certain lists.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted to Mr. ANFUSO (at the request of Mrs. KELLY of New York), for Wednesday, June 27, on account of illness in the family.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1726. An act to change the date for the beginning of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the United States, including the Territory of Alaska, from the 1st day of July to the 1st day of November, and to extend the time during which annual assessment work on such claims may be made for the year beginning July 1, 1950, to the 1st day of November 1951; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. STANLEY, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

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;

H. R. 1424. An act for the relief of T. L. Morrow;

H. R. 1692. An act for the relief of Chester A. Macomber;

H. R. 1789. An act for the relief of Sgt. Benjamin H. Martin;

H. R. 1800. An act for the relief of the estate of Chin Hien Lee; and

H. R. 3229. An act for the relief of Mrs. Albert W. Lack.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. STANLEY, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that

that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

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;

H. R. 1424. An act for the relief of T. L. Morrow;

H. R. 1692. An act for the relief of Chester A. Macomber;

H. R. 1789. An act for the relief of Sgt. Benjamin H. Martin;

H. R. 1800. An act for the relief of the estate of Chin Hien Lee; and

H. R. 3229. An act for the relief of Mrs. Albert W. Lack.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 48 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, June 28, 1951, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

565. A letter from the Under Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a report of a proposed transfer to the city of Stamford, Conn., of one 30-foot fireboat for use in the protection of Stamford's industrial waterfront area, pursuant to section 6 of the act of August 7, 1946 (60 Stat. 897); to the Committee on Armed Services.

566. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the report on cooperation of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease, pursuant to Public Law 8, Eightieth Congress; to the Committee on Agriculture.

567. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting copies of orders of the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to the act of Congress approved July 1, 1948 (Public Law 863), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

568. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend or repeal certain laws relating to Government records, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

569. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed rescissions of amounts placed in reserve pursuant to section 1214 of the General Appropriation Act, 1951, in the amount of \$572,829,925 (H. Doc. No. 182); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

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. VINSON: Committee of Conference. H. R. 4200. A bill to make certain revisions in titles I through IV of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, as amended, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 656). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 287. Resolution for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 277 making appropriations for the fiscal year 1952, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 657). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. Sixth intermediate report; without amendment (Rept. No. 658). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. EBERHARTER: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 3181. A bill to continue until the close of June 30, 1952, the suspension of duties and import taxes on metal scrap, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 659). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARING:

H. P. 4619. A bill to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 4620. A bill to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CROSSER:

H. R. 4621. A bill to amend the Air Commerce Act of 1926, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H. R. 4622. A bill to change penalties for the sale of narcotics; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H. R. 4623. A bill to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 4624. A bill to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H. P. 4625. A bill to grant preference to certain quota immigrants who are the broth-

ers and sisters of citizens of the United States, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. R. 4626. A bill to amend sections 1505 and 3486 of title 18 of the United States Code relating to congressional investigations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 4627. A bill relating to the promotion of certain officers and former officers of the Army of the United States, or of the Air Force of the United States, or of any component thereof, retired for physical disability; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROGERS of Texas:

H. R. 4628. A bill granting the consent of Congress to a compact entered into by the States of Oklahoma, Texas, and New Mexico relating to the waters of the Canadian River; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H. R. 4629. A bill to prohibit the importation of certain articles and products containing raw materials with respect to which priorities have been established or allocations made under the Defense Production Act of 1950; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H. J. Res. 278. Joint resolution to continue for a temporary period the Defense Production Act of 1950, the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MORANO:

H. Con. Res. 133. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that Greece, Turkey, and Spain should be invited to become parties to the North Atlantic Treaty and members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. EARRETT:

H. Res. 288. Resolution favoring a protest in the United Nations against the arrest, confinement, and trial of Archbishop Josef Groesz; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

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

By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts: Memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts,

urging amendment of the Displaced Persons Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. KEARNEY:

H. R. 4630. A bill for the relief of Ayako Kimura; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 4631. A bill for the relief of Vincenzo Incorvaia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H. R. 4632. A bill to effect entry of a minor child adopted or to be adopted by United States citizens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SABATH:

H. R. 4633. A bill for the relief of Eugenia Marchetti Belluomini, Mirena Belluomini, and Salvatore Belluomini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILSON of Texas:

H. R. 4634. A bill for the relief of Johann Komma; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

327. By Mr. HART: Petition of the State of New Jersey withdrawing the application, to the Congress of the United States, to call a convention to propose amendments to the Constitution of the United States to authorize the United States to join in a World Federal Government; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

328. By Mr. HESELTON: Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts memorializing Congress to amend the Displaced Persons Act, so-called; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

329. By Mr. SADLAK: Petition of the Bridgeport Industrial Union Council, CIO, Bridgeport, Conn., containing some 400 signatures urging the Connecticut Members of Congress to work toward strengthening and extending the Defense Production Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.