Mr. President, within an hour of each other we have two releases from the same administration, one putting all the blame for the increased cost of living on the farmer, the other one saying that farm prices are declining and that the farmer is paying all-time high prices for what he is buying, thus putting the blame on other factors. The two contradictions lead me to wonder whether we can believe any statement at all coming from our Government in relation to the cost of living.

Each of the statements is made up to serve a particular purpose. Between them I suppose they are intended to assure the American people, whether consumers or producers, that the administration is with them. It appears to me to be a very ridiculous proceeding, particularly in view of the fact that the news items came over the ticker less than an hour apart.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the right of the floor is so ordered.

The motion was agreed to; and at 6 o'clock and 7 minutes p. m. the Senate took a recess until Monday, April 30, 1951, at 12 o'clock meridian.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the agreement of Friday last, the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. Chavez) is entitled to the floor.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

Mr. Chavez. Of course, it is understood that I will have the floor on Monday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arizona.

The motion was agreed to; and at 6 o'clock and 7 minutes p. m. the Senate took a recess until Monday, April 30, 1951, at 12 o'clock meridian.

RESOLUTIONS OF BOARD OF DIRECTORS, BALTIMORE (MD.) ASSOCIATION OF COMMERCE.

Mr. O'Conor. Mr. President, resolutions dealing with the necessity for reduction of nondefense spending and other vital matters affecting the administration of the Federal Government during these critical days were adopted by the board of directors of the Baltimore Association of Commerce last week. Favorably considered on the recommendation of the association's committee on national affairs, of which Frank B. Ober is chairman, the resolutions voice the considered opinion of the representative body of the businessmen of the Baltimore area and will find support I am sure, among businessmen from all sections of the country.

I send the four resolutions to the desk for appropriate reference.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolutions will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolutions presented by Mr. O'Conor were referred as follows:

A resolution adopted by the board of directors of the Baltimore (Md.) Association of Commerce, relating to nondefense spending; to the Committee on Appropriations, to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments;

A resolution adopted by the board of directors of the Baltimore (Md.) Association of Commerce, relating to the reactivation of the War Damage Corporation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. Hayden, from the Committee on Appropriations:

H. R. 3067. A bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 309);

S. 1118. A bill for the relief of Philip J. Hincks; with an amendment (Rept. No. 304);

S. 1227. A bill for the relief of sundry former students of the Air Reserve Officers' Training Corps; without amendment (Rept. No. 305);

S. 1254. A bill for the relief of Athanasios Elias Cheliotis; with an amendment (Rept. No. 306).

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. Hendrickson:

S. 1413. A bill for the relief of Maja Sksto Erkkiia (also known as Maja Sksto Leskine); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. Young (for himself and Mr. Lange):

S. 1413. A bill to permit the retention of oil, gas, and other natural resources in hands condemned by the United States for waterway improvement purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'Connor:

S. 1414. A bill for the relief of the E. J. Albrecht Co.; and

S. 1415. A bill to amend the War Claims Act of 1946; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. Anderson (for himself, Mr. Lehman, and Mr. Nixon):

S. 1416. A bill to amend the War Claims Act of 1946, as amended, to provide compensation for unpaid compulsory labor and inhumane treatment of prisoners of war; and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. Atchen:

S. 1417. A bill for the relief of Lefrancos and Chamberland, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1951—AMENDMENTS

Mr. Green (for himself and Mr. Pastore) submitted amendments intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (H. R. 3842) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.
ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THIS APPENDIX

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

By Mr. LODGE:

An address discussing foreign policy and domestic administration, delivered by him to the Republican 21 Club of Massachusetts, at Worcester, Mass., on April 28, 1951.

By Mr. WYNYARD:

Address on the subject Export of America's Freedoms, delivered by him and broadcast from Station WON in Chicago on April 26, 1951.

By Mr. MARTIN:

Excerpt from an address by him on the policy of the United States in Asia, delivered before the Pennsylvania Greeter's Association, Chapter No. 41, in Washington, Pa., April 28, 1951.

By Mr. MARTIN:


By Mr. MARTIN:

Editorial entitled "Alternatives in Korea," from the Oil City (Pa.) Derrick of April 11, 1951, expressing the views of the author as promulgated by General MacArthur on the Korean War.

By Mr. IVEY:


By Mr. WILLIAMS:


By Mr. THYE:

Letter addressed by Hon. Harold E. Stassen to Mr. President, requesting reconsideration of the President and Gen. Douglas MacArthur, and an editorial from the New York Herald Tribune of April 22, 1951.

By Mr. THYE:

An editorial entitled "This business farm "as usual is a worry," discussing factors entering into a possible reduced agricultural production, written by Paul Martin published in the Prairie Farmer of April 21, 1951.

By Mr. BENTON:

Article entitled "Farmer talks to Lyford regarding the reaction in Italy to the MacArthur incident," published in the Hartford Times.

PRICE CONTROLS AS APPLIED TO LIVE­STOCK AND MEAT INDUSTRY—LETTER FROM GOVERNING BOARD OF MINNE­SOTA LIVESTOCK BREEDERS' ASSOCIA­TION

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record, as follows:

Mr. Michael DiSalle, Price Stabilization Administrator, Office of Price Stabilization, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DISALLE: The governing board of the Minnesota Livestock Breeders' Association met in the office of its secretary, Mr. J. B. Jones, on Monday, April 16, 1951, and reaffirmed the position taken by its membership, consisting of approximately 2,500 breeders and others, at the annual convention of the association, held last February at the University of Minnesota on February 2, 1951, relative to price controls as they apply to the livestock and meat industry.

Representatives of the livestock and meat industries do not wish the inflation. For example, they do not know from experience gained in World War II that price controls do not cure the disease, but only add to the problem. They know that restrictions reduce the supply of meat and increase inflationary pressures. They also believe that the domestic problem confronting the people of America today is that of defending the purchasing power of the dollar. They realize that if this is not done, their savings, savings bonds, and insurance contracts will not be worth much to them in the future.

The answer to this inflationary problem is increased production and a cut-back in purchasing power. The farm people believe that they can increase their production level to a point equal to, or above, that attained during World War II. This can be accomplished through increased use of commercial fertilizers, the employment of new varieties of seed, and efficient types of equipment. The increased production of livestock and meat will also result in the development of "black markets" due, largely, to the fact that livestock cannot be controlled at its source. Whenever we depart from the functioning of the free market, through the application of price controls, the Government will have to assume the responsibility for doing those things that are normally done by price in the free market. The farm people fully believe that move will soon be accompanied by rationing and subsidies.

Perhaps the greatest objection to the price control program is that it typifies the very thing this country is fighting to avoid, namely, the Government regula­tions on the free market system, which in the past has made this country great. Imperative that controls be applied sparingly, lest the productive energies and the initiative of our people be so dulled that they may never again recover.

Those enaged in the livestock business realize that those sections of the Defense Production Act which provide for the imposition of controls will expire on June 30, 1951. Undoubtedly, hearings on this measure will be held sometime within the near future. The members of the Minnesota Livestock Breeders' Association are definitely of the opinion that the price control program as developed can be, and should be, thrown out. They believe that if it were possible to apply effective controls on cereal grains, including not only the prices of all commodities, but the wages and salaries of labor as well, it might be the thing at this particular time, but they think that we must be realistic and practical and recognize that this cannot be done. Wages have been "thawed out," as you know, through the recognition of escalator clauses, annual improvement factors, and other similar developments, which started Jan. 1, 1950, and the exemption of Federal, State, and municipal employees.

The livestock and meat industry is def­initely in a chaotic situation today. The members of the Minnesota Livestock Association sincerely believe that the answer to the inflationary problem is increased production, which can be held by the Government maintains a policy of "hands off," and through the curbing of purchasing power by modification of the monetary and fiscal policies of the Federal Government.

Price and wage controls are not the answer to the problem. Our Federal Government insists on continuing its efforts to develop a price and wage control program, the live­stock and meat industries are very much afraid that this production will be cut back at a time when all­ out production is needed, and that this country will lose its freedoms in the process.

Very truly yours,

MINNESOTA LIVESTOCK BREEDERS' ASSOCIATION

J. S. JONES, Secretary.

THE RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPO­RATION—STATEMENT BY HON. HER­BERT HOOVER

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Record, as follows, a statement by former President Herbert Hoover before the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency this morning during the consideration by the committee of a measure to abolish the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

There being no objection, the state­ment was ordered to be printed in full:

STATEMENT BY HERBERT HOOVER BEFORE SENATE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY, APRIL 30, 1951

Your committee has requested me to advise you of my views upon the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. I presume this request arises from the original creation of the RFC by former President Taft, and from the investigation into it by the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, of which I was chairman.

1. I believe that the RFC should be liquidated.

2. It should be liquidated by its new Administrator.

3. I believe some facilities for loans in the small business field should be continued under other organizations.

Stabilization for credit in this area cannot have any very long-lasting effect of 6 years. The 6-year average of the number of businesses operating is almost 4,000,000, and the number of businesses started since about $400,000 annually. From the number of loans under $100,000 made by the RFC—and assuming they were necessary—the relative figures indicate that probably 99 percent of small businesses managed to finance themselves otherwise.

Be that as it may, the need should be tested out. The Federal Reserve banks are already engaged in guaranteeing loans for defense production. Therefore, I suggest that their authority be extended to a 100 percent guaranty (where necessary) of small business loans and to administrative Reserve banks should be indemnified by the Government against losses. A small organi­zation should be set up by the Department to guide this purpose. But such loans should be restricted: (a) they should not exceed $100,000 in aggregate; (b) that the RFC and the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency Committee recommended 2 years ago) be made only where public interests are involved and not solely in the interest of the borrower.

4. I believe the collateral activities of the RFC should be transferred to appropriate de­partments where definite responsibility of a Cabinet officer or single-individual adminis­trator can be established. For instance, the
rubber business should be transferred to the Department of Commerce; the tin smelting that is the basis of the great economic potential of the Defense Department; or to the Director of Defense Mobilization, who already have such authorities.

REASONS FOR THESE RECOMMENDATIONS

(a) Emergency agencies for defense production cannot be already in motion and the RFC is not needed in this field.

(b) If a national emergency in credit should arise, as it has in 1930, Congress, at any such time, can quickly create the necessary institution. Of great importance is the fact that in time of emergency, the Government can command the best talent in the country. It can not maintain such talent in other times.

(c) The last time the Congress was considering extension of the authority of the RFC I recommended (May 30, 1947) that it be retained as an inactive standby institution for 2 or 3 years in a restricted field. Instead it has been most active.

(d) The RFC was founded in 1932 to meet the emergency of a national collapse of credit, stringent requirements were set by law, for a specific purpose, and the absence of other sources of credit. Since that time, the requirements have been relaxed by legislation passed in January 1935, April 1938, May 1938, and June 1948. As a result, the institution now undertakes to finance, by legislation, anything, domestic and sometimes even foreign, on most any terms it pleases.

(e) In my view when it enters the non-emergency area of loans in excess of $100,000, its social and economic purpose becomes obscured in support of risky business, and in bailing out creditors on a large scale. It would appear from the Fulbright hearings that the operation of the RFC for the past 4 or 5 years really shows a great loss. I see no reason why the taxpayers' money should be used to subsidize larger peacetime and sometimes even emergency area of loans in excess of $100,000, if it is not needed in that field.

(f) This area of loans in excess of $100,000 is where the great dangers to the Nation have occurred. That loans of this character have led to favoritism and corruption has been demonstrated by the exposures of the Postmaster General. Corruption in business government is far wider in effect than corruption in private business. Corruption in business affects the character and ability of employers or owners. Corruption in Government affects the pockets of all taxpayers, but far worse, it affects the character of a people and lowers their respect for government.

(g) The wisdom of the management of the RFC in recent years is seriously challenged by that incontestable test of results. These results have been exposed by the Fulbright committee. It is doubtful if wisdom can be maintained in such widespread Government action requiring the utmost good judgment. Under any new administration a large part of the decisions must be delegated. And delegation by bureaucracy cannot always find such skilled and honest men as are required that the test of public interest has been little applied. The public interest in several of the large loans has been questioned by the Fulbright committee. I append some lists of a few samples.

(h) The institution now has nearly 3,000 employees and a great overhead. The Federal Reserve banks could administer the small-business loans with a minor staff. The Federal Reserve personnel are of high order of character and ability. Also, they understand the loaning of money.

REPUBLIC ON THE RFC BY THE COMMISSION ON ORGANIZATION OF THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH OF THE GOVERNMENT

The reports and recommendations of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government on the RFC are now due to the President.

The task force recommendations

The Commission’s task force for this examination was set up on the suggestion of Sec­retary of Defense J. Frank Pace, Jr., a member of the Commission. The Secretary recommended that Mr. Paul Brady, of Price Waterhouse & Co., public accountants, be made chairman of this task force. Mr. Grady was a former Assistant Secretary of the Navy handling finance matters. He was supported by an advisory committee of able men.

This task force recommended the liquidation of all RFC loans in excess of any necessary lending of this character in the Federal Reserve banks under a system of guar­antees. The Commission recommended disposal of the collateral activities. They made alternative recommendations in case liquidation was not possible. These rec­ommendations call for a most vigorous re­organization with greater safeguards on loans if the institution was to continue.

The Commission’s recommendations

The Commission itself made a number of recommendations in respect to this agency. The Commission did not agree upon liquidation of these loans. However, the Commission agreed upon a condemnation of direct lend­ing by the RFC to persons or enterprises, except in national emergencies, saying that it “Opens up dangerous possibilities of waste and favoritism * * * it invites political and private pressure or even corruption.”

We recommended that Congress review at once the powers of the RFC so as to produce “economy, efficiency, and integrity.”

It was further recommended that greater restrictions should be placed on loans.

We also recommended that the normal channels of credit should be used by guar­anteed loans “through private or other es­tablished agencies.”

We recommended that the placing of some of the collateral activities in other agencies be­ter able to administer them.

We further recommended that the whole organization be placed in the Treasury De­partment, with responsibility for its admin­istration vested in the Secretary of the Treasury.

The factual matter and recommendations of the Commission and the task force appear in several places in the Commission’s state­ments. For the convenience of this committee, I offer the record for an assembly of the scattered parts.

Selected loans to distillers, brewers, and other bat­teries, June 30, 1930

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distiller/Compan</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Undisbursed loan balance</th>
<th>Unpaid loan balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United Distillers of America, Inc.</td>
<td>Cleveland, Ohio</td>
<td>$381,500</td>
<td>$315,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston Distillers Co., Ltd., New York</td>
<td>New York, N.Y.</td>
<td>$315,000</td>
<td>$315,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvard Brewing Co., Lowell, Mass.</td>
<td>Lowell, Mass.</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Thirty-nine lessee-sold loans made for bars, ranging from $6,000 to $1,000,000 in 23 States;

(2) Seventeen loans made to theaters and bowling alleys, ranging from $17,000 to $1,000,000. The drawback of these loans to beauty parlors, pool rooms, and a snake farm. What public interest there can be in operations of these types of business at the taxpayers' risk is difficult to see;
Simburg, Harry and Jennie (Hotel Sorrento), Miami Beach, Fla., Oct. 26, 1949. $1,000,000.00

Civic Hotel Corp. of Odessa, Odessa, Tex., Feb. 27, 1950... 650,000.00

Jack Benkel, Hot Springs, Ark.: Unpaid loan balance, June 30, 1950. 555,000.00

Borgman Hotel Corp., Tex., Jan. 30, 1950. 415,429.00

The Virgin Isle Hotel, Inc., Trunk Bay, St. John, Virgin Islands. Unpaid loan balance, June 30, 1950. 400,000.00

Tahoe Biltmore Hotel, Inc., Crystal Bay, Mo.. 270,000.00

Borger Hotel
Tahoe Biltmore Hotel, Inc., Knutson Hotel
Hereford Community Hotel
Shore Club
Carlton
Tower Courts, Dallas, Tex.: Unauthorized balance as Casa Blanca Hotel, Apr. 3, 1949. 35,000.00
Woodlawn Club, authorization April 24, 1949. 145,000.00
Charles Pink Fischer and Vera Fischer, doing business as Sandpiper Inn, Fort Walton, Fla., Jan. 26, 1950. 32,000.00
Frontier Motel, Wilcox, Ariz.: Amount authorized. 25,000.00
Remora Lodge, Inc., Lyndon, Vt.: Amount authorized. 16,000.00
Cactus Courts, Carlsbad, N. Mex.: Gross amount. 22883.00
Rock Creek Camp, Whitesboro, Tex.: Amount authorized. 11,446.00
Mission Trailer Park, Tulare, Calif.: Amount authorized. 9,000.00

THE RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION—STATEMENT BY HON. MAR RINER S. ECCLES

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the body of the Record a statement by Hon. Marriner S. Eccles, member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, on April 27, 1951, before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, which is considering legislation to abolish the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

STANMENT OF MARRINER S. ECCLES, MEMBER, BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM, BEFORE THE SENATE BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE CONSIDERING LEGISLATION TO ABOLISH THE RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am greatly honored by your invitation to appear here this morning and give my reasons why I feel that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation should be abolished. I am speaking for myself and not for the Federal Reserve Board. I am speaking as one who has been in Government service for the past 17 years and who, during that entire period, has taken an active part in helping to solve the problems of maintaining economic stability within the framework of our democratic society. I have, ever since the termination of the war, viewed with grave misgivings the continuation and expansion of the Government in the field of private lending. There are sound and indisputable reasons why the RFC should be abolished. With your permission I shall present, as briefly and directly as possible, what I consider to be the most important reasons.

INFLATION AND ITS CONTROL

Throughout the postwar period, and particularly since the Korean invasion, the country has experienced a most serious inflationary development. This was brought about by too much money and credit in the hands of the public relative to the goods and services available in the market. The RFCs have contributed to this inflation. Instead of liquidating its outstanding credits during this period, added to inflationary pressures by extending its lending activities and those of its affiliate, FNMA. Inflation has greatly depreciated the purchasing power of the dollar, and as a result the cost of living has increased approximately 40 percent since the end of the war. This has been a most serious and unjustified development, and should not have been permitted. Inflation has worked its injustice upon large numbers of our people; it has injured most the aged, the pensioners, the widows, and others disabled by the burdens and members of our society. Inflation diminishes our incentives to work, to save, and to plan for the future, and it is affecting the very foundations of our free democratic society.

With a rapid increase in defense expenditures immediately confronting us, prevention of further inflation will be difficult. If it is to be avoided, all of us must support fiscal monetary, and credit measures essential to its control. With full utilization of our manpower and raw materials, it is imperative that the Federal cash budget be maintained on a pay-as-you-go basis. This is necessary to assure the transfer of funds from the Government to the pay for the goods and services that are transferred. Otherwise, more funds will accumulate in the hands of the public than there are goods and services available for the public to buy. Such a condition will lead to further inflation. The development of the credit expansion, taxes have already been raised and will have to be raised further to keep pace with the increase in defense expenditures.

However, the success of an anti-inflationary program depends more than a balanced budget. Despite the existence of a substantial budgetary surplus since Korea, a very rapid growth of bank credit has intensified inflationary pressures. As taxes increase, efforts to offset the resulting reduction in incomes give rise to increased demands for all types of credit, thereby tending to minimize the effects of a balanced budget. For this reason, an adequate program of credit restraint is essential to the success of a pay-as-you-go tax program.

Such a program of credit restraints has been developed, including control of consumer credit through regulation W, of real estate mortgage credit through Regulation X, and of business credit through the voluntary credit restraint program provided for in the Defense Production Act of 1950 and under the supervision of the Federal Reserve Board. The need for further legislation to curb the growth of bank credit is being considered. Most important of all, the monetary and fiscal authorities have just recently reached an accord with reference to the management of the public debt that may go far toward check expansion, providing a balanced budget is maintained. All of the measures so adopted have received endorsement and support in congressional and financial circles, as well as by the general public.

GOVERNMENT LENDING INCONSISTENT WITH ANTI-INFLATIONARY POLICY

The Government is obviously very inconsistent when it acts to balance the Federal budget and restrain credit expansion to prevent inflation, while at the same time continuing force and effect lending activities of Government agencies such as the RFC. There is no logical basis for restricting the flow of good private credit, and at the same time permitting and encouraging the granting of unemployment loans by Government agencies to the private economy.

We must recognize that the conditions under which the RFC came into existence were different from those prevailing at the present time. It presents the depths of the greatest economic depression in our history for the purpose of providing
emergency financial assistance to banks and other financial institutions. Subsequently, its authority was broadened to include loans to nonfinancial business concerns under certain conditions. In the early thirties, no one seriously questioned the need for a temporary Government agency such as the RFC as an emergency measure which was forcing all financial institutions, as a matter of self-preservation, to liquidate all outstanding credits.

We have long since recognized and corrected most of the weaknesses that brought about our economic collapse in the thirties. We have greatly strengthened our commercial banking system and provided for a reserve of bank deposits; we have provided for regulation and supervision of security flotation and the organization of the organized securities exchanges; and the Government has recognized by statute its obligation to assist in the maintenance of maximum employment and has provided extensive social security for a large number of the people. In addition, we have improved our techniques of credit and regulation and use of monetary, credit, and fiscal policies for purposes of achieving and maintaining economic stability. For these reasons, the necessity for continuing the RFC as an emergency financial institution no longer exists.

The problems confronting the country today are the very opposite of those which confronted us when the RFC was first established. In our present situation, the operations of the RFC, as well as those of FHA, in continuing to put additional funds on the market only intensify the already difficult problem of curbing credit expansion. Having long since outlived its original purpose, the RFC should be abolished without further delay.

NO NEED FOR DIRECT GOVERNMENT FINANCING

There is no real place in a private enterprise economy for direct Government lending to the private economy, any more than there is a place for direct Government ownership of the means of production. Government participation in either activity is socialistic in nature and will, if continued and expanded, weaken and ultimately destroy the private enterprise system. The Government's function is to regulate and supervise the activities of private enterprise in the public interest and provide for adequate tax-free financing or production organizations in competition with those that are private. If the RFC is not abolished and expanded, we might feel differently about the RFC if our private financing facilities and resources were unable to provide the credit required to utilize as fully as possible the labor and materials available in the economy. But such is not the case at the present time.

There are located throughout the United States more than 14,000 commercial banks, over 600 life-insurance companies, more than 500 mutual savings banks, and nearly 9,000 savings and loan associations. In addition, there are numerous mortgage companies, sales of project property, industrial loan associations, and other financing institutions. Each and every one of them, operating within the existing framework, are in competition with one another. These institutions, in competition with numerous other institutions, is enhanced in extending credit, in controlling, modifying and participating in spending and investment policies, to meet all of the legitimate needs of a private enterprise economy. In fact, the private financing institutions are competitive and derive their earnings from the loans and investments which they make in an assurance that the necessary credit requirements of the economy are being, and will continue to be, met. The combined resources at the disposal of these institutions are enormous; as of December 31, 1950, the commercial banking system had savings and loans of $290,000,000,000 of loans, investments, and other assets, and they are adding billions of dollars to these assets every year.

To continue the existence of the RFC in competition with our private financing institutions is completely indefensible if we really believe in our private-enterprise economy. This is because the RFC's only source of funds is the Federal Treasury, while the Treasury's only source of funds is the private economy through taxes and by borrowing to meet a budgetary deficit. Using these funds to make loans that cannot be secured as a profit to the RFC, is to employ funds obtained from the entire public in making questionable loans for the benefit of a select few. It is obviously unfair for the Government to subsidize with credit those business concerns which cannot stand on their own feet, but, nevertheless, are competing for sales and profits with concerns that have to obtain the funds they use in the private market. In other words, the RFC's only reason for being is to compete with our private financing institutions.

The RFC is designed to make or guarantee loans to companies whose interests either are not of the public interest, or who cannot secure credit on reasonable terms from customary sources. Under this arrangement heavy private losses have been incurred by the RFC, a very small fraction of which the Government and the taxpayer, has recognized by statute its obligation to assist the country in an emergency. For this reason RFC was authorized by the Act of Congress of March 19, 1932, to guarantee loans to credit-worthy borrowers who would have been unable to provide the credit required to non-financial business concerns under certain conditions. Subsequently, the RFC was directed to make or guarantee loans to credit-worthy borrowers who incurred substantial losses at the disposal of the RFC, to facilitate defense production.

The RFC has applied for, and been granted, there would be great criticisms of the RFC by the would-be borrowers and their political representatives. If it does grant questionable loans in response to political requirements, then, as the recent investigation has shown, it will be bitterly criticized by the public. So long as there is a Government lending agency like the RFC there will be great and undeniable demand for new and unused credits. This will put all Members of Congress under more or less political pressure to assist applicants in receiving such credit. I think in these circumstances Members of Congress would be the first ones to want to liquidate the RFC and be relieved of the pressures which they have to provide these credits and can serve no useful public purpose.

Aside from the economic considerations which I have enumerated above, there are strong collateral reasons for abolishing the RFC. It has already been demonstrated that where a Government agency is in competition in loaning large amounts of funds to the voting public, its ethical and moral standards deteriorate over a period of time as a result of inevitable political pressures. This has the unfortunate effect of tending to destroy the confidence of the people in their Government.

CREDIT FOR DEFENSE PURPOSES

In letting defense contracts, priority should be given to those prime contractors or subcontractors who have the necessary skill, productive facilities, and financial resources. However, it may be necessary for the RFC, as in World War II, to facilitate defense production by giving some contracts to those who do not have the adequate facilities and cannot obtain them from private financing institutions. In such cases, some Government backing may be provided, and credit should be provided in the form of a Government guaranty of private credit and not by a direct Government loan. Such guarantees would be most effectively handled under a single program, such as the Regulation V program which was used by the RFC in 1942 to regulate the Federal Reserve banks and their branches throughout the country gained extensive experience in authorizing guarantees on $6,600,000,000 of loans, amounting to over $10,000,000,000. The net result of the V-loan operation was a net profit of $26,000,000,000 from the loan guarantee fees charged, after deducting all expenses and losses.

Under the V-loan program, a defense contractor or subcontractor could get a defense production loan who was unable to obtain the necessary credit may apply for a guaranteed loan to the Federal Reserve bank or other financial institution which would be backed by the RFC and approved by the RFC. The RFC would not have the special facilities required to provide adequate managerial and technical assistance to small business, and it should be left to private enterprises to develop them, as well as to supply whatever capital and credit are needed, especially under emergency conditions.

RFC LENDING SUBJECT TO POLITICAL PRESSURE

One of the most striking facts brought to the recent investigation of the RFC is the extent to which certain activities have been subject to political influence. The RFC is designated to make or guarantee loans to companies whose interests either are not of the public interest, or who cannot secure credit on reasonable terms from customary sources. Under this arrangement heavy private losses have been incurred by the RFC, a very small fraction of which the Government and the taxpayer, has recognized by statute its obligation to assist the country in an emergency. For this reason RFC was authorized by the Act of Congress of March 19, 1932, to guarantee loans to credit-worthy borrowers who incurred substantial losses at the disposal of the RFC, to facilitate defense production.
applications. Upon approval by the guar­
antees, the borrower must pay in the full amount of the loan and a fee is paid
covering the guaranteed portion of the loan.

The guarantee fee ranges from 10 to 40 per

cent of the interest rate on the loan, depend­
ing upon the percentage of the loan guar­
anteed. In practically every case the banks carry
in the guarantee. Not only is the financing decen­
tralized, but the local banks have a real inter­
est in the process. It is being centered in those industries essential to the
defense effort.
The existence of the V-loan program to
provide essential defense credit makes un­
necessary the continued existence of the RFC
for this purpose.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, I ask
unanimous consent to place in the
Record the eloquent tribute paid to the late
Senator Vandenberg in honor of his
service. That triumphant, courageous,
and valiant leader of the Senate, our
Great Christian Senator, Arthur Hendrick Vandenberg, whose
life was such a source of inspiration to
mankind, is no more.

In the spring of 1951, Senator Vandenberg was more concerned with the
freedom of our fellow citizens than he
was with his own, though he was fighting
for his life. He gave his all, and we are
grateful for the splendid results of his
service. That Senator Vandenberg has
passed is a tremendous loss to our
nation. We mourn the passing of our great
Christian Senator, Arthur Hendrick
Vandenberg.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield for a question.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, it seems to be that we are considering a
very important piece of legislation. I
have listened with great interest to the
arguments presented by the distin­
guished Senator from New Mexico. I
believe it is very important that Sena­
tors be on the floor to listen to the pres­
tation of both sides of the issue, and I
am wondering whether the dis­
tinguished Senator from New Mexico would
yield for the purpose of having a quorum
call.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I may say to my very
good friend from Nebraska that I be­
lieve he is correct. There is not a piece
of legislation before us which is more
important to the American people than
the pending bill. For that reason I shall
be very glad to yield for a quorum call,
provided that I thereby do not lose the
floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, without
prejudicing the rights of the Sena­
tors from New Mexico, I suggest the ab­
sence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The
Chair lays before the Senate the unfin­
ished business.

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The
Senator from New Mexico has the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the
distinguished Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield for a question.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, what are
the provisions of the bill (S. 984) to amend the
Agricultural Act of 1949?
Mr. WHERY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for one question?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes.

Mr. WHERY. I thank the distinguished Senator for his statement. I agree with him implicitly that we should focus upon the bill before us, direct our attention to it, amend it and pass it or vote against it. But I think the Senate is right from New Mexico has been very patient during the past 3 or 4 days.

Mr. President, I made a statement to a colleague where there being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE MACARTHUR OUTBURST

From almost any angle you look at it, the storm now swirling around General MacArthur is deplorable. What remains of our national unity is in danger of being destroyed by the supercharged lightning flashes of emotion generated by personal and political partisanship. We discern but one hopeful ray in the lightning-riven clouds: if the conflict can be brought under control and carried on calmly on the basis of the issues involved, it may become the last Great Debate on United States foreign policy.

The one Herbert Hoover touched off 6 months ago, apparently with the Senate's troops-to-Europe resolution of April 4, dealt largely with our policy for Europe. Our far-eastern policy, or lack of it, was not formally debated in the Senate. The MacArthur incident, for better or worse, has made such a discussion inevitable. We can only hope that it will be productive of a renewed national unity.

Already, as Walter Lippmann observed in the present case of China, there is confusion as to what General MacArthur meant in his now celebrated letter to Congressman Martin. The general, as the columnist pointed out, wanted more than permission to bomb Red China's Manchurian bases and to use the Formosa forces of Chiang Kai-shek against the Chinese mainland. The general wanted permission to wage a full-scale war against China. Contending that the global conflict with communism has already begun, the general argued that it must be won by defeating Red China. The way to save Europe, he said, is to defeat communism in Asia.

That involves an almost complete reversal of our present policy. The United States and its allies have long since decided to concentrate on Europe while diverting the necessary minimum to prevent a Communist sweep in Asia. The fundamental issue is therefore clear-cut: Shall the United States abandon its present efforts to safeguard Europe and devote its resources chiefly to a full-scale war with Red China?

Those who join General MacArthur in an affirmative answer to this fateful question should not overlook these considerations:

1. If we decide to join the issue in Asia, we shall have to do it alone. Our Atlantic allies, the Asian-Arab nations, and the Latin-Americans will not support us.

2. The Attacking China theory that the U. S. S. R. will not come to her aid is not a calculated risk—it is the wildest sort of gambler.

3. Our big strategic bombers, on which we now rely to deter Russia in the west, will be of little military value, would infuriate our European allies, the Asian-Arab nations, and the Latin-Americans will not support us.

4. Our long-neglected tactical Air Force is still woefully unready for a major conflict.
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5. If even Russia did not intervene in China, she would be powerfully tempted to take advantage of or to join forces with other enemies of the West, including Britain, acquiring thereby tremendous war-making potential.

6. Though most people are aware that our success in the field of nonmilitary relationships, the field in which we have been organized to properly organize to take action.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Maurer, one of its resident clerks, communicated to the Senate the intelligence of the death of Hon. Frank B. B. Representative, of the State of Pennsylvania, and transmitted the resolutions of the House thereon.

SUPPLYING OF AGRICULTURAL WORKERS FROM MEXICO

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

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I have asked my good friend, the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. Kerr), to wait a little longer, which he referred to the Declaration of Independence. Prior to the time when the Senator from Oklahoma made his statement, I saw a copy of it, and I told him that I would yield 1 minute to him for the purpose of presenting his statement, because I intended to use it in opposing the proposed legislation contained in Senate bill 984. So I wish to thank the Senator from Oklahoma for making that statement.

Mr. President, the Declaration of Independence had a real purpose. It is a rather short document, but it tells a great deal:

When in the course of human events—

What were the colonists talking about there? The colonists in America, from Georgia to New Hampshire, were referring to the events which were affecting them at the moment. Those colonists were in this country prior to the Declaration of Independence. Many of them not only fought in 1776, but also fought for the soldiers who fought the French at Louisburg, and forever drove the French, as a political entity, from Canada.

So, Mr. President, we have the immortal words:

When in the course of human events, it becomes necessary for one people to dissolve the political bands which have connected them with another, and to assume among the people of the earth, the separate and equal station to which the laws of nature and of nature’s God entitle them, a decent respect to the opinions of mankind requires that they should declare the causes which impel them to the separation.

Mr. President, that was in 1776, but we should remember that the political revolution did not begin in that year. So far as the American colonists were concerned, the political revolution began in 1750 or 15 years before the Declaration of Independence was drawn up. Of course, the fighting occurred afterward; but the thinking of John Adams, Samuel Adams, Franklin, Washington, and Jefferson began and continued for a long, long time before the fighting commenced and the Declaration of Independence was drawn up.

Mr. President, I love the Declaration of Independence. As a result of that declaration of American independence in the Revolutionary War—the actual military operations, which involved considerable loss of life on the part of the American colonists—they formed a new country and established a Constitution, which today is the law of our land.

Let me read from the preamble of the Constitution, which states its purpose:

We, the people of the United States—

They were talking about the American people, not about people anywhere else; not the people of a foreign country. Much as I like to agree, and do agree, with what the Senator from Minnesota stated as to the desirability of our being kind to and charitable to others, I still think we owe a duty to the people of the United States. What was the purpose and objective of the founding fathers in drafting the Constitution, Mr. President? It is stated in the preamble of the Constitution as follows—in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice—

In all kindness, I may say to my good friend who is sponsoring this bill that one of the purposes of the Constitution of the United States to “establish justice” is not being fulfilled by a bill which would create a preference for foreign slave labor as against American labor, against American citizens. Is this bill designed to establish justice? How will it establish justice when preference is given to an alien over a citizen of the State of Pennsylvania, for instance, in the field of labor and employment? Under this bill, as described by the Senator from Louisiana, the alien laborer may have all advantage over the domestic laborer. Does that fulfill the purposes of the Constitution?

Another purpose of the Constitution is to “insure domestic tranquility.” There are millions of workers throughout the United States who are in need of work; yet some employers are so selfish and greedy that they prefer to employ a foreign worker to an American who may have lost a job fighting for his country in Korea or elsewhere.

Another purpose of the Constitution is “to provide for the common defense.” In order to provide for the common defense, it is of course necessary to have money, which must be raised by taxes. Who pays the taxes? The American citizen. Under this pending bill an alien who came to this country to engage in the work contemplated would not be required to pay taxes. A poor American laborer who may work for less would be forced to earning a little money with which to enable him to pay taxes.

A further purpose of the Constitution is “promote the general welfare.” I ask Senators who have been kind enough to listen to my remarks, and our guests in the gallery who are listening to me now, how is the general welfare of the United States to be promoted if slave
labor, peon labor from another country, is preferred over that of our own citizens? Another purpose of the Constitution is to "secure the blessings of liberty." When I began my speech last Friday, I stated that peonage had been nonexistent in American life since 1865. We do not want it to return. The blessings of liberty cannot be secured on the basis of cheap wages paid to slave labor of the type specified by the bill.

The preamble to the Constitution concludes: "and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America."

The Constitution is the law of the land. No matter how charitably inclined we may be, no matter how kind—and we are kindly disposed toward the other peoples of the world, as shown by the fact that we feed hungry peoples of the world—it is unwise and unsafe to prevent an American laborer from being employed, even at hard labor, when work is available, if we use legislation which would give a preference to one particular country as against the other countries of the world.

Yes, the pending bill could be passed within a matter of moments, but I submit it would be an injustice to the American citizen. When I say "the American citizen" let me remind the Senate that the Constitution does not require that an American citizen be of Anglo-Saxon, or Jewish, or Spanish descent. It is a Constitution for all citizens of the United States. That explains one of my objections to the amendment offered by the Senator from New York [Mr. Lehman] regarding the citizens of Puerto Rico. Citizens of America include citizens of Puerto Rico; citizens of America include the Indians.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I wonder whether the distinguished Senator from New Mexico will yield for a comment along the lines of his present discussion.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield. In doing so I desire to propound a question to my good friend from Pennsylvania. Everything being equal, if workers are needed on American farms and in American industries, and if American citizens are available to perform the required work, whom does the Senator think should be employed?

Mr. MARTIN. I, of course, agree fully with the position taken by the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, that it is our duty first to see that American is gainfully employed. If the Senator will permit, a very distinguished former Vice President of the United States, Gen. Charles G. Dawes, passed to his reward last week. The Senator will recall that General Dawes had an important part in the negotiations regarding various matters following World War I, and at those times, General Dawes made this statement:

Successful international negotiations must begin with the representatives of each nation having upmost in mind the conditions of their nationals with that there must be the determination to adjust these interests to the common good of all.

But General Dawes, Vice President of the United States, stated that our first consideration should be given to our own nationals.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I thank the Senator. I think that proposition is basic. What citizen is intended to be protected by the oath which we take under the Constitution when we assume office? What citizen is the Constitution designed to protect? Senator Johnson. Last Thursday, when I began my speech last Friday it was stated on the floor of the Senate that we have spent $120,000,000 in the Republic of Mexico to keep the hoof-and-mouth disease away from our border, for the purpose of protecting our cattle industry. We do not buy beef from the Argentine, though by doing so we might provide 40-cent steaks. Why is that? We abstain from the purchase of Argentine beef in order to protect American commerce. Yet, the pending bill would permit the importation of foreign labor, to be used in preference to American labor. I referred a few moments ago to the Indians. To me, they are Americans. They are good enough to be allowed to live in Korea while the uniform of the United States is good enough to serve as soldiers of the Republic and to be buried in France, Belgium, and Italy, but, under the provisions of the pending bill, even though they might want to work as agricultural laborers, they would be prevented from doing so.

I do not question the integrity of the committee, nor of the sponsors of the bill, but I say Senators are mistaken. If this bill were to pass, it would become a cancerous growth upon our body politic. It would interfere with public health, it would interfere with our whole economy. It would bring back a condition which was done away with by Lincoln, namely, that of slavery and peonage. The bill should not pass.

I should like to call the attention of the Senate to a telegram I have received from Texas. I regret that my good friend Senator Johnson from Texas (Mr. Johnson) is not present. I wish all Senators would listen to this telegram. It is from the American GI Forum of Texas Independent Veterans' Organization. I am sure that the junior Senator from Texas knows the person who sent the telegram, which is addressed to me at the United States Senate, from Corpus Christi, Tex., reading as follows:

American GI Forum of Texas Independent Veterans Organization, representing more than 50,000 American veterans of Mexican origin, wish to ask you to continue to fight to exclude foreign workers, especially in Texas. Thousands of veterans—

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

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

All they ask is just a chance to exist—not to get rich—a chance to find employment so that they may feed their families, to send their children to school, to teach them to adore the flag and to know that their fathers and brothers did not die in vain on foreign fields. In many instances, the kind of persons the writer of the telegram is talking about are relatives of American boys who are buried in American cemeteries with the only decoration a white cross. Now a bill is introduced which, if it should pass, would result in foreign labor being brought into the United States. I say it is un-American.

Americans of Mexican origin in Texas must have an opportunity to live like human beings and first-class citizens. Best way to do it is to stop all imported labor.

The telegram is from American GI Forum of Texas Independent Veterans' Organization, by Hector P. Garcia, medical doctor, chairman. I am sure my good friend from Texas knows him. Mr. President, one member of the President's committee was Ambassador Lucey from the heart of Texas. This is what he says:

S. ANTONIO, N. MEX., April 26, 1951.

Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Senate Office Building:

May I sincerely commend your efforts to amend the farm-labor measure now under Senate consideration so that it will contain at least some standards of decent working conditions and will not encourage a further influx across the border of large numbers of Mexican workers who are not needed. Having long studied the farm-labor situation in this Nation, I wholly believe that the demand for further Mexican workers is not justified, if a small number of alien workers are required immediate steps should be taken to organize our farming which in itself should be adequate for our needs. I wish you success in your noble undertaking.

ARCHIBALD LUCHEY.

The telegrams which I have been reading are from outside my own State. The American Federation of Labor is against the bill. The Railway Labor Executives Association sent a telegram which reads as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., April 27, 1951.

DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Chairman, Railway Labor Executives Association.

We applaud your leadership in seeking to amend the farm-labor bill now before the Senate so that it will contain at least some minimum working standards and so that Mexican workers will not be encouraged to cross the border. We call your attention to the wire we sent to the majority leader, Senator McFARLAND.

G. E. LEECHY,
Chairman, Railway Labor Executives Association.

I read a telegram into the Record last Friday which came from my State, in which the writer, Mr. Roberts, stated...
that his association, the Farm Bureau Federation, represented 8,000 persons.
I believe that is correct. But listen to this telegram:

WASHINGTON, D. C., April 27, 1951.

DENNIS CHAVEZ, United States Senator from New Mexico, in behalf of the following persons, accordingly asks your acceleration of the pending legislation for the protection of the poor Navajo whose son may have helped to cultivate the soil of the Nation. It will be their wish to see this benefit extended to other Indians of Oregon, Washington, Idaho, Montana, and Minnesota.

I thank the writer for the following telegram which is addressed to me, coming from the border, the area which would possibly benefit by the passage of this bill:

PHOENIX, ARIZ., April 27, 1951.

Mr. President, the next telegram is addressed to me from Norman, Okla., reading as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., April 26, 1951.

Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ, United States Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

We the undersigned send you this message of support for the valiant and intelligent fight you are making on the Senate floor to shape the farm-labor legislation now being considered into an instrument aimed truly to further the interests of farm workers both domestic and foreign.

Ralph W. Amerson, Philadelphia, Pa.; Shirley E. Green, Agricultural Relations Secretary, Council for Social Action of the Congregational Christian Churches; Elizabeth Christian, Amalgamated Clothing Workers, CIO; Dr. Ira Dereth, Haverford, Pa.; Lee F. Johnstone, Executive Vice President, National Housing Conference; Benton J. Stong, National Farmers Union; David C. Williams, American for Democratic Action; Gertrude Folks, Zimans National Child Labor Committee; CIO Maritime Committee; H. L. Mitchell, President, National Farm Labor Union, Inc.; Paul Nelson, National Legislative Representative, United Automobile Workers, CIO; C. Emerson Smith, Virginia; Terrance E. Holland, President, CIO; and Farmers Union; Richard E. Bennett, New Jersey;


THEODORE A. BATH, New Jersey; E. A. Ritter, Chillicothe, Ohio; John C. McFarland, Arizona.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, the following telegram is addressed to me, coming from the border, the area which would possibly benefit by the passage of this bill:

WASHINGTON, D. C., April 27, 1951.

Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

Following telegrams have been sent to Senator HAYDEN and Mr. McFarland:

"Urge all-out fight against Senate bill 984 introduced by Senator Ellender. For sake of entire country please support Senator Dennis Chavez in his fight against indiscriminate and unlimited importation of Mexican farm labor."

MASON M. WARE, Secretary, Yuma Building and Construction Trades Council.

I have another telegram to the same effect from the Arizona State Federation of Labor, which reads as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., April 27, 1951.

Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

We the undersigned send you this message of support for the valiant and intelligent fight you are making on the Senate floor to shape the farm-labor legislation now being considered into an instrument aimed truly to further the interests of farm workers, both domestic and foreign. Achievement of your objective is of profound social value to the Nation as a whole. We promise you continuing support in your high endeavor.

Ralph W. Amerson, Philadelphia, Pa.; Shirley E. Green, Agricultural Relations Secretary, Council for Social Action of the Congregational Christian Churches; Elizabeth Christian, Amalgamated Clothing Workers, CIO; Dr. Ira Dereth, Haverford, Pa.; Lee F. Johnstone, Executive Vice President, National Housing Conference; Benton J. Stong, National Farmers Union; David C. Williams, American for Democratic Action; Gertrude Folks, Zimans National Child Labor Committee; CIO Maritime Committee; H. L. Mitchell, President, National Farm Labor Union, Inc.; Paul Nelson, National Legislative Representative, United Automobile Workers, CIO; C. Emerson Smith, Virginia; Terrance E. Holland, President, CIO; and Farmers Union; Richard E. Bennett, New Jersey;
I will not read what the labor groups have said. I merely wish to invite the attention of Senators to 22 telegrams which I received from labor groups in my State, who are opposed to the bill. I ask unanimous consent that the telegrams be printed in the Record at this point in my remarks.

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

**SANTA FE, N. MEX., April 27, 1951.**

**Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,**

**United States Senate,**

**Washington, D. C.:**

Respectfully request you hold fast in your stand against importation of Mexican labor to United States. Thousands of working people in this and other States available for farm work, however, employers would hire cheap foreign labor and starve working citizenry of this country. Advise Senator that working people of New Mexico sent him to Senate to represent the State of New Mexico and people. His continued support of Senate bill 984 will be a disservice to his State.

Respectfully,

**J. W. GARCIA,**

President, Santa Fe Central Labor Union.

---

**SANTA FE, N. MEX., April 30, 1951.**

**Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,**

**United States Senate,**

**Washington, D. C.:**

We are greatly opposed to Senate bill number 984. We feel we have sufficient labor to do all work in New Mexico providing they are paid current wage scales in order to make it convenient for them to live a normal life. We will appreciate your cooperation against this bill. Our local represents 1,000 members plus their families and relatives.

**T. L. LOPEZ,**

**Financial Secretary,**

**Carpenters Local No. 1353.**

---

**ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX., April 27, 1951.**

**Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,**

**United States Senate,**

**Office Building,**

**Washington, D. C.:**

We urge you to defeat Senate bill 984. Surplus of farm labor available when wages are adequate.

**J. B. MCCOTTY,**

President, Local 823.

---

**ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX., April 28, 1951.**

**Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,**

**United States Senate,**

**Office Building,**

**Washington, D. C.:**

We urge you to defeat Senate bill 984. Mexican importation. 1,500 organized laborers represented.

**LENO MARTINEZ,**

**Agent AFL Local 16.**

---

**ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX., April 28, 1951.**

**Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,**

**United States Senate,**

**Office Building,**

**Washington, D. C.:**

The working populations of Chavez County and the Pecos Valley ask in the name of decency for you to use your influence and oppose Senate bill 984 which would bring in Mexican nationals for farm work at a lesser wage scale of wages than the prevailing wage. In 1950 farmers used Mexican nationals to harvest cotton at $1.75 per hundred, paying wage was $3.50 to $4 per hundred. Several thousand people would oppose the recurrence of exploitation of American citizens.

**FRANK MORGAN,**

**Business Manager, Craftsmen Local Union,**

**April 28, 1951.**

**ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX., April 28, 1951.**

**Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,**

**United States Senate,**

**Office Building,**

**Washington, D. C.:**

The working people of Chavez County, as the representative of Building Trades and Construction Council of Northern Area, New Mexico, representing 18,000 workers of all crafts, I am urging the defeat of Senate bill No. 984.

**THOMAS HILL,**

**President, New Mexico State Federation of Labor.**

---

**Honors, N. M. EX., April 28, 1951.**

**Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,**

**United States Senate,**

**Office Building,**

**Washington, D. C.:**

We of our local union oppose bill S. 984. Supply of labor available if fair standard of wages paid. One hundred and eighty members in our local.

**A. M. ESPINOLA,**

**Painters Local 689.**

---

**Honors, N. M. EX., April 29, 1951.**

**Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,**

**United States Senate,**

**Office Building,**

**Washington, D. C.:**

We urge you to defeat Senate bill 984. Mexican importation. 1,500 organized laborers represented.

**LENO MARTINEZ,**

**Agent AFL Local 16.**

---

**Honors, N. M. EX., April 28, 1951.**

**Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,**

**United States Senate,**

**Office Building,**

**Washington, D. C.:**

Construction and General Laborers Union, Local 1246, of Eddy County, N. M., of approximately 978 members would like to go on record to strongly oppose Senate bill 984 relating to the Mexican nationals entering our country to do farm work in the Pecos Valley. We of the Mexican nationals were brought into New Mexico, and the work we do is unneeded workers. Our American standard of living will suffer. Electrical Workers Local 611 urge defeat of Senate bill 984.

**ELMER ZEMKE,**

**Business Representative.**
to pick cotton and were paid $1.75 per hundred, whereas our own people's scale is from $3 to $4 per hundred. You can readily see why we are opposed to such policies.

RonalD E. BAYEman, Secretary-Treasurer, Local 1385.

CARLSBAD, N. Mex., April 29, 1951.

Senator Dennis Chavez.

Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:--Our people of the State of New Mexico and Northwest District Council of Laborers would like to go on record to strongly oppose Senate bill 984 relating to the Mexican nationals entering our country to do farm labor. Last fall Mexican nations were brought into New Mexico to pick cotton and were paid $1.75 per hundred, whereas our own people's scale is from $3 to $4 per hundred. You can readily see why we are opposed to such policies.

RonalD E. BAYEman, Business Agent.

CARLSBAD, N. Mex., April 28, 1951.

Senator Dennis Chavez.

Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:--Plasterers and cement finishers of local 835 of Eddy County, N. Mex., with approximately 64 members would like to go on record to strongly oppose Senate bill 984 relating to the Mexican nationals entering our country to do farm labor. Last fall Mexican nationals were brought into New Mexico to pick cotton and were paid $1.75 per hundred, whereas our own people's scale is from $3 to $4 per hundred. You can readily see why we are opposed to such policies.

L. L. CARKEL, Secretary, Local Union 835.

ALBUQUERQUE, N. Mex., April 29, 1951.

Senator Dennis Chavez.

Washington, D. C.:--Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen State New Mexico firmly oppose Senate bill 984 granting importation of Mexican national laborers until all existing labor supply at fair wages has been exhausted.

A. G. POWE.

State Legislative Chairman, Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen.

ALBUQUERQUE, N. Mex., April 29, 1951.

Hon. Senator Dennis Chavez.

Washington, D. C.:--We are opposed to the importation of Mexican laborers in this State until we have exhausted the labor supply at a fair standard of wages. This concerns Senate bill 984.

Norris H. Penny.

Chairman, Brotherhood of Railway Clerks, New Mexico State Legislative Committee.

Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. President, I do not wish to read all the messages I have received, but I invite the attention of Senators to what civic organizations in my State have said. They are organizations which have no axes to grind, which are made up of outstanding and fine citizens in my community, as they are in every other community. In my State they represent a fine cross section of what is community life in the entire United States. I read the first one:

SANTA FE, N. Mex., April 29, 1951.

Senator Dennis Chavez.

Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:--New Mexico congress of parents and teachers urge you amend S. 984 to insure fair and equal treatment of American labor, protect Indian labor and child welfare acts. School attendance law should be applicable to import labor from Mexico. This labor will further burden State health and welfare agencies and because of extremely low wages will lower standard of living and will create serious problem in unemployment.

Mrs. Kenneth S. Clark.

State Legislative Chairman.

I have another telegram, which reads:

ALBUQUERQUE, N. Mex., April 28, 1951.

Senator Dennis Chavez.

Washington, D. C.:--We are opposed to original Senate bill 984 but are in favor of your amendments thereto.

L. G. Boyte.

Commander, Department of New Mexico, Disabled American Veterans.

The disabled veterans are the boys who faced the music. They are the boys who are not interested in cheap labor. They are the boys who would like to see the kind of government continue for which they were supposed to have fought, in order to preserve our American standard of living.

I have another telegram:

ALBUQUERQUE, N. Mex., April 29, 1951.

United States Senator Dennis Chavez.

Washington, D. C.:--I urge you to adopt Senate bill 984. I am not a member of the Reverend Mr. Farr's church; but he is an American and a fine citizen, who is carrying out the Christian belief in furthering the cause of humanity. That is why he sent the telegram.

I have another telegram, which reads:

ALBUQUERQUE, N. Mex., April 29, 1951.

Senator Dennis Chavez.

Washington, D. C.:--Thank you for your gallant fight for your amendment on Senate bill 984. We are opposed to the Ellender bill as reported to the Senate.

Celine Davis Rapp.

President, American Legion Auxiliary, No. 82, Benavides Grande.

I have a telegram from Albuquerque:

ALBUQUERQUE, N. Mex., April 30, 1951.

Senator Dennis Chavez.

Ellender bill, Senate 984, not acceptable to many people unless carrying your three proposed amendments. Will be opposed by some in any event. With amendments will probably help solve problems of southern New Mexico during critical periods.

A. G. POwe.

State Legislative Chairman. Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen.

I wish the Senator from Illinois had not left the Chamber. I would have liked to tell him how the New Mexico Health Foundation was started and who financed it. I have another telegram:

ALBUQUERQUE, N. Mex., April 27, 1951.

Senator Dennis Chavez.

Washington, D. C.:--Ellender bill, Senate 984; Ellender bill, Senate bill 984.

Archbishop Lucey.

May I urge you to preserve your amendments to this bill.

Rev. W. Karl Clement.

Pastor, Trinity Methodist Church.

Rev. W. Carl Clement sends the following telegram:

ALBUQUERQUE, N. Mex., April 27, 1951.

Senator Dennis Chavez.

Washington, D. C.:--I endorse your amendments to Senate bill 984.

Rev. W. Karl Clement.

I have another telegram, which reads:

ALBUQUERQUE, N. Mex., April 27, 1951.

Senator Dennis Chavez.

Washington, D. C.:--Endorse your amendments to Senate bill 984, as the following telegrams show:

ALBUQUERQUE, N. Mex., April 27, 1951.

Senator Dennis Chavez.

Washington, D. C.:--Endorse your amendments to Senate bill 984; Ellender bill.

Harry Halley.

Chairman.
women from every State of the Union. One of our largest industries is reha­bil­itating people who are afflicted with tu­berc­ulo­sis. They have come here from Kokomo, Ind., from Maine, and from New York. They come from Sparta, New Market, and Fayetteville. They come from Batesville. They come from Baton Rouge and Thib­re­voo, La. That is the kind of group it is. Do Senators think that they would want to have any­thing done which would handicap them in their efforts to regain their health, by making it easy to import unhealthy aliens? I have some telegrams from local lodges, and I ask that they be printed in the Re­cord at this point in my remarks.

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

ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX., April 29, 1951.
Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.: Being much pleased in Senatorial bill No. 984, we wish to express our sincere thanks in behalf of Al­lianza Hispano-Americanos for having sponsored the Ellender bill as reported to the Senate and are much in favor of your amendments to said bill.
ALIANZA HISPANO-AMERICAN LODGE 37, CARPIO M. CHAVEZ, President.

ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX., April 29, 1951.
United States Senator CHAVEZ, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.: The Al­lianza Club, Inc. voted to endorse the amend­ments of Senator CHAVEZ to said bill. We oppose Senator ELLENDER bill as reported and for a stand in decency and equality the membership of said club endorse the amend­ments of Senator CHAVEZ.
ALIANZA CLUB, PAUL SANCHEZ, President.

Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. President, on Fri­day last I read a telegram from Mr. Rob­ertson, Legislative Director of the American Farm Bureau Federation. He is a splen­did citizen, and represents a fine group. However, he is completely mistaken as to the eventual benefits of the proposed legislation. It is the first place, it would not stabilize farm labor. The bill would be in effect for only 1 year. Its pro­ponents want cheap labor during the growing season of 1951. Such legislation would not stabilize farm labor. Labor could be stabilized by means of legis­lation which would take care of American labor first and which would provide workable conditions under which an American could work in keeping with our standards. We love to brag about our standards of living. They are grand, and it is import­ant and necessary that we keep them up. We cannot keep up American standards of living on 70 cents a day. It cannot be done here or else­where.

At any rate, the American Farm Bu­reau Federation, through its President, sent a telegram approving Senate bill 984. Now there comes a telegram from a person who belongs to the same or­ganization. He has not a thousand acres in cotton. He has a little bean farm near Mountainair. He says:

DEAR SENATOR: I notice in radio broadcasts that you are opposing the Ellender bill. Please feel free to have our support in your opposition to this bill.

C. A. NEELY, President, MOUNTAINAIR FARM BUREAU.

He belongs to the same organization as the other men, but he owns an ordinary farm. He represents the 6,000,000 farm­ers who operate family-sized farms, and not the 125,000 who represent 7 percent of the farmers.

Another telegram reads:

DEAR SENATOR: We are opposed to Senate bill No. 984. We must find ways to adequate­ly utilize our own labor resources.

That is all there is to it. I repeat that we spent $120,000,000 getting rid of foot and mouth disease in old Mexico, so as not to affect the fine dairy herds in the home State of the Senator from Wis­consin. Mr. Senator, the point to affect the fine beef cattle in the State of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON]. I think it was money well spent. The Congress would not allow the importa­tion of one pound of Argentine beef though it is of good quality and the housewife and the consumer could probably obtain steak for 30 or 40 cents a pound if its importation were allowed. Why has Congress taken that position? It has taken it for the protection of American industry. That is a correct position. Our first duty is to the United States; and the sooner we realize it the better. But the pending bill would side­track all that is sacred so far as the protection of American labor is con­cerned. We would be importing cheap labor. How are American laborers go­ing to keep up the American standard of living if they must compete with that class of labor?

Here is a telegram from Herman Dinkle, president of the Stanley Farmers Union. He is opposed to the bill.

So is L. C. Timmons, legislative direc­tor of the Morality Farmers Union. So is E. C. Green, legislative direc­tor of the Mountainair Farmers Union; and Wayne Smith, of Mountainair, N. Mex.; and Mr. B. C. Berryman, of Corona, N. Mex. Corona is on the Southern Pacific railroad line, on the way from Dalhart, Tex. to El Paso, Tex., across the southeastern portion of New Mexico. It is a beautiful little mountain town. Its citizens are God-fearing people. They are not big farmers. The average farm in that vi­cinity is a family farm. Those farmers are opposed to the bill.

Here is a telegram from Sam Kendricks, legislative director of the Stanley Farmers Union. He is opposed to the bill. So is W. A. Thomas, of Estancia, N. Mex.; and Herbert R. Parsons, of Mountainair, N. Mex.

Those farmers operate family-sized farms. The messages which I read last Friday were from other types of farmers. Mr. President, I ask unanimous con­sent to have printed in the Record, at this point, as a part of my remarks, the group of telegrams to which I have referred.

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

MOUNTAINAIR, N. Mex., April 30, 1951.
Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ, Washington, D. C.: DEAR SENATOR: I notice in radio broadcasts that you are opposing the Ellender bill. Please feel free to have our support in your opposition to this bill.

C. A. NEELY, President, MOUNTAINAIR FARM BUREAU.

MOUNTAINAIR, N. Mex., April 30, 1951.
Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ, Washington, D. C.: DEAR SENATOR: We are opposed to Senate bill No. 984. We must find ways to adequate­ly utilize our own labor resources.

B. A. KINGCHELOR, President, Torrance County Coopera­tive Association.

MOUNTAINAIR, N. Mex., April 30, 1951.
Hon. Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ, Washington, D. C.: Honorable Senator CHAVEZ: Your opposition to the Ellender bill will receive full support of the people of this community.

B. A. KINGCHELOR, President, STANLEY FARMERS UNION.

MOUNTAINAIR, N. Mex., April 30, 1951.
Senator CHAVEZ, Washington, D. C.: Senator CHAVEZ, I am opposed to the provisions of this bill and hope you continue to oppose it.

L. C. TIMMONS, Legislative Director, MOUNTAING AIR FARMERS UNION.

MOUNTAINAIR, N. Mex., April 30, 1951.
Senator CHAVEZ, Washington, D. C.: Senator CHAVEZ, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Senate RECORD the following messages which I read last Friday:

DEAR SENATOR: We are opposed to Senate bill No. 984. We hope you will continue your fight against this bill.

B. C. BERRYMAN, Legislative Director, STANLEY FARMERS UNION.

MOUNTAINAIR, N. Mex., April 30, 1951.
Senator CHAVEZ, Washington, D. C.: Senator CHAVEZ: This is to advise you that we are definitely opposed to Senate bill No. 984. We hope you will continue your fight against this bill.

SAM KENDRICKS, Legislative Director, STANLEY FARMERS UNION.

MOUNTAINAIR, N. Mex., April 30, 1951.
Senator CHAVEZ, Washington, D. C.: Senator CHAVEZ: I am opposed to Senate bill No. 984 as feel we should use what labor we
have in our own country before bringing in others.

ESTANCIA, N. MEX.

W. A. THOMAS.

MOUNTAINAIR, N. MEX., April 29, 1951.

Senator Dennis Chavez.

Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Thank you for your stand on Senator Stevenson's bill. We are opposed to the entire Ellender bill. May we encourage you to vigorously oppose this type of legislation.

HERB, R. PARSONS.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I think it would be proper at this particular point, in order that there may be a comparison, to ask permission to have printed in the Record all the telegrams and letters which I have received in favor of Senate bill 984. I ask unanimous consent to do so, in order that the record may be complete.

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

LOVINGTON, N. MEX., April 27, 1951.

Senator Dennis Chavez, Washington, D. C.: Please support the Ellender bill on farm labor without amendments, otherwise the farmers in this section will be seriously crippled.

H. A. DUKE.

LOVINGTON, N. MEX., April 27, 1951.

Senator Dennis Chavez, Washington, D. C.: Support Ellender bill, No. 984, without amendments. We need labor badly.

H. E. MATHER.

McDonald, N. Mex.

LOVINGTON, N. MEX., April 27, 1951.

Senator Dennis Chavez, Washington, D. C.: Cooperate with Ellender bill without amendments. Situation will be critical concerning labor otherwise.

N. G. HOWAY.

HUMBLE CITY, N. MEX.

DEMING, N. MEX., April 27, 1951.

Hon. Dennis Chavez, Washington, D. C.: We are firmly behind Ellender farm labor bill, S 984, regarding importation of labor. Request your support without amendment or change. It is to New Mexico's benefit just as it is written. We expect your support of this bill.

LUNA COUNTY FARM AND LIVESTOCK BUREAU.

FRANK A. BREDIEKOFF, President.

LOVINGTON, N. MEX., April 27, 1951.

Senator Dennis Chavez, Washington, D. C.: I think you should support the Ellender bill without amendments.

BRADY LOWE.

LUBBOCK, TEX.

LOVINGTON, N. MEX., April 27, 1951.

Senator Dennis Chavez, Washington, D. C.: Do not add amendments to Ellender bill. Help pass it as is.

ERNEST MAHON.

LOVINGTON, N. MEX., April 27, 1951.

Senator Dennis Chavez, Washington, D. C.: I personally think you should not attach amendments to Ellender bill. Leave as is. We find that we get good service through Mexican nationals.

J. B. HALE.

LOVINGTON, N. MEX., April 27, 1951.


L. G. CAUDILL.

LOVINGTON, N. MEX., April 27, 1951.

Hon. Senator Dennis Chavez, Washington, D. C.: I am well pleased with the contract for Mexican nationals as it is. But the Ellender bill, without amendments, is acceptable.

SUN ACRE FARMS, INC., Rolf A. More, President.

LOVINGTON, N. MEX., April 27, 1951.

Hon. Senator Dennis Chavez, Washington, D. C.: We need Ellender bill without any amendments. Mexican labor is nearest available extra help we can get; less expensive transportation.

R. L. SERRING.

LOVINGTON, N. MEX., April 27, 1951.


L. G. GREEN.

LOVINGTON. N. MEX., April 27, 1951.

Senator Chavez, Washington, D. C.: We would like to have Ellender bill 984 without amendments. National labor made satisfactory and closer.

H. L. WADE.

LAS CRUCES, N. MEX., April 26, 1951.

Senator Dennis Chavez, Washington, D. C.: Farmers and ranchers in New Mexico vitally interested in passage, without amendments, of Ellender and Posse labor bills for providing Mexican nationals for farm labor. Am advised you have introduced amendments which will emasculate the provisions of this legislation. Urgently request you reconsider these amendments and pass passage of bills as now written. These bills represent many months of work by producers who foot the bill, cast the votes, and carry the load of getting production and therefore are entitled to your cooperation. Our entire organization of 6,000 members strongly behind this legislation. Which is of vital interest in view of huge cotton acreage planted as requested by our defense officials.

DEMETRIS ROBERTS, President, New Mexico Farm and Livestock Bureau.

LOVINGTON, N. MEX., April 26, 1951.


W. B. MCLARISTER, Vice President, New Mexico Farm and Livestock Bureau.

ARTESIA, N. MEX., April 26, 1951.

Hon. Senator Chavez, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.: In interest of farmers of New Mexico we desire Senate bill 984 passed without any amendments attached. We do not have adequate labor to harvest our crops. With personal regards. Would appreciate your reply.

J. W. BERRY.

ALAMOGORDO, N. MEX., April 26, 1951.

Senator Dennis Chavez, Washington, D. C.: The farmers in this area are requesting that you support the Ellender bill without any amendments. Ellender bill is really agitated in this district.

VERNER CLAYTON.

CARLSBAD, N. MEX., April 26, 1951.

Senator Chavez, United States Senate Building, Washington, D. C.: Dear Senator: Since you request your support of original Ellender bill without any amendments. It's practical to use Mexican nationals to harvest our crops the season of 1951. Believing that you will rely on information of your constituents as to labor bills, thanking you for your support, your friend.

BOB JAMES.

MALAGA, N. MEX.

ROSSWELL, N. MEX., April 26, 1951.

United States Senator Dennis Chavez, Senate Building, Washington, D. C.: Strongly urge you to support the Ellender bill regarding the use of Mexican nationals for farm labor upon contract basis. There is an inadequate supply or labor here. The use of national in the past has saved millions of dollars in crops in this area. Magnificent and transit labor has failed within the past decade been adequate in this area due to extensive development. This same condition exists in Lea County due to extensive irrigation development there within last 4 years.

Defense projects in this area have absorbed practically all of local labor and farmers and ranchers both are faced with critical shortage. Contract method has worked successfully and we believe it is only method to provide adequate labor in harvest period for this area. We realize and understand your former position in this matter; however, development has been so extensive in area, and shortage of labor is critical. We urge you to support this measure. Farmers and ranchers have contacted me in considerable numbers, urging you to be contacted and situation explained to you. Many of them feel you have prejudged the necessity of this legislation, and I cannot too strongly urge your support of same.

T. T. SANDERS, Jr., Democratic County Chairman, Chaves, N. Mex.

CARLSBAD, N. MEX., April 26, 1951.

Senator Dennis Chavez, Washington, D. C.: Otis Farm and Livestock Bureau requests your support of the original Ellender bill. Farmers of this association will be seriously
hampered in production goal if it is not passed as is. 

Oral Nichols, 
President, Otis Farm Bureau.

Carlsbad, N. Mex., April 26, 1951.

Senator Dennis Chavez, 
Washington, D. C.;

Your support is requested for the original Ellender bill on agricultural labor.

J. C. Ogden, 

Carlsbad, N. Mex., April 26, 1951.

Senator Dennis Chavez, 
United States Senate Office Building, 
Washington, D. C.

We deem it best for us that the Ellender bill, Senate bill No. 984, be passed without amendment and will appreciate your support and all farmers in this area as well as the Farm Bureau for your support of the Ellender bill without your 10 amendments.

A. W. Painter, 
President, Otero County Farm Bureau.

Chamber of Commerce, 
Carlsbad, N. Mex., April 26, 1951.

Hon. Dennis Chavez, 
Senate Office Building, 
Hon. Clinton P. Anderson, 
Hon. Antonio M. Fernandez, 
Hon. John J. Dempsey, 
Washington, D. C.

Gentlemen: The directors of Carlsbad Chamber of Commerce and numerous farm-er-businessmen in this area are unanimously protesting that hamper the importation of Mexican labor. This labor is necessary for us and is one of the best good-will promotions that we have in educating the Mexican labor to better use of our equipment and our method of farming. I have talked with the local contractors and all found them all to be excellent labor.

C. F. Beeman, 

Alamogordo, N. Mex., April 29, 1951.

Senator Dennis Chavez, 
Washington, D. C.

We want your support on the Ellender bill as originally written. This request is from all farmers in this area as well as the Farm Bureau for your support of the Ellender bill without your 10 amendments.

A. W. Painter, 
President, Otero County Farm Bureau.

Senator: Request you support original Ellender bill. Farmers ask 1,600,000 crop. Imperative Mexican national labor made available during growing season and harvest. A crop grown without harvest is without benefit.

Carlsbad, N. Mex., April 26, 1951.

Senator Dennis Chavez, 
Senate Office Building, 
Carlsbad, N. Mex.

Senator: For the record Mr. M. Fernandez, who is a member of the President’s Migratory Labor Commission, and trust that the Commission's report will be unacceptable and be disapproved.

Very truly yours,

Carlsbad Chamber of Commerce, 
By Victor L. Minter, Secretary.

Mr. Chavez. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point, as a part of my remarks, a letter which I received only lately, but which is dated April 14, 1951, addressed to me by Mr. Winston Lovelace, president of the New Mexico Cotton Growers Association together with a letter to Mr. W. J. Hooten, editor of the El Paso Times, wherein Mr. Lovelace takes issue with the Most Reverend Robert E. Lucey, bishop of San Antonio, who is a member of the President’s Migratory Labor Commission.

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

New Mexico Cotton Growers Association, 
Loving, N. Mex., April 14, 1951.

Senator Dennis A. Chavez, 
Senate Office Building, 
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator: In connection with the recent report of the Migratory Labor Commission and interview with the Most Reverend Robert E. Lucey, in El Paso, and the subsequent publicity given to this interview, I have written the El Paso Times a letter in rebuttal of the position of the Commission that additional labor is not needed by farmers. I enclose copy of this letter to you for your information.

We believe that it is nearly a question of life and death as far as gathering our cotton crop next year is concerned. We feel that an increase of 10 percent in the raw product he markets is a lowering of the grade. There is an extreme rather than on the preponderant average of conditions and is, therefore, of very little value. It is a great need in New Mexico and elsewhere for more farm labor and especially at harvest time in the cotton fields. Many people say we would still be picking cotton from last year’s crop if we had depended on local and migrant United States labor. To make matters worse for the farmer and also for the migrant laborer, some business concerns over the imported workers and, too, the Mexicans receive the same wage for cotton picking and other farm work as do other persons.

Carlsbad will need imported labor from Mexico and we are definitely concerned that should labor from Mexico be made unacceptable and be disapproved.

Very truly yours,

New Mexico Cotton Growers Association, 
Loving, N. Mex., April 19, 1951.

Mr. W. J. Hooten, 
Editor, El Paso Times.

Dear Mr. Hooten: In your issue of April 10 you carried report of an interview with the Most Reverend Bishop Lucey of San Antonio, who is a member of the Migratory Labor Commission. This report was headed “Braceros not needed, prelate says.”

As is so often the case when such a Commission makes an investigation, the extremes are played up and apparently the report of this Commission is low extremes rather than the preponderant average of conditions and is, therefore, of very little value. It is a great need in New Mexico and elsewhere for more farm labor and especially at harvest time in the cotton fields. Many people say we would
cottonseed-oil mills, and spinning mills, is more than willing to do this, but they will need more land, more fertilizer, more insecticides, and support of the entire public.

Yours very truly,

New Mexico Cotton Ginners' Association,

Washington Lovelace, President.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, when I concluded my remarks on Friday, I had just called attention to the articles which appeared in the New York Times on several days during the early part of April. I shall proceed from that point.

As recently as the 23d and 24th of this month, the New York Times contained articles by Mr. Gladwin Hill describing the recruiting scenes at Hermosillo, Mexico, where growers from the United States picked out workers whom they wanted to hire under contract. Hermosillo, Mexico, is south of the border state of Sonora, in the Republic of Mexico. The scene was far from pleasant to read about.

Look magazine in its March 27th issue had a picture and text article portraying in unforgettable terms the sad dilemma of these people. In its April 9 issue Time magazine dealt with the problem, and Newweek in its April 16 issue ran an article about the "Woeful Wetbacks." The Washington Post carried an editorial on April 9 deploring "the influx of aliens willing to work for wages that are indeed too low according to American standards." That is one of the issues.

The editorial concluded:

We agree with the Commission that our efforts in the future should be directed toward increasing the number of our own farm workers and eliminating dependence on foreign labor.

What is wrong with that? Let me say to my good friend from Nebraska [Mr. Wherry] that I inquired from Mr. Goodwin Hill, the editor of the Washington Post, how many of these workers had been admitted under the law, but who remains in this country illegally? Is there not some way by which the laborer can have knowledge that such sons are here in violation of the law, or are they exploited during the time they are here? Is there not some way by which those who employ that type of labor can have knowledge that such persons are here in violation of the law, or are they not cooperating with the immigration laws?

Mr. ELLENDER. This form of illegal entry has been going on for 50 years or more, and it has been aggravated recently, because so many Mexicans want to cross the border into the United States in order to obtain better wages than they get in Mexico. As I have pointed out, the bill prohibits the employment of a Mexican under this program if he is a wetback. I believe the only way in which the problem can be solved is to enact legislation along the line contained in this bill, as demonstrated in my remarks to you last week.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator point out in the bill any provision which would accomplish what he suggests? Where does the bill provide that it shall be illegal for the wetback to obtain employment as a laborer to enter the country provided it comes here legally? Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator will find on page 2 of the bill the following language:

(1) To recruit such workers.

Mr. WHERRY. I am referring to those who came into the United States illegally. But I see the Senator from New Mexico wishes to continue his address. Perhaps as he continues he will answer my question: Where in the bill is there a provision which would prevent the hiring of wetbacks?

Mr. ELLENDER. The bill provides that no Mexican can be contracted with unless he has legally entered the United States.

Mr. WHERRY. That is the point I developed last Friday. The Senator must understand that I want this labor to come into the United States if it is needed. The bill, however, makes provision only for those who come here legally. What is going to be done with those who are now in the United States illegally?

Mr. ELLENDER. It is now against the law, of course, for Mexican labor to come into this country in any other way than provided by law.

Mr. CHAVEZ. They are wetbacks, are they not?

Mr. ELLENDER. They are illegally within the country.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Is that correct?

Mr. WHERRY. They are wetbacks, and they are exploited during the time they are here.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I admit that is a very conservative statement. Is that the Senator means for a liberal Democrat, a New Deal Democrat.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes; for a New Deal Democrat that is a very conservative statement. If they were to be counted, they would probably number a million.

Mr. WHERRY. How many are here illegally? How many have been recruited, brought here by contract under existing arrangements with them, and then have not been deported to Mexico when the contract was up? Mr. CHAVEZ. I could not give the exact figures.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator have some idea.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I should venture to say the number runs into the thousands.

Mr. WHERRY. The report states that farmers of the Southwest, or whoever employs them, are exploiting these laborers.

Mr. CHAVEZ. There is no question about that.

Mr. WHERRY. Let us ask the distinguished Senator a question for my information. How can a farmer exploit a wetback who is not here in compliance with the immigration laws? How can a farmer exploit one who has been admitted under the law, but who remains in this country illegally? Is there not some way that those who were admitted legally, but have not gone back to Mexico, can be checked? Is there not some way that a check can be had on the wetbacks who, as the report said, are being exploited?

Mr. CHAVEZ. There are so many thousands of them all the way from Brownsville, Tex., to the Pacific in California that if the entire force of the Immigration Bureau were used they could not catch them all.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator from New Mexico mean that the enforcement of the immigration laws is completely nil so far as handling the wetbacks illegally within the United States today is concerned?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Will the Senator from New Mexico wish to continue his statement?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Aiken in the chair). Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. I desire to state to my distinguished friend from Nebraska that during the hearings we held in Mexico City a statement was made by officials of the Immigration Service, as I recall, that there were an estimated 1,000,000 Mexicans who entered this country illegally in 1950 and 1951. Mr. WHERRY. They are wetbacks, are they not?

Mr. ELLENDER. They are wetbacks, yes. And that last year 500,000 were apprehended and deported back to Mexico. Many of them reentered the United States illegally again, and probably many of those not apprehended crossed and recrossed the border several times.

Mr. WHERRY. My question is, How are they exploited during the time they are here? Is there not some way by which those who employ that type of labor can have knowledge that such persons are here in violation of the law, or are they not cooperating with the immigration laws?

Mr. ELLENDER. The form of illegal entry has been going on for 50 years or more, and it has been aggravated recently, because so many Mexicans want to cross the border into the United States in order to obtain better wages than they get in Mexico. As I have pointed out, the bill prohibits the employment of a Mexican under this program if he is a wetback. I believe the only way in which the problem can be solved is to enact legislation along the line contained in this bill, as demonstrated in my remarks to you last week.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator point out in the bill any provision which would accomplish what he suggests? Where does the bill provide that it shall be illegal for the wetback to obtain employment as a laborer to enter the country provided it comes here legally?

Mr. ELLENDER. The bill provides that no Mexican can be contracted with unless he has legally entered the United States.

Mr. WHERRY. That is the point I developed last Friday. The Senator must understand that I want this labor to come into the United States if it is needed. The bill, however, makes provision only for those who come here legally. What is going to be done with those who are now in the United States illegally?

Mr. ELLENDER. It is now against the law, of course, for Mexican labor to come into this country in any other way than provided by law.

Mr. CHAVEZ. They come here anyway.

Mr. ELLENDER. There are laws against murder, but of course murders are perpetrated every day.

Mr. WHERRY. But what is going to be done to prevent the exploiting of laborers who are here illegally?

Mr. ELLENDER. As I have previously stated, those who attempt to enter the United States illegally are apprehended...
as they try to come across the border. Some five hundred thousand who attempted to cross the border were caught and sent back to Mexico last year. Not a day passes that the immigration authorities do not catch many Mexicans attempting to cross illegally.

Mr. CHAVEZ. And such as are here illegally who do not behave, are reported to the immigration authorities by those who employ them, and are returned to Mexico.

Mr. WHERRY. That is the point. I understand the situation with respect to legal immigration. I do not object to Mexican labor, but I can find no clarification in the bill with respect to Mexican labor which is illegally within the country. It is admitted that more and more of them are coming into the United States; that wetbacks will continue to come into the United States; that wetbacks will continue to come into the United States by any means of transportation, who-
incorrectly interpreted provisions of the bill.

In this connection, Mr. President, I wish to refer the Senator to section 503 of the bill, which contains the following provision:

"The following conditions shall be imposed upon the recruitment of such workers under this title:"

And an amendment is pending which would change those words to "the Secretary of Labor—"

Mr. WHERRY. I think that is a good amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER. The section continues—

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.

Surely, Mr. President, if the administrator of this measure does his duty American farm workers will be protected. That is the bill which should be enacted would any penalty be imposed upon an employer in case such Mexican laborers who enter this country fail to return to Mexico when their contract of employment is terminated?

Mr. ELLENDER. At the present time such laborers are required to return to Mexico.

Mr. WHERRY. But what penalty does the bill provide in case they do not return to Mexico?

Mr. ELLENDER. They are supposed to be returned to Mexico in compliance with the law.

Mr. WHERRY. I understand that; I realize that it is supposed to be done; but, the fact is that it is not done.

Mr. ELLENDER. The greater portion of those who are legally in the United States are employed under contract to return to Mexico.

Mr. WHERRY. I think that is true. However, this bill does not contain a penalty provision which will insure that those workers do return to Mexico.

Let me say that I suppose I am not approaching this matter from the angle from which the distinguished Senator from New Mexico is approaching it. In other words, in my State there are certain types of cultivation for which Mexican labor is needed. The other day I referred to raising sheep, and so forth, for which we need Mexican labor; and of course we also have to depend on such labor in connection with the growing and harvesting of sugar beets, unless we can develop the place of hand labor are finally developed.

Mr. President, I believe that the need for the labor must be shown; I am in favor of imposing this matter handled in the way in which it should be handled. The point which arises in my mind is that this bill does not contain provision for the imposition of penalties in case such laborers who are legally in the United States do not return to Mexico following the termination of their contracts of employment.

I also point out that the bill does not provide for a penalty in the case of the wetbacks who illegally enter this country by the thousands.

Does the Senator agree with me that if we are to enter into a new treaty with Mexico in connection with this matter we should consider some provision be made with regard to the return to Mexico of those who are legally in the United States, but also some provision should be made in the way of protection against the exploitation of those who are illegally in our country?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I think I understand what the Senator has in mind. If we are to enter into a new agreement with Mexico, one which necessitates national legislation, it seems to me that the question of certification should be handled in such a way that it will not be national in scope, and will not be handled on the basis of individual States, either in my State or in any other State, for in the latter case there would be 48 different provisions in regard to how such workers should be imported.

If the proposed legislation is so important—and I think it is, and I wish to cooperate and help in connection with it—certainly the treatment should be national in scope, and there should be national certification as to the imported labor and as to the need for it.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, if the Senator from Mexico will yield, let me say, as I have already indicated, there are several amendments on that point, and it is possible that one of them will be agreed to. I do not know what the Senate will do in that connection, of course; but, so far as I am concerned, I have no serious objection to having certification made on a national basis.

My district is far different from Nebraska has referred to the question of penalties. Mr. President, if the employer were in a position to hold a Mexican laborer it would be an easy matter for the employer to say, why should I hire a Mexican, there is nothing to stop a Mexican from leaving his employment a day or so after he begins it. He cannot be held in bondage by his employer.

Mr. WHERRY. Of course, that is true.

Mr. ELLENDER. Since the employer has no control over his Mexican laborers, why should we impose a penalty upon him? Certainly we should not penalize him for committing an offense over which he has no control.

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

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

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; it is the law, and it prohibits them from coming into the United States. There can be no question about that.

Mr. WHERRY. But the law is not being enforced. Is that correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; it is being enforced.

Mr. WHERRY. Then why do we find 500,000 of them in the country now?

Mr. ELLENDER. Five hundred thousand of them were arrested last year. There is statutory authority to enforce their return to Mexico. However, difficulty is due to the fact that there are not a sufficient number of enforcement officers to properly patrol the border between us and Mexico.

Mr. WHERRY. Apparently there is not the authority, otherwise there would not be a million wetbacks in the United States.

Mr. ELLENDER. Of course, it is a difficult problem to achieve 100 percent compliance with the law. There can be no question about that.

Mr. WHERRY. We do not know whether the authorities have returned all those who came illegally. I know that applications have come into my office from persons who are in the country illegally, who want an extension of the terms of their employment for a matter of months or even of years, in order that they may remain in the United States.

Mr. ELLENDER. The evidence produced at the conference held in Mexico City showed there were approximately
Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator know how many of those contract laborers returned to Mexico? Is there not some way where the number can be checked? It seems to be very simple.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I said, I understand there are 30,000 of them in the country now.

Mr. WHERRY. That is, illegally?

Mr. ELLENDER. No; persons who entered legally, but whose contracts have expired. These laborers are not wetbacks.

Mr. WHERRY. Then they are in this country illegally.

Mr. ELLENDER. Under the pending bill, if the Mexican Government agrees that these Mexicans may be recontracted, it can be done.

Mr. WHERRY. What is the difference between a Mexican laborer who is here illegally, having come in under contract, which has expired and a wetback?

Mr. ELLENDER. The wetback swims the river. He comes in illegally, whereas the others come in under contract.

Mr. WHERRY. A Mexican laborer who remains in this country after his contract has expired is as illegally here, is he not, as one who swims the river?

Mr. ELLENDER. In many cases the right to reconstruct is extended for 2 or 3 weeks, and it may be a month or so before the contract can again be completed.

Mr. WHERRY. I am not complaining of that, but the facts are, nevertheless, that there are those who remain in this country for months and months, and even for years and years, after having been brought into the United States legally, but who are now staying in the country illegally.

Mr. ELLENDER. They were brought in under contract. The contract between the employer and workers from Mexico provides:

The employer shall, after the expiration of the contract, return the worker to the point of departure to Mexico, as promptly as possible, except as otherwise provided in article 33 of the International Executive Agreement, but no later event than 15 days. While waiting for return transportation, the worker shall be furnished subsistence on the expense of the employer.

It is natural to assume that every employer is going to return the Mexican worker as soon as possible.

Mr. WHERRY. But do the employers return them?

Mr. ELLENDER. Certainly.

Mr. WHERRY. Then does the Senator think that none of the labor of this type is exploited in this country?

Mr. ELLENDER. No. The question of labor exploitation which was described by that distinguished Senator from New Mexico had reference to the wetbacks. Those Mexicans accept work on almost any terms offered by the employer, because of the fact that they are in this country illegally. I am firmly of the belief that unless this bill is passed, the employer in this country will be unable to contract them, because the Mexican Government has absolutely turned thumbs down on any future contract unless legislation of this character is enacted.

Mr. WHERRY. Is there any penalty on the wetback’s returning to Mexico? Are the doors of Mexico open to him, after he has once left the country illegally?

Mr. ELLENDER. In such a case the Mexican is supposed to be punished by the Mexican Government.

Mr. WHERRY. Is there any fear of that on the part of the returning Mexican?

Mr. ELLENDER. No; I do not believe so, but there is a law in Mexico, enacted 2 years ago, as I recall, which provides very severe penalties in the case of persons who leave Mexico illegally, and who are later returned to Mexico through our immigration authorities.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Probably that is why they leave.

Mr. ELLENDER. But the information we received in Mexico was that the Mexican Government does not enforce that law to any great extent.

Mr. WHERRY. If the Senator from New Mexico will permit me, I say to you, in favor of importing what labor we need, provided it is done legally. We must have labor of this kind in Nebraska, but it seems to me that in legalizing the entry of a few thousand laborers who are to be brought in under contract, we still are not reaching the crux of the whole problem. Why cannot the Judiciary and Agricultural Committees get together and bring before the Senate the kind of legislation which is needed, so that it may be dealt with in one bill? I see no reason for dealing with it in separate bills.

Mr. ELLENDER. I may say to my good friend from Nebraska that in the last Congress an omnibus bill was introduced and referred to the Judiciary Committee that touched on this problem in part, but the bill was not acted upon. The same bill was reintroduced this year.

Mr. WHERRY. I thought it was.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is easy. The Senate has the subject before it.

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

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. THYE. I should like to ask the Senator whether the wetbacks are not in this country illegally, and whether the immigration authorities do not have full power to deal with any person who is within the United States illegally? We may legislate as much as we desire, but we are never going to enact legislation which will prevent a wetback from coming into this country and then later swimming back to his own country. The Senator knows that to be a fact, does he not?

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not ask the Senator how it actually works out, let me say that many years ago, during prohibition days, I happened to be in a Federal court when Judge Nebbett, who is about 4 or 5 years in the United States, was sentencing a Mexican woman immigrant. She could not speak English, so the judge said to me, “Mr. Chavez, come over here and interpret.” Senators know how judges are. He asked the woman, “Have you anything you want to say?” She said, “No.” Finally, the judge said he was going to send her to the Federal reformatory for women, at Alderson, W. Va., and he sentenced her to 2 years. After he had imposed sentence, she, speaking to me in Spanish, said, “Will you kindly ask the judge if he will take a little bit of time? The judge gave her permission to speak. She said, “I want to thank the judge for being so kind to me, in giving me 2 years, whereas I might have been sentenced if he had given me 5 years.” She said, “I should have preferred to remain in the reformatory for women in West Virginia 5 years, rather than be sent back to Mexico at the end of 2 years.” That is the way many of them feel. They want to be able at least to get something to eat, and that is why they are willing to work for 60 or 70 cents a day, whereas to us it is a pernicious system. But we cannot blame them. They are hungry. Sixty cents a day is a large sum of money in old Mexico.

It is quite a problem throughout the Southwest, as to how to deal with the situation. But we must face it. Senators heard read a telegram from the head of a veterans’ organization in Corcoran, Calif., saying about 50,000 Texas boys of Mexican origin, who complain that they cannot compete with this class of labor. They ask, “Why should the States ask the Senators, do they deserve protection? This situation exists in my State, in the case of people whose ancestors have lived there for generations, perhaps for 400 years, people who now have sons fighting in the United States Army, not the Mexican Army, but the United States Army, the Marine Corps, and the Navy. Because they have to compete with this kind of competition, they have to leave home and family to try to get a piece of work in Nebraska or, possibly, in Wyoming. So the situation is serious. It will not only affect the American way of life unless something is done about it, but it will affect American labor, American standards of living, and American health. How can we look after 5,000 or 6,000 wetbacks in order to keep the immigration laws? Are they not the very people whom the immigration authorities do not have power to deal with? Are they not a pernicious system? If they can beat the immigration laws, it is easy to beat the health laws. That is very dangerous.

It is a problem of the Southwest. I want Senators seriously to consider that fact, and realize that it is a matter which affects everyone.
I stated a little while ago that we had spent $120,000,000 to combat the footand-mouth disease, but we let into the country millions of dollars' worth of hay, the result of which is worse than the disease which I mentioned.

Mr. President, in its April 9 issue, Time magazine dealt at length with the plight of the Mexicans in the Southwest. A newspaper in its April 16 issue, contained an article about the Woeful Wetbacks. The Washington Post carried an editorial on April 9, deploring, "the influx of labor to work for wages that are indecently low according to American standards."

What do we hope for? What do we dream? With world conditions as they are, we tell the rest of the world to help save democracy. We sermonize to the world that we have done that, then until such time as we emerge entirely from this period of emergency and can develop a coordinated program of aid to domestic agricultural labor, so that there will be a dependable labor force as to seasonal opportunities here, there, and yonder over the Nation.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is the point.

Mr. CORDON. Certainly. What I am trying to do is that it is utterly impossible for us ever to approximate the complete utilization of our domestic labor.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is the point.

Mr. CORDON. Until we have done that, it is humanly impossible for any administrative officer ever to be able honestly to certify that there does not exist in the United States an individual who is available for labor. Would the Senator permit me to embody that statement a little bit?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Certainly.

Mr. CORDON. It seems to me there must be a rule of reason somewhere that would permit of an administrative officer making a finding based upon the best evidence. That is what I have done that, that until such time as we emerge entirely from this period of emergency and can develop a coordinated program of aid to domestic agricultural labor, so that there will be a dependable labor force as to seasonal opportunities here, there, and yonder over the Nation.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield further.

Mr. CORDON. My question goes to this proposition: The proposed legislation, as reported by the committee, provides for the entry into the country of Mexican nationals for specified periods of time, and under as much control, perhaps, as we can apply, but with the added value to the laborers of their being here legally, and, therefore, being in position to bargain with their employers for a higher rate of wages than they could obtain as fly-by-nights or what not. In the Senator's view, would the enactment of the bill, as reported, in itself have a tendency to lessen the influx of Mexican laborers who come in illegally, and who, because of that fact, are discriminated against in the wage field?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I think the Senator from Oregon is approaching the subject in the correct way. I do not have any objection at all to making foreign labor available to American farmers. I want to help them, but, in helping them, I want to consider the effects of that assistance on the entire social and political structure. I think the approach suggested is good. The only difficulty is that it does not take care of the problem in the way it is intended it should be handled.

I do not like to have a bill passed which would show preference to any foreigner.

Mr. CORDON. Nor do I.

Mr. CHAVEZ. No matter how I feel toward them. I have devoted 16 years to helping them, from the border to Panama, through the whole of Mexico. I want to get along with them, and I do get along with them. But we may as well make up our minds that any piece of legislation on this subject should at least provide that if only one laborer is available, and he is an American citizen, he should not be discriminated against in the matter of wages— he might get an advantage by bringing in labor from the outside.

Mr. CORDON. I am in entire agreement with Senator from New Mexico in that respect. I am rather inclined to think that the requirement in the bill is about as stringent and strong as we could make it, if we are to expect to get any results. The thought comes to me that it is humanly impossible for any administrative officer ever to be able honestly to certify that there does not exist in the United States an individual who is available for labor. Would the Senator permit me to embody that statement a little bit?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Certainly.

Mr. CORDON. It seems to me there must be a rule of reason somewhere that would permit of an administrative officer making a finding based upon the best evidence. That is what I have done that, that until such time as we emerge entirely from this period of emergency and can develop a coordinated program of aid to domestic agricultural labor, so that there will be a dependable labor force as to seasonal opportunities here, there, and yonder over the Nation.
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the bill. That is all we expect of the bill. We are willing to cooperate along the lines suggested by the Senator from Oregon, and what I know are the ideas of my good friend from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENBERGER].

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

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. If the bill as reported by the committee is enacted, and receiving the benefit of the centers would be the man along the border. If a farmer takes his own lumber industries. They have their own sawmills. They have a fishery industry. They have their own fresh fish packing activities.

Mr. CHAVEZ. And they have beautiful 

Mr. THYE. The Minnesota Indian has always had the opportunity to take a job wherever the job was crying for the man to take it. Minnesota Indians have their own lumber industries. They have their own sawmills. They have a fishery industry. They have their own fresh fish packing activities.

Mr. CHAVEZ. And they have beautiful 

Mr. THYE. Indeed. They have—more than 10,000 of them. I am advertising a little.

Nevertheless, in spite of all that, last fall I was in the Minnesota Indian reservation in late October, when we were threatened with a freeze. I received a great number of calls from the northwestern section of Minnesota where potatoes were then being harvested. It was late in the year. The producer was fearful that his potato crop or sugar-beet crop would be damaged by frost, or possibly buried by a snowstorm.
I received a great number of calls from producers who see the crisis as offering the opportunity to set aside a Federal law. Of course, a Federal law cannot be set aside in that manner; but they wanted a certain provision of Federal law set aside for the children to have the privilege of being excused from school for a few days, to go into the fields and dig potatoes or help to harvest sugar beets. The producer was willing to pay almost any price to might ask, in order to get the job done.

If that situation existed last fall, before the extremely critical manpower shortage which the Korean crisis has brought about as we have remobilized, what may we anticipate the situation to be this fall? Today the defense plants are bidding for workers. Last fall they were not necessarily bidding for workers. That is the only reason why I personally recognize that we must take some action by way of enacting legislation which will allow the importation of offshore workers. I am confident that we are not going to have a sufficient supply of domestic workers.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I assure the Senator from Ohio that there is no intention to oppose all legislation along this line. I believe that legislation is needed, but I do not believe that the bill as reported to the Senate carries out the idea which the Senator from Minnesota has in mind. I know the history of the importation of foreign labor, especially the classes which we are now discussing. During the war they did well contribute, not merely to farm labor, but also to labor in factories, plants, and railroads.

The Federal Government has now in the Treasury possibly a little more than $3,000,000 in the railroad retirement fund, which was paid in by Mexican workers. It is contributed to the fund. We still have the money in the Treasury. It was deducted from the pay. As a matter of fact, I believe that the Senator from Ohio introduced a bill to help them get their money back. It belongs to them. However, we still have it.

As the Senator says, the supply of migratory laborers begins early in the spring, possibly working on asparagus and peas in California. Eventually they finish with potatoes and beets in the northern section of the United States. We want to help those laborers. From the standpoint of humanity, there is no reason why we should object to them obtaining employment. However, I know that the situation is quite difficult, because we are dealing with people who do not think as does the Senator from Minnesota. I think the reason why they work at stoop labor, which the average American will not accept. I do not want to interfere with the idea of the average American by importing very cheap labor, even the class of labor which will not stoop to conquer.

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

Mr. CHAVEZ. I do not want anyone's necessity to be the basis for the American standard of living.

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

Mr. CHAVEZ. Certainly.

Mr. THYE. In any community to which these workers go they must be paid the going wage. I realize the Senator recognizes as existing, in that workers who are illegally in the country are exploited. They do not have the benefit of negotiation. They are not under the supervision of State employment officers or Federal employment officers. When I served as governor of the State, there were many conferences with State officials on an effort to protect the Mexican workers.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Let me point out there that if I felt that labor would be treated everywhere as it is treated by the employment agency in the State of Minnesota, I would be for the bill. There may be some States, perhaps, where some persons do not want the prevailing wage paid either for domestic labor or imported labor.

Mr. THYE. I thank the Senator for the compliment and I may say that the employment office in Minnesota can stand up against the importation of foreign labor. We still have the money in the Treasury possibly a little more than $3,000,000 in the railroad retirement fund, which was paid in by Mexican labor, but also to labor in factories, plants, and railroads.

With the problem.

My real concern here, of course, is with what we may call the wetbacks, those who crossed the border illegally. Such persons may enter into contracts for less than the going wage in a community. I do not know how we can legislate to bring workers into the United States and at the same time take care of that particular question, except by strengthening our immigration authorities, and increasing their power to patrol and protect our border so as to guard against illegal entry.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Let us take one thing at a time. The Senator from Minnesota speaks of the thousands of workers in the area into which the imported worker, the conditions under which he was compelled to live, and other factors.

My real concern here, of course, is with what we may call the wetbacks, those who crossed the border illegally. Such persons may enter into contracts for less than the going wage in a community. I do not know how we can legislate to bring workers into the United States and at the same time take care of that particular question, except by strengthening our immigration authorities, and increasing their power to patrol and protect our border so as to guard against illegal entry.

Mr. THYE. I thank the Senator for the compliment and I may say that the employment office in Minnesota can stand up against the importation of foreign labor. We still have the money in the Treasury possibly a little more than $3,000,000 in the railroad retirement fund, which was paid in by Mexican labor, but also to labor in factories, plants, and railroads.

With the problem.

My real concern here, of course, is with what we may call the wetbacks, those who crossed the border illegally. Such persons may enter into contracts for less than the going wage in a community. I do not know how we can legislate to bring workers into the United States and at the same time take care of that particular question, except by strengthening our immigration authorities, and increasing their power to patrol and protect our border so as to guard against illegal entry.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I have been reading from an editorial in the Washington Post. I concluded with the following words:

We agree with the Commission that our efforts in the future should be directed toward increasing the number of our own farm workers and eliminating dependence on foreign labor.

The Los Angeles News and many other newspapers and magazines have published articles and editorials dealing with the problem.

My purpose in referring to the great amount of attention recently given to this question by the press of the Nation is to focus our thinking on the effect of the proposed legislation on the conditions described. I cannot see how this legislation will help remedy these conditions. I fear it will do just the reverse. I should say it will do this.

Many of the articles make it clear that there are large numbers of unemployed workers in the area into which the wetbacks and legal Mexican immigrants come. These are unemployed by the growers because they prefer the foreign labor which is cheaper for them. Of the half million domestic native migrant workers—I am talking about a half million domestic migrant workers, not foreign migrant workers—a large proportion are descendants of Anglo-Americans from the eastern seaboard who crossed the Appalachians settled in the once-fertile valleys of the Southwest and later were "tracored off" the land to become "Okies" made famous by John Steinbeck in his Grapes of Wrath. Another large number of these migrants, as I personally know, are Spanish-speaking Americans who have been in this country for hundreds of years. Prior to World War II, many of the people of my State of New Mexico also followed the crops, going from northern New Mexico into the Rio Grande Valley, into the States of Colorado and Arizona—obtaining employment to supplement the income they received from their own small farms. During and since World War II
most of these people have found it increasingly difficult to obtain employment in the large commercial farms. So, too, have the American Indians in my State— the Nezavos, the Apaches, the Pueblos, and others—and residues, as their testimony before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry shows. Some of those Indians appeared before the committees of the Senate and the House and testified in person.

The President's Commission, in its report, gives verification to the statements I have just made. It declares that if our domestic labor supply is recruited and transported from places where there is no employment to areas of labor shortage there will be no need, as I pointed out at the beginning, to import foreign workers for food and fiber production in the present defense emergency. As chairman of a subcommittee on appropriations, I recently conducted hearings on President's Commission recommendations for the current year. I questioned the Director of Employment Security about his handling of this farm-labor supply program. Some of his answers surprised me more than less than satisfactory, especially regarding employment of Puerto Ricans and American Indians. I have read excerpts from that testimony hereafter.

It is not alone, however, in the utilization of our citizens from Puerto Rico and Hawaii and from among our own American Indians that we have failed. There also a vast reservoir of potential agricultural workers among the Nation's million or more marginal farm families—farm operators whose total value of farm production, including farm products used in the home, did not exceed $1,500 in recent years. A recent study of the Joint Congressional Committee on the Economic Report, prepared and issued under the supervision of a subcommittee chaired by the able Senator from Alabama (Mr. Sparkman) declared that the underemployment of these marginal farmers is depriving the Nation of the equivalent of more than 2,500,000 workers. That is, the underemployment of marginal farmers throughout the United States, so the Subcommittee on Economic Report reported, is depriving the Nation of the equivalent of more than 2,500,000 workers.

That study further pointed out that there are a million and a half rural nonfarm families with family incomes of $2,000 or less in 1948. "Full employment of the workers in these families," the study says, "is done."

The legislation we are now considering is aimed at improving the methods of developing an adequate agricultural-labor supply from among the millions of underemployed and poverty-ridden families discussed by the Sparkman report. No; it limits itself to the importation of cheap labor from Mexico. This raises a serious question of public policy which the Congress of the United States must face. As the President's Commission put it:

- Shall we continue indefinitely to have low work standards and conditions in agriculture, thus depending on the underprivileged and the unfortunate—

Those who are subject to hunger, starvation, and empty stomachs; and, of course, the assumption is that the measure is to deal with that situation—

home and abroad to supply and replenish our seasonal and migratory labor force?

Mr. President, should we attempt to ruin one segment of labor—agricultural labor—and is it to provide for an economic system quite different from that applying to any other industry in our country?

On that point, I read further from the report of the President's Commission:

Or shall we do in agriculture what we have already done in other sectors of our economy—create honest-to-goodness jobs which will offer a decent living so that domestic workers, without being forced by dire necessity, will be willing to stay in agriculture and become a dependable labor supply? As farm employers find willing workers needed, so do workers want reliable jobs which yield a fair living.

Mr. President, the workers want, and should have, at least a decent American standard of living. Of course, we want labor to be available for the farmer when he needs it, but we also want the labor to have the benefit of our American standards.

I read further from the report of the President's Commission:

We have long wavered and compromised on the issue of migratory labor in agriculture. We have failed to adopt policies designed to insure an adequate supply of such labor at decent standards of employment.

That is the test.

Actually, we have done worse than that. We have used the institutions of government to procure alien labor willing to work under obsolete and backward conditions and thus to perpetuate those very conditions. This not only entrenches a bad system, it expands it.

At that point in their report, Mr. President, the Commission and its able staff make a statement which I think is of paramount interest and of fundamental importance. The statement is:

We have not only undermined the standards of employment for migratory farm workers, we have impaired the economic and social position of the family farm operator.

I give the last part of that statement special emphasis; I repeat it:

We have impaired the economic and social position of the family farm operator.

Before going further what the President's Commission says on this crucial question, I remind the Senate that a study of history will show that a major factor in the decline and fall of empires and nations is that they could happen here in the United States, Mr. President—has been the abandonment of family-type farm ownership and operation in favor of the large-scale, absentee-ownership type of operation. Mr. President, I choose to be a member of the Appropriations Committee, and on that committee I happen to serve with the distinguished Junior Senator from Georgia (Mr. Russell) on the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations. I wonder whether Senators know that of the 6,500,000 farms in the United States, practically half of them have absentee owners. That is the reason for the concern of appropriation committees who do not want the small farmer to be further harmed by making him compete with cheap labor.

Mr. President, the little corner of Finland that is great and green also is stuck up, even against Russia, because 96 percent of the farms in Finland are owned by those who farm the land. Some of them may own 1 acre of land; but, like the English, they are able to say, "My castle may be but a hovel, but it is mine." So each of those farmers farms his own land, and does so intensively.

On the other hand, I do not know what would happen as a result of the importation of cheap foreign labor, which is the subject with which the present measure deals. Perhaps 125,000 of our farms—those owned by large-scale operators—might receive some advantage from such importation; but it seems to me that our farm operators would be seriously injured.

I read further from the report of the President's Commission:

The operator of a family-type farm is a capitalist, but one whose business is derived primarily from his own labor.

Of course, Mr. President, a man who is farming 3 acres, and is raising truck crops—cabbage, radishes, tomatoes, and so forth—which he sells on the market, is a capitalist, even though he depends upon his wife and his children, in addition to himself in growing his crop. In fact, probably his children are unable to have a holiday on Saturday, because they must pull weeds on the farm. However, that man is a capitalist.

I read further from the report:

In this sense he is also a laborer. He aspires to the success of agriculture to maintain an American standard of living. He is, therefore, in a poor position to compete with the foreign farm worker who has lower wages, who leaves his family at home, and who makes no demand on his employer or the communities after the crop season's work is done.

Mr. President, I wish to point out to my good friend, the Senator from Illinois (Mr. Douglas), that those who will be the recipients of work under this bill, if it is enacted, are more to be pitied than censured. Stern necessity confronts them. Of course, we have heard of church mice and of how poor they are, but I venture the assertion that those who will be the recipients of work under this bill are poorer than the poorest of church mice. These people need work very badly. However, in trying to be charitable and kindly toward them, we must not let anything undermine our own economic system. That is the basis of my opposition to this bill. I believe in the American standard of living and in maintaining it. I think my record in this body is about as good as that of any other Member of this body, in that particular respect.

I have voted without quibbling for the appropriation of billions of dollars to help starving people in Asia and in Europe.
However, I cannot convince myself that I am justified in doing that, if at the same time I neglect American citizens, even when we are dealing with charity.

Mr. President, I ask my colleagues to consider a telegram which I have received. It comes from the American GI Forum of Texas, an independent veterans' organization, and is signed by Hector P. Garcia, M. D., chairman:

CORPUS CHRISTI, TEX., April 20, 1951.

Hon. Dennis Chavez, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.: American GI Forum Veterans' Organization representing more than 50,000 American veterans of Mexican origin wish to ask you to continue to fight to exclude foreign workers, especially in Texas. Thousands of veterans not able to make decent living because of low-wage competition by wetbacks and enforce workers, many of whom, as the Commission report makes clear, remain in this country illegally, even though they came into the country legally. These pools of alien labor willing to accept low wages obviously tend to tear down the standards of all labor, whether agricultural or industrial. Nor is it to be wondered at, that the churches and religious organizations of our country have become aroused at the conditions of this migratory labor which has been recently so tellingly described in the newspaper and magazine articles to which I have referred. These conditions are a scandal to our Nation and are a serious weakness before the world in our Nation's leadership in the fight against the Krem­lin. So long as they are allowed to continue—and, as I have said several times, the proposed legislation does nothing to remedy them, but will, in my judgment, tend to aggravate them—as a people we cannot stand before other peoples in other nations and maintain that we know so well how to order the affairs of people within our own borders that we may teach the rest of the world how to order its affairs. No, Mr. President, this proposed measure fails completely to face the grave problems with which we are confronted respecting agricultural labor. I introduced a measure, Senate bill 949, which I felt took some steps in the direction of facing those problems. It was not reported by the Senate Agriculture Committee. In truth—if we are to judge by the committee report and the objectives my bill sought to achieve were scarcely considered at all by the committee.

So, with the pending committee bill, the best I can do is to offer, and have offered, a number of amendments in an attempt to accomplish what my bill sought to do. I shall discuss them in due time. I hope I shall be able to persuade a majority of the Members of the Senate to support my amendments, because I honestly believe we will make a major blunder, both for our domestic social and political economy and even in our international relations, if we permit the committee bill to become a law.

In conclusion, I hope that so far as the pending bill is concerned, in its present form, as I stated earlier, without in any way questioning the motives or the sincerity of purpose of the members of the Agriculture and Forestry, I firmly believe that it represents a backward step. In my opinion it would undo many of the things which have been done for the country by the great Lincoln. In my State it would bring about the return ofpeonage, which became unlawful in 1868. It would do away with all of the notable and laudable ideals, traditions, and concepts for which America has stood. It would do violence to those things which were in the minds of the founding fathers, particularly as expressed in the Declaration of Independence, and to all the concepts embodied within the preamble of the Constitution which begins, "We, the people of the United States."

The bill is an American betrayal. It would under­mine everything for which we have stood, so far as human liberty and American standards are concerned. True, it would benefit a few; but at what expense? At the expense of undermining our health standards, at the expense of bringing about human misery and human exploitation. I trust that the bill in its present form will not pass.

RELATION OF AIR POWER TO THE SAFETY OF THE NATION

Mr. LODGE and Mr. HUMPHREY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Has the Senator from New Mexico yielded the floor?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I have concluded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I shall be glad to yield to any Senator who wishes to make a routine insertion in the Record.

Other than that, I do not wish to yield. I have been waiting for quite a while to make this speech. It is not going to take very long. I should not yield for anything other than a routine insertion.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I may say to the Senator from Massachusetts that my only purpose in rising was to continue with the discussion on the pending legislation. I have been informed now that an understanding was reached earlier this morning that the Senator from Massachusetts was to make a short address to the Senate on another subject.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I wish to speak on a subject other than the one which is pending. I am doing so, because of its great importance.

I wish to make an urgent plea today for something which involves the safety of our troops in Europe—the tactical air force.

Then I wish to speak with reference to air power as a whole in relation to the safety of the Nation.

By way of introduction, let me say that there appears to be almost unanimous agreement that the United States, strategically speaking, is essentially a sea and air power. This does not mean, of course, that we may not be required by circumstances to make an effort on land. But on land we will always need air. But even the most unsophisticated lay-
man sensed that war had advanced somewhat beyond the point where the bomber could be measured solely in terms of numbers of men.

The commanders of our Army assured us this was so and informed us they were building United States armed ground forces, which, in the view of the future on the age-old principles of fire power and maneuver, as adapted to the air-atom age. Our divisions were designed to exploit the mastery of air superiority of the American Nation in applied mechanics and mass production.

Mr. President, the first ingredient of this kind of military power, of course, is air power. The most mobile troops with maximum fire power per pound are still as naked as men in their underwear unless they are certain at the outset that their air forces control the air over their own lines, over the enemy’s lines, over his assembly areas, and over the centers of his production.

The assurance of a former Secretary of War, Mr. Lodge, that if the Soviets attacked at “4 o’clock we would be ready to strike back at 5,” appears, in the light of the facts I propose to submit, as a most mischievous representation.

It is today obvious that the survival of the United States is once more in jeopardy, just 6 years after a million men became casualties to make the United States the strongest power on earth and safe, presumably, from enemy threat for decades to come. Now it is clearly touch and go whether the United States will survive the leadership vacuum it has had since that time.

For the cold, brutal fact is, Mr. President, that the United States does not have air supremacy, air superiority, or anything like it. The staggering fact is that on balance air superiority as well as land superiority lies with the Soviet Union. Let me elucidate that point.

Air power falls into three categories:

First, air defense, which is a nation’s ability to defend its homeland—its industrial power—against enemy air attack. The biggest potential source of military power on earth today is the United States industrial plant, and, Mr. President, I am advised that the United States is now, and for some time to come, will be, unable to defend it, even against the enemy’s presently limited ability to strike with atomic attack.

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

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not care to interrupt the Senator’s speech, if he desires to preserve its continuity.

Mr. LODGE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator has just mentioned our industrial war potential. Can the Red air force bomb the industrial potential of the United States?

Mr. LODGE. I am so advised. Today’s air defense is air defense in which is capable of protecting our great industrial centers.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the distinguished Senator remember the testimony of Vandenberg in relation to the resolution which was up for hearing, which had to do with defense bombing, when the distinguished general said that if the combined strategic air command of Russia came over the North Pole, it which could do within 5½ hours. It was his judgment that 4 percent of the Russian planes would get through?

Mr. LODGE. I remember something like that; yes. I shall come in a moment to something concerning air power which we heard on the troops-to-Europe question.

Mr. WHERRY. In that connection, does the distinguished Senator recall the statement of Mr. Vandenberg before the joint meeting of the two Houses, in which he said that mastery of the air would protect the whole line from eastern Siberia to Malaysia clear down to Singapore? I think the Senator was present at the time the general made that statement. Would the Senator agree that by strategic bombing we could protect a line running from the farthest edge of east Siberia on the Pacific, south to Singapore?

Mr. LODGE. Does the Senator say that General Vandenberg stated that could be done if we had air mastery?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

Mr. LODGE. I think that is true. I say that at the present time we do not have mastery of the war.

Mr. WHERRY. I agree. Is it not also true that if we can do that in the Pacific area we can do the same thing in Western Europe, if we have mastery of the air?

Mr. LODGE. I believe a ground army can never begin to operate without air superiority in the place where it is located. But until we control air power cannot do. I do not undertake to say that air power can do everything the Army or the Navy can do, because I do not entertain that view.

Mr. WHERRY. If the Senator will yield further, I was not attempting to elicit that answer from the Senator. I am trying to establish that if we have mastery of the air, the first move we should make in defense, not only in the Pacific area but in Western Europe, is to get into a position, so far as our Air Force is concerned, to defend our troops, our Navy, and our industrial centers of the West.

Mr. LODGE. Of course, it is a vital question. It involves the ability to read the minds of the Soviets, which I am unable to do. I do not even know whether we have a sufficient force with which to carry out such an undertaking, or whether we have a large enough strategic Air Force to divide it into different parts. It is certainly a question which we must consider.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. LODGE. Yes.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Massachusetts agree with me that at least before any decision is made to inaugurate the type of preventive war in which the bombing of Manchuria might involve us, we had better know whether we have a sufficient force with which to carry out such an undertaking?

Mr. WHERRY. I agree that certainly when armies are on the ground, we must have tactical air power to protect them, that we have to protect them. Does not the Senator in view of the speech of Vandenberg just now know, agree with me that in making a choice in the expenditure of the defense dollar the priority, if we are to choose between arms, should be to move toward the development of air power capable of bombing Russia’s war potential, in order to destroy it, as the first priority in our defense against an attack on Western Europe?
tremendous weight of numbers and accept fantastic casualties. Our forces in Korea are massively outnumbered by the Chinese Reds. Yet so far, they have been able not only to hold, but inflict staggering casualties on the Chinese because of our ability to deliver an atomic attack on their homeland. Yet, I am informed that even our strategic air offensive is far from as formidable as it should be and that our relative position over the Soviets in this one element of strategic air power diminishes. I am advised that even the B-36, invaluable though it is, will not be an operational weapon in the near future. Defense moves too rapidly on the heels of offensive capability to let any nation rest on a stopgap weapon. I understand that we should replace the B-36's as soon as possible with all-jet, high-speed bombers like the Boeing B-52, and the all-jet version of the B-36 and that at the present time insufficient funds are being provided to move quickly to this goal.

I address myself especially today to the question of our tactical air power. The Senate overwhelmingly voted—with my vote among a large majority—approval for sending four additional divisions overseas, provided always, of course, that the Joint Chiefs of Staff certify that sending these divisions is an essential step in strengthening the security of the United States and that the nations of Europe are making their own full and realistic effort. The whole idea of the North Atlantic Treaty is based on the assumption that the troops on the ground will have really adequate tactical air support. Anyone, therefore, who is interested in the welfare of these troops—as most of us are—must be equally interested in seeing to it that an adequate tactical air force is in existence to protect them.

In order to decide how large the tactical air force in Europe ought to be, we must first have an estimate of how big the Soviet tactical air force is. Publications have quite naturally been accepted estimate the Soviet tactical air force at 16,000 to 20,000 planes. Of this total some are needed in other parts of the world and it is probably not too wide of the mark to say that 9,000 Soviet tactical planes are available for attack on the west.

If we assume that the North Atlantic Treaty nations should have at least a 2-to-1 superiority over the Soviet mass armies, it follows, therefore, that the tactical air force of the North Atlantic Treaty powers should consist of 18,000 planes. This total should not include whatever British or French planes are used in air defense for the protection of places like London and Paris against bomber attack.

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

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Would the Senator tell us the basis for his assumption of the ratio of 2 to 1? Is the ratio based upon any military study or information of which the Senator is aware? It strikes me that it is too low a figure, based upon information which we have received in the Committee on Armed Services, on the superiority and the antiaircraft power which often goes along with ground superiority.

Mr. LODGE. I will say to the Senator that the ratio of 2 to 1 is very conservative. I should like to see it much larger than that. In my present statement I am trying not to be extravagant. I am trying to be very prudent and moderate and trying to be very realistic. I am trying not to be extravagant. I am trying to be very prudent and moderate, sometimes arrive at some very startling results.

Mr. MORSE. I may say to the Senator from Vermont that he is noted for his understatement. It is well that he engages in understatement. However, I believe it is important that some of us who share his point of view should raise a question now and then as to whether or not he is not understating a case too much. That is why I raised the question about the 2-to-1 ratio. I think it would be a mistake for the American people to have their full interest and want to provide an appropriation which would give us a 2-to-1 superiority over the Russian air force. In view of lack of bases from which our Air Force would have to operate, and in view of the kind of attack the Russians would make on Western Europe, I think we had better face the fact that we must increase it beyond a 2-to-1 ratio.

Mr. LODGE. I am not disagreeing with the distinguished Senator, particularly when the ratio is so tremendously against us as it is now. We do not even have a 2-to-1 superiority now. In fact, we are laboring under a very substantial inferiority. We have hope of making all the headway we can in order to reach the 2-to-1 point. I believe the Senator will find that the great weight of military opinion is on his side that the ratio should be greater than 2 to 1.

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

Mr. LODGE. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not know whether the Senator has covered some of the points I have in mind, but I should like to ask him whether he heard the remarks made by the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] on April 26 relative to the need for a tactical air force not only in the United States, but especially in Western Europe.

Mr. LODGE. I remember it in a general way. I could not quote from it in detail.

Mr. WHERRY. I believe the statement was taken from a United Press report. It was to the effect that the delayed start in providing air support for the Atlantic Pact army had created a problem which had become so critical that it was to be placed on the agenda of the British, French, and American conferences to be held shortly. I wondered whether the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts could tell us anything about that. I should like to ascertain whether it is true that there is in every tactical air force in Western Europe to protect the army we are about to build there.

Mr. LODGE. I do not believe we have sufficient tactical air power there. I believe we must develop the air groups, particularly when the ratio is so tremendously against us as it is now. We do not even have a 2-to-1 superiority now. In fact, we are laboring under a very substantial inferiority. We have hope of making all the headway we can in order to reach the 2-to-1 point. I believe the Senator will find that the great weight of military opinion is on his side that the ratio should be greater than 2 to 1.

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

Mr. LODGE. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator for yielding once again. I appreciate his answers to the questions. I should like to ask a further question. It has come to my attention that the program
of building long-range bombers in this country has already slowed down in order to provide for more construction of tactical planes. Does the Senator know anything about that?

Mr. LODGE. I did not know that. I was advised that there are not sufficient funds for developing the new long-range bombers, but the proposition which I am going to make is that we accelerate the strategic air development, and that we build up the tactical Air Force. I do not want to do one at the expense of the other.

Mr. WHERRY. That was the next question I intended to ask. As I understand the Senator from Massachusetts, in advocating air supremacy, is also in favor of the strategic long-range bombing force.

Mr. LODGE. Oh, yes.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator would not for a moment detract from building up that arm of the service in order to build up some other branch of the Air Force, would he?

Mr. LODGE. The Senator is correct. I am coming to that question in a moment. I am taking up the tactical Air Force first, because the tactical Air Force is the one which is most flagrantly underfunded. I will have the advantage over the Russians in the strategic Air Force. While our advantage is gradually disappearing, we still have the advantage. We should profit by the superiority which we possess in strategic Air Force in order to build up in the lines in which we are weak.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator place in the record what it would cost to build a 95-group force, a 150-group force, and so forth?

Mr. LODGE. I have some figures. I have figures in terms of planes and in terms of manpower. I have not as many figures in terms of dollars as the Senate will need before it finally makes a decision on this question. However, I am hopeful that the Appropriations Committee can obtain the figures in terms of dollars to correspond with the figures which I am stating in terms of planes and manpower. The Senator from Nebraska is a member of the Appropriations Committee and is interested in this problem. I am sure he will obtain the figures.

Mr. WHERRY. That is the reason I brought up the question. If the Senator prefers, I will wait until he has concluded. I should like to ask not only with respect to the figures but also whether the Senator does not feel that the Appropriations Committees itself, with the advice and consent of other committees, and with all the evidence which can be obtained, should help to determine what the defense dollars should be spent. Is not that what the Senator is now suggesting to the Senator from Nebraska and his colleagues?

Mr. LODGE. I am suggesting to the Senator from Nebraska that the figures which I am submitting show that, on balance, the Soviets have the edge on us in the air. I am suggesting that the Congress should take steps so that they would have the edge on them in the air.

Mr. WHERRY. I commend the Senator.

Mr. LODGE. That must be done in three different departments, namely, strategic, tactical, and air defense. I have stated that the tactical air force needs are the most pressing because that is where we are the weakest.

Mr. WHERRY. I appreciate the answer of the Senator. I am in complete sympathy with the Senator which has been made about the determination of the appropriations, and the numbers of Air Force units which should be supplied. I am in complete sympathy with the idea of making an evaluation for all branches of the military service. I suggest to the distinguished Senator, because he is a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, which is now sitting with the Armed Services Committee as a joint committee to listen to evidence relative to defense dollars in the Pacific, which I am stating in terms of planes and men. The Senator is speaking of the advantage over the Russians in the strategic Air Force. While our advantage is gradually disappearing, we still have the advantage. We should profit by the superiority which we possess in strategic Air Force in order to build up in the lines in which we are weak.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator read it. I do not want him to make a speech in my time, but I shall be glad to have him read that paragraph and base a question on it.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to have it in the Senator's remarks because I believe it is very pertinent to the case here, and also to the suggestions being made by the distinguished Senator.

Paragraph (7) is as follows:

(7) Effort should be made to reduce air power as major deterrents to war and decisive weapons for victory if world war comes; comparing the relative cost in manpower, financial, industrial, and other resources of mastery of the air and sea with that of a defense policy based upon ground forces as the decisive factor; and also comparing resources of a potential enemy for ground warfare and vulnerability of such potential enemy's war industrial potential to demobilization by air power, as well as the importance of having mastery of the air for defense of United States industrial centers against destruction by such potential enemy.

That is a suggestion for the committee, to help it to advise the Congress. Does not the Senator feel that it is very pertinent in determining global defense policy?

Mr. LODGE. There is no doubt that the two committees will have to go into the whole question of air power, sea power, and land power. I hope that the Senator's comments, while not being drawn into a theoretical comparison, in absolute terms, as between the three, because if there is one thing that is clear about air power, sea power, and land power, it is that they must be considered specifically with relation to specific situations. There are situations which arise in which we can use only land power, and in which air power and sea power are not only much more expensive, but utterly impossible to use. It is like saying that you can either eat meat or eat potatoes. They are two different things. So I do not think we ought to become involved in the joint committee with discussions of theoretical preferences as between the various arms.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator feel that the committee should interest itself in practical solutions?

Mr. LODGE. Oh, yes.

Mr. WHERRY. With a limited amount of money and manpower, we cannot have superiority in everything. I submit to the Senator that it is necessary to emphasize those things which should come first.

Mr. LODGE. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. WHERRY. In that sense should not the Senate be guided by the wisdom—

Mr. LODGE. Let me answer one question before the Senator proceeds to the question I stated at the beginning of my speech today—and I think I covered that point quite thoroughly—that the United States, strategically speaking, is essential for both air and air power. I read from my statement:

By way of introduction, let me say that there appears to be almost unanimous agreement that the United States, strategically speaking, is essentially a sea and air power. This does not mean, of course, that we may not be required by circumstances to make an effort on land. But I do believe we will always need effective allies, whereas in the air and on the sea we can reasonably expect to have a preponderance of strength alone.

This is the point which may have escaped the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. I think that is a very good statement. In line with that—and I hope the Senator will be patient for a moment—I am going on the theory that resources are limited. I am going on the theory that the air power which we have also is limited. Therefore it is very necessary that the Congress be guided by the wisdom and the findings of the Appropriations Committee—in this particular case the joint committees. Let me show the Senator what I mean—

Mr. LODGE. Before the Senator proceeds to the next point, the fact that our resources in manpower are limited—which indeed they are—argues very strongly for a foreign policy which will give us effective allies, not ineffective ones. I am glad that the Senator brought up the point that we have a shortage in manpower, because I think that must lead directly to the conclusion that we need as many allies as we can get in all theaters of the world.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senate further yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. The point I was attempting to make was this: Take, for example, the Air Force. I happen to have the latest figures which I could get as to what it would cost to build a 95-group force, a 150-group force, and a 120-group force. I also have figures as to what it
would cost to maintain them after the first year, in which they are built and placed on the line.

I am not sure that I should release these figures. I suppose the distinguished Senator has already seen them. I think it is highly disquieting to the American people, in my judgment. Nor do I think that any Senator, Mr. President, can see them and understand them the way I do. The figures are approximately what the Senator from Massachusetts has mentioned in his remarks this afternoon. They are made public. I am for open hearings whenever they can be had, because I believe the facts are clear. The figures are placed on the table where every man can read them and understand them the Congress will have the backing of the people. I think the information should be made public, where it will do the most to invite attack and that the Soviets have far greater domestic air power than has been requested of it. Mr. President, it is clearly the fault of inadequate Executive leadership.

What must we do to get air superiority?
The present over-all objective of 95 groups is not big enough to include the 48 tactical groups of which I speak, and in addition to give us enough strategic aviation and enough air defense for the continental United States. Yet I understand that there is actually a shortage of resources for the Air Force. I have been told that we are short of personnel and that the Air Force will not be able to man the planes. I think this is the fault of inadequate Executive leadership.

Mr. President, you have not enough to go around. We have to make the right approach with the money we have, so that our position will be strong enough to be a deterrent, or to stop a war with Russia.

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I am coming to that in a moment.

Mr. WHERRY. I know how the Senator feels about information being given publicly, but the appropriation bill has been handed to the Appropriations Committee for the Air Force apparently for this year. They are not based on a 150 air group, but on a 75 air group. The figures are approximately what the Senator from Massachusetts has mentioned in his remarks this afternoon. They are made public. I am for open hearings whenever they can be had, because I believe the facts are clear. The figures are placed on the table where every man can read them and understand them the Congress will have the backing of the people. I think the information should be made public, wherever it will do the most to invite attack and that the Soviets have far greater domestic air power than has been requested of it. Mr. President, it is clearly the fault of inadequate Executive leadership.

Mr. WHERRY. I shall be glad to bear the burden of responsibility. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. I shall be glad to bear with the Senator.

Mr. WHERRY. I am coming to that in a moment.

Mr. WHERRY. I know how the Senator feels about information being given publicly, but the appropriation bill has been handed to the Appropriations Committee for the Air Force apparently for this year. They are not based on a 150 air group, but on a 75 air group. The figures are approximately what the Senator from Massachusetts has mentioned in his remarks this afternoon. They are made public. I am for open hearings whenever they can be had, because I believe the facts are clear. The figures are placed on the table where every man can read them and understand them the Congress will have the backing of the people. I think the information should be made public, wherever it will do the most to invite attack and that the Soviets have far greater domestic air power than has been requested of it. Mr. President, it is clearly the fault of inadequate Executive leadership.

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I am coming to that in a moment.

Mr. WHERRY. I know how the Senator feels about information being given publicly, but the appropriation bill has been handed to the Appropriations Committee for the Air Force apparently for this year. They are not based on a 150 air group, but on a 75 air group. The figures are approximately what the Senator from Massachusetts has mentioned in his remarks this afternoon. They are made public. I am for open hearings whenever they can be had, because I believe the facts are clear. The figures are placed on the table where every man can read them and understand them the Congress will have the backing of the people. I think the information should be made public, wherever it will do the most to invite attack and that the Soviets have far greater domestic air power than has been requested of it. Mr. President, it is clearly the fault of inadequate Executive leadership.
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Mr. WHERRY. I am coming to that in a moment.

Mr. WHERRY. I know how the Senator feels about information being given publicly, but the appropriation bill has been handed to the Appropriations Committee for the Air Force apparently for this year. They are not based on a 150 air group, but on a 75 air group. The figures are approximately what the Senator from Massachusetts has mentioned in his remarks this afternoon. They are made public. I am for open hearings whenever they can be had, because I believe the facts are clear. The figures are placed on the table where every man can read them and understand them the Congress will have the backing of the people. I think the information should be made public, wherever it will do the most to invite attack and that the Soviets have far greater domestic air power than has been requested of it. Mr. President, it is clearly the fault of inadequate Executive leadership.

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I am coming to that in a moment.

Mr. WHERRY. I know how the Senator feels about information being given publicly, but the appropriation bill has been handed to the Appropriations Committee for the Air Force apparently for this year. They are not based on a 150 air group, but on a 75 air group. The figures are approximately what the Senator from Massachusetts has mentioned in his remarks this afternoon. They are made public. I am for open hearings whenever they can be had, because I believe the facts are clear. The figures are placed on the table where every man can read them and understand them the Congress will have the backing of the people. I think the information should be made public, wherever it will do the most to invite attack and that the Soviets have far greater domestic air power than has been requested of it. Mr. President, it is clearly the fault of inadequate Executive leadership.
fortunes of battle, we should have 175 groups. Certainly 150 groups will get us started off the present dead center of disaster and courage.

There is no doubt that 150 air groups will cost money, roughly an average of $25,600,000,000 a year while we maintain them at top combat efficiency. But it is quite clear to all of us that it comes high at a time when the entire free world is faced with the greatest threat of our times. Insofar as manpower required, I have it. I should like very much to have his views on the choice which confronts us in regard to the spending of our dollars. The Armed Services Committee must hold a ceiling of $60,700,000,000; or will it be $60,000,000,000; or $59,000,000,000; or $58,000,000,000; or $55,000,000,000; or $50,000,000,000; or $45,000,000,000; or $40,000,000,000; or $35,000,000,000; or $30,000,000,000; or $25,000,000,000; or $20,000,000,000; or $15,000,000,000; or $10,000,000,000; or $5,000,000,000; or $4,000,000,000; or $3,000,000,000; or $2,000,000,000; or $1,000,000,000; or $0,000,000,000.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senate yield at this point?
Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senate yield at this point?
Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senate yield at this point?
Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senate yield at this point?
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Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senate yield at this point?
Mr. LODGE. I yield.
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Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senate yield at this point?
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Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senate yield at this point?
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Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senate yield at this point?
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Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senate yield at this point?
Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senate yield at this point?
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Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senate yield at this point?
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Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senate yield at this point?
Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senate yield at this point?
Mr. LODGE. I yield.
Mr. LODGE. I yield first to the Senator from Nebraska, after which I shall yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. WHERRY. I am trying to say to the Senator from Massachusetts that the old bread-and-gun approach which he is talking about has been the political approach, giving one-third to one service, one-third to another, and one-third to another.

I have been on the Committee on Appropriations for about 9 years. The question comes to us each and every year of providing appropriations and dividing them this, that, and the other way. My feeling is that there has not been the determination which is being suggested by the Senator from Massachusetts this afternoon, that all we do is go along with the recommendations of the unified command, which contemplate so much for the Army, so much for the Navy, and so much for the Air Force. They have agreed, and that is the way the money has been divided, approximately one-third for each. I ask the Senator whether, in order to bring about the preparedness for which he contends—and today he is emphasizing the need of air power—does he not feel that there is a very large element given to the distribution of the defense dollar, that first things be built first, and that the Congress help determine the global policy, and the way in which the money is to be distributed, since it is appropriated by the Congress?

Mr. LODGE. Regarding the importance of the determination of the policy relative to distribution of the defense dollar, I should like to say that the Senator is correct. He is also correct when he inferred—he did not quite say it, but he inferred it, and I believe he believes—it that the lack of unification which we have among our armed services compels a great deal of compromise and horse trading, so that none of the services get hurt in the end. If we had real unification, the money would go much more scientifically where it ought to go in the light of military realities. I think it is one for which the answer should be obtained at the hearings.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The reason the Senator from Minnesota asked the question is that there has been much military master minding on the floor of the Senate as to how we can get the complete and total victory which we would like to have in the Asiatic area, and I have been so deeply impressed by the very constructive and pointed remarks of the Senator from Massachusetts as to our weakness in tactical air power, although in the area of strategic air power we do have some strength. I wondered how we can put these two things together, namely, extend the operations of the present war, with such a limitation upon our power as there is, and at the same time hope to attain a victory.

Mr. LODGE. Of course, whenever it is said that we ought to start an all-out aggressive war against someone, the question to ask is, "With what?" The fact of the matter is that our preparedness has been neglected for so long that we are not now in a position to undertake an all-out, generalized, aggressive war against anyone, in my opinion. I do not know in detail what we have to do in order to regain the initiative and in order to achieve victory, and to organize the peace, but I do know that we are not going to do it without making a major effort in America, and it is my hope that if we do make such a major effort we may be able to avoid a great deal of bloodshed. But I do not think we are ever going to regain the initiative and go into a guns-and-butter procedure, and that is what we have all—except for those actually in the service—been engaged in for so long a time now.
The President. pro tempore. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. Lodge. I yield first to the Senator from Nebraska, after which I shall yield to the Senator from Minnesota for a question.

Mr. Hether. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator a question about the amount of waste which I am sure will bring out what I have in mind; what the cost would be for a 150-group Air Force. Mr. Lodge. It is estimated that it would cost $15,000,000,000 to maintain it, after it is set up.

Mr. Lodge. If we are going to be on an in-and-out basis for 5 or 10 years, I think that the Senate should be made responsible for the cost of the military, and Mr. Lodge, I was simply asking for information.

Mr. Lodge. It is not information; it is an opinion. I believe, with the United States being the kind of a country it is and the American people being the kind of energetic and intense people they are, the sooner we turn the crank and get it up and get it over with, the better. Of course, that means that in 1951, 1952, and 1953, expenses will be much greater. I do not know what is going to happen to us if we have to engage in this kind of a brawl all the time for the next 10 years.

Mr. Lodge. The Senator knows what the total budget, the military and the military, will be for the next 10 years?

Mr. Lodge. I could not tell the Senator out of my head.

Mr. Lodge. As far as Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. Lodge. I yield.

Mr. Morse. Am I correct in my understanding of the thesis which the Senator from Nebraska is defending this afternoon that he is telling the American people the time has come, with the world situation so serious, so far as the future security of this country is concerned, that we must resolve to pay whatever price is necessary for total defense to keep our security from the totalitarian threat?

Mr. Lodge. That is the substance, yes. It is made much more pointed and much more bitter by the fact that our troops are in combat. They have been in combat ever since last July. When we have our own flesh and blood in combat, we certainly owe it to them and to ourselves, but especially to them, to leave no stone unturned to regain the initiative so that we can have peace.

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

Mr. Lodge. I yield.

Mr. Humphrey. I want to associate myself with the general philosophy of the statement of the Senator from Massachusetts. I recall that when the budget came to the Congress for the next fiscal year, many of the Members of the Senate were asked by some of our friends of the press what we thought about the budget, so far as military preparation was concerned. I recall that my answer was that we should have a minimum of $6,000,000,000 for the military forces and a minimum budget for military preparedness of $80,000,000,000. I want to say a word and then I wish to ask the Senator from Massachusetts a question. When he talks about mobilizing this country, he realizes that mobilization is more than simply military. There has been a report released which indicates that the present program of military defense has been cut and limited, because of inflation, to the tune of $3,000,000,000 of additional cost. In other words, we are appropriating a certain amount of money for the Air Force, but the price of materials has gone up so drastically that instead of getting a balanced schedule on the basis of dollar appropriations, we are getting fewer materials for the money appropriated. So I make the suggestion that mobilization means more than military mobilization; it means the cracking down which needs to be done by Government, with the Congress not doing it when it refused to control speculation on the commodity exchange, and when we permitted speculation on the commodity exchange at the expense of American security.

I simply ask the Senator from Massachusetts if he does not agree with me that the kind of mobilization we need is more than merely military? Do we not need discipline within our own ranks which will permit economic as well as military mobilization?

Mr. Lodge. I certainly agree. I think it means that not only should Congress do its duty, but that we should have courageous and intelligent leadership in the executive branch, which, I regret to say, has not been as I wish it could have been. I have seen studies made by very reputable economists and students of the problem which indicated that we could have a $6,000,000,000 mobilization, without a chaotic upheaval in America. If we do that, we must have a control of inflation which is on an entirely different basis from what it is now. The Senator from Minnesota thinks it is the fault of Congress. I am inclined to think that Congress did its duty pretty well, and that we are not having everything we should have in the way of courageous and intelligent administration.

Mr. Humphrey. I want to say that the Senator from Minnesota is not partisan in this matter. I think it is a question of national security.

Mr. Lodge. Oh, yes.

Mr. Humphrey. I think the administration has been derelict in its anti-inflation program. I have said so publicly, and shall continue until the administration and the Congress buckle down to the business of mobilizing at home. The fact of the matter is that both branches of government have been acting on the business-as-usual basis, with just a little extra on the side.

Mr. Lodge. That is correct.

Mr. Humphrey. I do not believe we can do that. I commend the Senator from Massachusetts for his courageous approach, and I join with him, not on that line of partisan matters, but for the cause of America. We cannot have this half-hearted effort in military and economic mobilization and have any semblance of security.

Mr. Lodge. That is true. The whole United States is on a terrible spot. We have never been before in a similar situation in our history. We have always been either at war or at peace. We are now in what some people call a state of alert. We are in a limited war in Korea, which has been an extremely dreadful thing, and we find ourselves as a people, all 150,000,000 of us, in the same
boat, confronting a challenge the exact nature and outline of which have not been made clear to us.

I am not criticizing anyone for that, All I am saying is that we shall not get out of this vale of tears through which we are traveling at the moment unless we make a real major effort. We can make a major effort, I think, and still avoid expending our time two or three, but we shall not accomplish anything if we drag along in such condition of perpetual military inadequacy.

Mr. HUMPREY: I think the Senate is a recent statement of one of the great men of our time, General Bradley, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, in which he said he had observed that some 6,0 or 7 months ago Congress could not get going fast enough, but that recently he had observed a let-down, which, of course, is not the opinion of the Senator from Massachusetts. But I think the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff made a very fair observation. In other words, I believe the Congress of the United States, yes, and the administration, are continually pounding into the American people the idea that the limited war in Korea is a matter of buying time. We should be making the world safe for democracy. We are on some grandiose scheme of some other part of the world, if we will. It is not the opinion of the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. LODGE: The Senator is correct. I am not one who take a mild view of the situation. There is an old saying that Congress either goes crazy or goes fishing. That reflects not only on Congress but on human nature.

Mr. HUMPHREY: I think it is time to go fishing.

Mr. AIKEN: The season opens tomorrow in my State.

Mr. LODGE: The Senator from Vermont advises me that the season opens tomorrow in his State.

In January and February we were told, “Everything is more or less all right.” Actually, the situation was just exactly as bad as it was last July, when we were all talking about the situation. The only difference was that we had gotten accustomed to it. The situation had not changed; we had changed.

One of the objects I had in mind in making this speech was to try to persuade my colleagues that the situation is still as dangerous as it ever was, if not a little more so, and that we should not be complacent about it.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. My question is not by way of criticism of anyone, but is it not true that the Congress has done everything that the Defense Department asked it to do and everything which the Joint Chiefs of Staff have recommended?

Mr. LODGE. I do not think we have passed manpower legislation yet.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Isn’t it true that we did a little more than they asked? As a matter of fact, they placed the figure at 3,000,000 men, and later they said they wanted three and a half million men, and the Senate voted them 4,000,000 men. Is not that true?

Mr. LODGE. I do not know whether it is true or not. I was against any limitation, because we can always control it through our power to appropriate funds.

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

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I have listened with a great deal of interest to the colloquy between the Senator from Minnesota and the Senator from Massachusetts. I believe in almost every instance my colleague has voted for a reduction of nondefense expenditures, as they have come before the Senate this year. Is it not the opinion of my colleague that when the Senator from Minnesota talks about economic mobilization and inflation, one of the primary ways of resisting greater inflation is to cut down non-defense Government expenditures, with respect to which there has been very little will on the part of the administration. Is that not a fair statement?

Mr. LODGE. I believe it is a very fair statement. It is utterly unsatisfactory.

Mr. President, I was referring to the fact that I did not believe the increase in air power which I propose should be made at the expense of either the Army or the Navy. I am still in favor of increasing the Army. I am not only in favor of increasing the United States Army, but I supported sending the United States Army overseas, provided always, of course, that our military authorities thought that sending them overseas was an essential step in strengthening the security of the United States. Indeed, it is as a friend of the Army that I urge this increase in tactical aviation and I cannot imagine a professional Army officer who would not agree that it was utterly vital to get command of the air over the Army before the Army could have a chance to function efficiently.

My support of aviation also goes back quite a few years—in fact to my return to the Senate in 1947 when I offered an amendment in the Senate to provide funds for a 70-group Air Force. The amendment, which was debated all afternoon was defeated. How I now wish that my amendment had prevailed. How immeasurably greater would be our security today if we had ended the summer of 1948 with 70 air groups. What false economy it was to defeat that proposal. Yet the Senators said, in all good faith, that it was a colossal expenditure. I do not see how we can doubt that if we had had 70 air groups at Bataan we would have held the initiative and would have had the majesty and ascendancy in world diplomacy which might easily have prevented some of the disastrous events from taking place which actually did happen.

Mr. President, we must place this matter of an adequate tactical Air Force second only in importance to General MacArthur’s statement that we are in a global struggle and in its proper significance. We must not bungle again on another life-and-death matter. I hope there will be prompt assurance from the administration and the appropriate committees that we will have air power which is able to do the job.

As I said before, our men in Korea are like the boy in the story who put his finger in the dyke and prevented the whole countryside from being flooded. By that course we got very precious time, as General MacArthur’s men at Bataan bought us precious time in 1942. We owe it to our men in Korea to get ready quickly, to use it to regain the initiative speedily which our lack of leadership threw away in 1945, to use it promptly to establish peace in Korea. If we neglect to build air superiority promptly we break faith with our men in Korea and with our own people.

If there are no questions, I yield the floor.

CONFIRMATION OF NOMINATIONS IN THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. SALTONSTALL and Mr. MORSE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER, The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, at the moment, the Committee on Armed Services [Mr. RUSSELL] is not in the Chamber. He has requested that I ask unanimous consent to, report those nominations, as well as sundry nominations in the Army and in the United States Air Force, and request that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Massachusetts? The Chair hears none, and, without objection, as in executive session, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

Without objection, the President will be notified of the confirmations.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Chair.

ECONOMIC SACRIFICES DEMANDED TO FURTHER THE DEFENSE PROGRAM—OPEN VERSUS SECRET HEARINGS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I rise to discuss the pending bill, butlore doing so, I wish to make a few brief comments on the able speech delivered by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. Once again he made a great service on the floor of the Senate by calling the attention of the American people to a matter of great moment, which deeply concerns them. It is very important. Mr. President, I think in those long hours that Members of Congress make very clear to the American people that the situation is exceedingly serious so far as the security of our country is concerned, and that the time has come when the American people ought to stop talking so much about sacrificing in
other directions and should start to sacri-
ifice on the economic front. I do not
know why politicians do not tell us
that the American people are being
forced to that subject later in my
speech. If the American people ought
to be told that the defense program.
I think that is going to mean a consid-
erable lowering of the standard of living.
They are not going to join those of
us who are going to take positive steps
to control the unconceivable greed
and selfishness which have come to
counter some economic groups in re-
spect to the defense program.
There was talk on the floor of the
Senator from Oregon, Mr. President, I think we must make
the American people will have to throw
a vast amount of wealth into defense,
and do it quickly. Moreover, they will
have to pay for it now. They cannot
justify leaving a legacy to posterity in
the form of a tremendous national debt,
economic debility, and inflation. The
American people ought to be told that,
in order to preserve their freedom, they
must snap out of it now, and pay as
much as they can have lots of butter at the
sacrifice of guns. The time has come when
the American people will have to throw
in order to provide the defense, which
is necessary. No one will ever
convince me that once the American
people will have to throw away their
wealth and their freedom, they
must snap out of it now, and pay as
much as they can.
Mr. President, I think we must make
the American people will have to throw
in order to provide the defense, which
is necessary. No one will ever
convince me that once the American
people will have to throw away their
wealth and their freedom, they
must snap out of it now, and pay as
much as they can.
answered in public because we do not desire to acquaint the Soviet Union with the facts. The President would take it, for granted—and I do not know of a member of the committee who would not follow such a suggestion—that we would be guided by such advice in the questions to be asked.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further? The PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. I feel, as I think the great majority of the minority who were present this morning felt very strongly, that there should be open hearings. I should like to see this matter approached not from a partisan viewpoint at all. I think that cloaking it behind the iron curtain in the committee, cloaking it in secret sessions, in view of the situation that has developed, is perhaps one of the worst things we can do at this time.

Mr. MORSE. I think it is a great mistake. Of course, the Senator from New Hampshire knows that this is not the first time the Senator from Oregon has pleased the House of Representatives on the floor of the Senate. Since I have been in the Senate I know of no time when the issue has been before the Senate that I have not always supported open hearings. Sometimes I have encountered a little difficulty because of my plea for open hearings; but I happen to be one who believes that in a democracy it is the duty of every Senator to conduct the people's business by way of investigating any matter of concern to them to hold open hearings.

One of the great safeguards of a democracy is the American system of public trial. That is one of our great freedoms. A person cannot be haled into a star-chamber proceeding and given a secret trial. In the old Colonial days prior to the Revolution the people of the Colonies were confronted with star-chamber proceedings. To that object the very Declaration of Independence mentions that as one of the reasons for declaring independence.

I have been disturbed since I have been in the Senate by the tendency toward secret hearings on the part of the committees of the Senate. I have never voted for one of them. I remember a year and a half or so ago I did a quite a fight for an open hearing in the case of a certain investigation. I think time proved me right in that case, and I believe time will prove us right in this case, for when open hearings are held and questions which affect the public so vitally as do those to be considered by the two committees sitting jointly, and the President, will the Senator yield for a question? The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MAYBANK in the chair). Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. LONG. The Senator from Oregon, not having been present at the meeting this morning, may not know the procedure that was agreed to by the majority of the committee. I should like to have the Senator know that it was the view of the majority of the committee which did not involve a secret vital to the Nation and which might not be of immediate advantage to our enemies, should be released as rapidly as it could be transmitted over to the press. However, I should like to suggest to the Senator from Oregon that unless we are careful about these things our enemies will obtain very valuable military secrets.

For example, a short time ago I heard a Senator on the floor of the Senate drop a bit of secret information, which when I heard it I realized was classified as "top secret." That Senator unwittingly happened to make a disclosure on the floor of the Senate a short time ago, and I know that at the time I considered it to be a bad mistake. Such matters do slip out during the course of public hearings, even before a person has time to realize that he is divulging secret information. We had better be careful how we conduct our hearings.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I fully appreciate the concern expressed by the Senator from Oregon is a risk involved. But democracy will be stronger and kept in a healthier condition if we take our chances with such risks and demonstrate to the world that in this country we proceed in open hearings, placing the responsibility on each individual Senator to be very careful about the kind of question he asks in a hearing, not to commit a military secret, securing clearance of the question if he is in doubt about it. With a chairman as the one who will preside over the meetings of the committee the Senator from Georgia (Mr. Branstad.) is as able a chairman as there is in the Senate I think we will not run much of a risk of disclosing any secret information. I think we will not run much of a risk of disclosing any secret information. I think we will not run much of a risk of disclosing any secret information. If we start out in the good old American tradition of open public hearings in conducting the people's business.

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

Mr. MORSE. I wish to make one more comment. In the second place, I am afraid in this case, as in the past, the hearings will be closed in name only, and not in fact. There is not another Senator on this floor who does not become as irritable as I do by the kind of pressure is put on us by telephones, all sorts of phone calls early in the morning, and late at night. "Were you in such and such a committee meeting? What happened?

"Well, I am sorry; it was in executive session." Senator Y says: "Maybe that happened, but I will not say whether or not it did." The newspapermen are exceedingly intelligent. They do not have to be told very much to know a great deal about what happened.

That is their business. They follow the committees. They follow the Senators and Representatives. Sometimes it seems to me they can almost read what happened, by muscle tension.

So I say to the Senator from Louisiana, I do not think we are going to have our security by holding executive sessions. I would rather have matters come out at the moment as they really are rather than to have a lot of dope stories ventilated that, then further enlargements upon them, and then corrections.

I do not know why this story cannot be told in an open hearing to begin with.

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

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

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

Mr. LONG. In illustration of what the junior Senator from Louisiana had in mind, I refer to the release of the recent correspondence involving the armament of South Korea. The junior Senator from Louisiana was advised sometime ago to see that the correspondence which was released was complete. In that it told exactly how many rifles, how many machine-guns, and so forth, which did not involve a secret vital to United States had which could be made available to arm an additional force of South Koreans, or even Chinese Nationalists. It seemed to me that least that could have been done when that document was released was to delete the number of the various weapons.

Mr. MORSE. I do not know about the incident presented here on the floor of the Senate?

Mr. LONG. It was released by the Defense Department or by the White House, one or the other. But it seems to me that we should be careful not to give out statistics as to the number of weapons available, and so forth, which may be of value to the enemy.

Mr. LONG. I think it is a great misfortune which does not have anything to do with the question of open hearings. Each member of the committee will be under a very solemn obligation to see to it that he conduct himself in such a way that no secret information will be released.

Mr. LONG. The point the junior Senator from Louisiana has in mind is that in case of a witness testifying about a situation, in connection with which a question might be raised as to the number of guns we have and the number of bombs, and so on, it might be well before such information is given out, or before a release on the subject is given out, that someone in authority pass judgment as to what should or should not be given out so that military secrets will not be given to the enemy.

Mr. MORSE. Under the able chairmanship of the Senator from Georgia, I am not at all worried about having come out, in the course of the United States, as released by the two committees, sitting jointly, any information which should not be divulged. The Senator from Georgia will be able to protect the secrets of our country in that respect that we will not have a worry about any information which has not been carefully scrutinized becoming public during the course of the hearings. However, from
the standpoint of public opinion, which is requisite for the unity of the people of the country, the American people, in my judgment about the temper of the public. We have removed from their minds any doubt that they are going to get all the facts about an issue which has simply rocked the Nation.

Mr. President, I wish to repeat what I said earlier in a speech in which I made at Milwaukee on the general problem involved in the MacArthur issue, namely, that I think for too long this administration, on the claim that it has involved the American people a great deal of information which should have been made available to the American people. It seems to me that the thinking of the public would be much clearer if the information had been made available.

There is a rising tide of demand on the part of the people that not so much information be kept from them. They feel that they are too much in the dark about what is going on. It seems to me that the average citizen recognizes that he should be told about matters and that publication would endanger the security of the United States, but, week by week, he is discovering that many things which were kept from him some months ago are perfectly safe for him to have, and that he would have understood the situation much better if the information had been made available.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. Let me say to the Senator from Oregon that I have been greatly disturbed regarding the manner in which the forthcoming hearings should be held. I wish the Senator to know that there seems to be considerable sentiment in the committee—that I do not say is shared by a majority of the committee, but certainly I share it—that the committee can try the system from Georgia has devised, namely, that all the testimony be taken a day, after the necessary precautions have been taken to prevent the disclosure of top-secret information. There seems to be considerable sentiment in the committee that that system can be tried until we can see how it works.

I should like to have the Senator know that that is a tentative approach which some of us have made in an effort to accomplish the dissemination of all the information which we can afford to give out and still protect the top-secret material.

I regret that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Long] has left the Chamber, because, he as well as the Senator from Oregon, will be interested to know that a quite different viewpoint has been expressed today as to what is necessary. I refer to a statement made by the chairman of the Republican policy committee, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TARR], who this morning addressed the Chamber of Commerce of the United States. With the indulgence of the Senator from Oregon, I should like to read a brief item about his statement which has been taken from the news ticker:

WASHINGTON.—Senator Taft today urged a half-million-man cut in the projected American military budget and a $60,000,000 reduction in the mobilization budget, but called for "a more aggressive war in Korea." The Senator, commenting on the statement by the one who now is Vice President, said, in the words of President Truman, "It is a stalemate war," which the American public, in his opinion, will not tolerate indefinitely.

Taft asserted his belief that the proposition of a so-called "soft war policy" carries danger of ending in "an appeasement peace." Taft asserted his belief that the formation which should have been kept secret, but at the same time giving to the people generally the 90 percent as it now is.

We have had another—and even more recent—illustration of the situation to which the Senator from Oregon has been referring. That occurred a year or more ago when he militantly attacked the executive branch of his party. Under the popular and attractive committee which was concerned with the investigation of certain charges. The committee held executive sessions on those matters. The catastrophic results of that policy, so far as it affected some of those who were immediately concerned with it, are still reverberating throughout the Nation.

It seems to me that if they had heeded the warning of the Senator from Oregon a year ago and had taken to heart the results of the experience of the Truman subcommittee which was headed by the present Vice President, Mr. BARKLEY, they would have avoided the difficulties which arose in connection with that committee hearings and which had the Nation virtually convulsed.

Now we are told that at the hearings which are about to begin, the joint committee will give out the information several hours after it is presented at the hearings. The members of the press, the fourth estate, who are as responsible as we are—and, as a matter of fact, more responsible to the people as regards giving them the news—are particularly concerned. They are told that they will be handed at 2:30 in the afternoon a transcript of what is said at the morning sessions, and that they will be handed at 8:30 in the evening a transcript of what is said at the afternoon sessions of the joint committee hearings. Whether the press can accomplish what is involved to that schedule is a serious question. It is doubtful whether that schedule will be very satisfactory. Certainly full and complete protection of the appearance of a group of witnesses before their peers will be a valuable contribution to the maintenance of the Anglo-Saxon system and the attainment of a satisfactory solution in connection with these matters.

The Senate has referred to star-chamber proceedings. Of course, we are not attempting to challenge the intelligence or the integrity of those who are operating in that situation, or their patriotic desire to supply information to the people. However, under modern means of disseminating information, the proposed course presents almost insuperable obstacles to any satisfactory handling of the situation—and I know that the Senator from Oregon has been witness such operations.

It is gratifying that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON] himself has indicated some doubt about the proposed procedure and has said that he feels that it is to be tentative.

It is very much to be hoped—and I gather that the Senator from Oregon
N. Bradley by concurs and agrees—that further consideration will be given, to this matter, so that there may be a fair presentation by the ladies and gentlemen of the press as to why the proposed procedure is not practicable or desirable—with the result that a change will occur, so that although the 9 or 10 percent of the material presented at the hearings which may be said to be top-secret material will be kept secret with the committee and with the executive departments concerned, yet, as the Senator has indicated, mandatory courses will be permitted in the case of the great bulk of the information which will come out in regard to the myriad of matters about which there should be no concealment.

Mr. MORSE. I am always pleased when I find myself in agreement with the Senator from Maine, and on this particular matter we are in complete agreement, and he has expressed my point of view more eloquently than I could express it. I should like to add the additional comment that the cold print of the transcript never tells the whole story, either. At all, one of the reasons for a public hearing or a public trial, in order to make certain that it is going to be a fair trial, is not only that the public hearing shall be upon the tribunal and upon the witnesses who testified before the tribunal, but it has a great effect on the witnesses, too, in the kind of story they tell, sometimes when they know they are testifying in the full light of the public, completely observed by the public.

I have seen enough witnesses, under varying circumstances, to cause me to say that the testimony of a witness upon which I shall most rely is the testimony of a witness given in public—not what he may give in an executive session. That is a part of the whole American tradition of a public trial and a public hearing. I understand that even if I had been present it would not have affected the total effect very much this morning, but I am sorry I did not have the opportunity to have a voice in support of the public hearing.

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

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

Mr. WHERRY. Did I correctly understand the Senator from Oregon to say that he understands this arrangement is tentative?

Mr. MORSE. I understood the Senator from Connecticut to say that.

Mr. WHERRY. But does the Senator from Oregon intend that that be so?

Mr. MORSE. That is what is to be tried out.

Mr. WHERRY. I hope it is tentative. I did not know whether the Senator from Oregon had been informed that it is tentative.

Mr. MORSE. I have not had a chance to talk to anyone. I have just returned to Washington and that is my view.

Mr. WHERRY. I thought perhaps the Senator had.

I should also like to ask the distinguished Senator this question: Referring to the resolution which the Joint Chiefs of Staff, in their report, have already determined our defense policy in the Congress—and we have already determined to send four divisions to Europe—does not the Senator feel that in view of the fact that the Senate adopted that resolution, the American people are more interested than ever before in knowing the facts which surround the entire global defense policy?

Mr. MORSE. I think they are not only more interested, but they are more entitled to know. That is the important thing. They are entitled to know.

Mr. WHERRY. That was my second question.

Mr. MORSE. In my opinion the situation is so serious that we cannot get the kind of response for which I pleaded early in my remarks this afternoon, and the support for the sacrifices which are going to be necessary on the part of the American people, unless they have every fact it is possible to give them.

Mr. WHERRY. Is it not the job of Congress to proceed on the road it has already taken, and to place all the facts on the table so that Members of the Congress and all the American people might have considered and may be able to understand them and to give the backing which is needed on the part of the American people to the policy which is finally determined upon?

Mr. MORSE. That is my opinion.

Mr. WHERRY. Let me say to the Senator from Oregon that I completely agree with his viewpoint on the subject of open hearings. I had hoped that this arrangement would be to have the hearings open, except when it is necessary to close them, rather than to have the meeting closed and then try to make some of them open.

I fully agree that the transcripts, after they have been handed to the press, will be susceptible of interpretation, and that witnesses might react differently in answering questions in a public hearing, from the way they would react in closed hearings. I think it is a mistake to hold secret hearings. I hope the Senator from Oregon and all other Senators interested in that respect will see whether it is possible to change the tentative plan in order that open hearings may be had whenever possible. I am satisfied the American people are going to determine the facts as a result of the hearings, and that if the hearings could be open the people would be well satisfied.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to say to the Senator from Oregon that in reporting the hearings there can be no substitute for an opportunity to observe the witnesses. While the interpreters of the hearings, particularly the reporters, write their stories and tell them to the American people, they will have been deprived of something I think they need for accurate reporting, namely, their own opportunity to observe for themselves and to read the testimony in the light of what they see, as well as in the light of what they hear.

Mr. President I have one other little matter upon which I wish to comment for a moment or two before I undertake a very brief article which I have on the farm-labor bill now pending before the Senate. In view of the mail which I have been receiving recently it occurs to me that I should express myself as a member of the Armed Services Committee. In doing so I am expressing only my personal opinion, but I feel I should state my views with respect to the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Gen. Omar N. Bradley. The American people should be told by some one who has had an opportunity to observe General Bradley in a good many committee hearings, but it has a great effect on the witnesses, too, in the kind of story they tell, sometimes when they know they are testifying in the full light of the public, completely observed by the public.

I have seen enough witnesses, under varying circumstances, to cause me to say that the testimony of a witness upon which I shall most rely is the testimony of a witness given in public—not what he may give in an executive session. That is a part of the whole American tradition of a public trial and a public hearing. I understand that even if I had been present it would not have affected the total effect very much this morning, but I am sorry I did not have the opportunity to have a voice in support of the public hearing.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Oregon that in reporting the hearings there can be no substitute for an opportunity to observe the witnesses. While the interpreters of the hearings, particularly the reporters, write their stories and tell them to the American people, they will have been deprived of something I think they need for accurate reporting, namely, their own opportunity to observe for themselves and to read the testimony in the light of what they see, as well as in the light of what they hear.

Mr. President I have one other little matter upon which I wish to comment for a moment or two before I undertake a very brief article which I have on the farm-labor bill now pending before the Senate. In view of the...
Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to say to the Senator from Oregon that I have the utmost confidence in General Bradley's integrity of statement regarding military questions and regarding matters which he believes come within the military purview. I have seen no reason to doubt any statement of his at any time, either before a committee on investigation or any other time.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts. I completely agree with his observation, and I am glad to have it.

Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Oregon that I have no group of military men not members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff in whom I have any such confidence as that which I have in the Joint Chiefs of Staff. I am perfectly satisfied, as a member of the Armed Services Committee, that the Joint Chiefs of Staff have never failed to give to the Armed Services Committee full information in answer to questions directed to them, and that their testimony has been completely and wholly reliable.

This afternoon the Joint Committee on the State of America's Air Defense commented on the state of America's air defense, and I think I did well to point out that there is serious question that we have superiority in the air, with the possible exception of strategic bombing, and that we move at a terrifically fast rate in order to place the air defenses of the Nation in a position strong enough so that if an all-out war should break out we could protect not only our troops, but the great sources of our industrial war production.

I desire to say, Mr. President, as one whose record shows he has disagreed with the administration in respect to a great many of its policies in Asia, that I started disagreeing with the administration on the floor of the Senate on July 28, 1945, in a major speech regarding the then Korean situation. Following that step, I was in disagreement not only on the evacuation of Korea, but, before that, on the very partition of Korea itself. I was in disagreement with the administration because we did not build our strength in Korea much greater than we did, and I was in fundamental disagreement in January 1960, with the announced policy as to what our front line of defense would be in the Pacific.

There was a long-standing disagreement with the administration in respect to the military reorganizations of the foreseen force of the Nationalist Chinese Government. I have no been one who has held any brief for the leaders of the Nationalist Chinese Government, but, rather, I have been one who has felt that, more than anyone else, are responsible for the loss of China to the Communists, because they did not put into effect the economic reforms which I think it was their duty to carry out at the same time they were getting economic aid from the United States.

In spite of these disagreements with the administration on Asiatic policy, Mr. President, I have also been one who has been very much opposed, and still am, to our starting an all-out major engagement on the mainland of China until we have a very high state of readiness on our part. I, therefore, as one who has been a supporter of the Nationalist Chinese Government. I have not been one who has felt that, more than anyone else, are responsible for the loss of China to the Communists, because they did not put into effect the economic reforms which I think it was their duty to carry out at the same time they were getting economic aid from the United States.

I was one who regretted the dreadful mistakes made in the demobilization program of 1946, 1947, 1948, and 1949, during which the fleet was placed in mothballs, where, largely, it still remains. Air bases were closed down; the manufacture of airplanes was stopped until a small loan was made to Glenn Martin to enable him to continue his operations. The Army was demobilized. That is one of the main reasons why we find ourselves in the position in which we are today. Upon those days when I was a member of the Military Affairs Committee, I voted against an amendment that between the time that the amendment was adopted and the time it was put into effect, we could at least get a figure, so that we could at least get what the House had agreed on. I believe the work of the Senate from Oregon voted for the amendment. A number of Senators now present did so.

In all frankness and fairness, I must say to the Senator from Oregon that the amendment that I introduced and carried that time was that the House of Representatives acted on the appropriation bill and the matter came before the conference committee, a number of Senator, is appointed by the White House, where they were told by the President of the United States that if the number was increased he would freeze the amount so that it would not go above 45 groups. I think the Senator from Oregon voted for the amendment. A number of Senators now present did so.

I was one who regretted the dreadful mistakes made in the demobilization program of 1946, 1947, 1948, and 1949, during which the fleet was placed in mothballs, where, largely, it still remains. Air bases were closed down; the manufacture of airplanes was stopped until a small loan was made to Glenn Martin to enable him to continue his operations. The Army was demobilized. That is one of the main reasons why we find ourselves in the position in which we are today. Upon those days when I was a member of the Military Affairs Committee, I voted against an amendment that between the time that the amendment was adopted and the time it was put into effect, we could at least get a figure, so that we could at least get what the House had agreed on. I believe the work of the Senate from Oregon voted for the amendment. A number of Senators now present did so.

In all frankness and fairness, I must say to the Senator from Oregon that the amendment that I introduced and carried that time was that the House of Representatives acted on the appropriation bill and the matter came before the conference committee, a number of Senator, is appointed by the White House, where they were told by the President of the United States that if the number was increased he would freeze the amount so that it would not go above 45 groups. I think the Senator from Oregon voted for the amendment. A number of Senators now present did so.

In all frankness and fairness, I must say to the Senator from Oregon that the amendment that I introduced and carried that time was that the House of Representatives acted on the appropriation bill and the matter came before the conference committee, a number of Senator, is appointed by the White House, where they were told by the President of the United States that if the number was increased he would freeze the amount so that it would not go above 45 groups. I think the Senator from Oregon voted for the amendment. A number of Senators now present did so.

In all frankness and fairness, I must say to the Senator from Oregon that the amendment that I introduced and carried that time was that the House of Representatives acted on the appropriation bill and the matter came before the conference committee, a number of Senator, is appointed by the White House, where they were told by the President of the United States that if the number was increased he would freeze the amount so that it would not go above 45 groups. I think the Senator from Oregon voted for the amendment. A number of Senators now present did so.
EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield so that we may proceed to the consideration of executive business?

Mr. MORSE. I shall be very happy to yield, provided I do not thereby lose the floor.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES RECEIVED

The following messages received:

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Sargent) in the chair, laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. CARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

By Mr. RUSSELL, from the Committee on Armed Services:
Daniel K. Edwards, of North Carolina, to be Assistant Secretary of Defense, vice Marx Leva, resigned.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask that the first nomination go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The legislative clerk will state the second nomination on the Executive Calendar.

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—SENATE

APRIL 30

RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to supplement my remarks relative to Mr. Symington. I have voted to confirm him every time he has been nominated for office by the administration. I wish to emphasize the fact that I am for him because I think he is a good administrator and has ability, and for no other reason. When I stated that I did not agree with everything that had been done with respect to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, I am sure all Senators knew what I meant.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed, and, without objection, the President will be notified.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Public Health Service.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the Public Health Service be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the Public Health Service are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be immediately notified.

That completes the Executive Calendar.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is entitled to the floor.

REMOVAL OF GENERAL MACARTHUR—OPEN OR CLOSED HEARINGS

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, as much as I was not permitted to make a brief statement while the Senate was in executive session, may I ask the Senator from Oregon if he will be generous enough to yield to me?

Mr. MORSE. I am certainly glad to yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. RUSSELL. I had hoped, in view of the remarks of other Senators, to have a few words to say this afternoon on the question of open or closed hearings of the committee which is investigating the facts and circumstances surrounding the removal of General MacArthur from his several commands in the Far East. I have a record of the hearings of the committee on Armed Services, which the hearings referred to were ordered and arranged. I believe they clearly demonstrate that no partisanship at all was involved in the decisions made. When I, as chairman, was consistent that General MacArthur be given an opportunity to address Congress as well as he had been before the committee, that was unanimously agreed upon. I believe that the hearings would be held in executive session, if the Senator from Oregon at this time, if he desires to continue, I shall be glad to defer my statement until tomorrow. I have an appointment for 5 o'clock, but I should like to proceed for approximately 10 minutes, if the Senator would be so generous as to yield to me that much time.

I do not desire to interrupt the remarks of the Senator from Oregon at this time, if he desires to continue.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I am very happy to yield to the Senator.
Mr. President, here is the record. The distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Morse], who today is so determined that he will say very frankly that when we held the hearings in open session, today, when the Senator from Georgia yielded, some of them—members discussed it. 

Was the first member of the committee that he felt the things he is to discuss would involve the security of the Nation, he would follow his wishes. If, on the other hand, the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. Monroney], who said he would like to have part of it in executive session; and part of it in public, we ought to follow that.

That was the view expressed by the Senator from Oregon. No Senator made any issue about the hearings in closed session. Member after Member stressed the fact that the issues would involve the top secrets of the Nation, secret war plans, secrets relating to lives of the men who are now in Korea, secrets which may mean the difference between Korea; and the other people whom you have mentioned—

The "you," referring to me—come before this committee, either in open session or closed session—personally I would prefer a closed session in the first instance, anyway, until we know where we are heading—to work out what we believe is a proper course for us in Congress to pursue.

Among others who were suggested as witnesses were the Secretary of Defense, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and others having knowledge of pertinent facts. 

Mr. President, I do not desire to read all the 38 names of the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse], who today is so determined that he will say very frankly that when we held the hearings in open session, stated, when he was asked the specific question whether they should be in open session or executive session:

I am troubled about that question, Senator Byrd. I think the general's wishes should prevail. It involves national security. The distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse], who today is so determined that he would like to have part of it in executive session; and part of it in public, we ought to follow that.

That was the view expressed by the Senator from Oregon. No Senator made any issue about the hearings in closed session. Member after Member stressed the fact that the issues would involve the top secrets of the Nation, secret war plans, secrets relating to lives of the men who are now in Korea, secrets which may mean the difference between life and death to American boys who are even now engaged in mortal combat in Korea. It was stated that such questions would be affected by the documents which would constitute a part of the hearings, and that it would be absolutely necessary, if the committee were determined to get the facts, and not merely to have a hocuspocus or circus, that the hearings be in executive session. That was the view of the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse], who today is so determined that he would like to have part of it in executive session; and part of it in public, we ought to follow that.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. Russell] said that we can get the truth in open hearings. Mr. Wherry, I am referring to matters which are not vital to the national security.

Mr. Russell. By having about three hearings—first a hearing in open session, when we shall not have proceeded very far until a question is raised which involves the national security. Someone will ask, "That question will have to go over. We cannot discuss that here." Then we go into executive session and hear from the witnesses in executive session. Then we must come back into open session and go over all the testimony again in the light of what was disclosed by the secret documents. 

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

Mr. Russell. Ordinarily I do not object to yielding, but I should like to complete my statement. I yield one more time.

Mr. Wherry. I have such high regard for the Senator that I do not want to interfere with his statement. Certainly if any witness who is testifying is asked a question involving national security he will know when the national security is at issue and can very judiciously ask the privilege of not answering such a question.

Mr. Russell. If the Senator will tell me the names of all the witnesses who will appear before the hearing is concluded, I will express an opinion on that statement.

Mr. Wherry. When we bring before the committee such a man as General MacArthur and dozens of other military men who know what the national security is, I hope that those men—including the Secretary of State—will be smart enough and capable enough not to answer in open session the questions involving the national security.

However, with respect to certain broad questions of national defense policy, and the distribution of the national defense dollar, I believe that the American people will get the truth as they would like.
Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Nebraska is a very able debater, but it will be many a day before he will be able to tie the shoestrings of Douglas MacArthur when it comes to speaking for Douglas MacArthur.

Mr. WHERRY. I agree with that.

Mr. RUSSELL. I gave General MacArthur his option of appearing in open or closed hearing. I told him that he had planned to have the hearing in executive meeting, just exactly as the committee voted, unless he expressed a desire to the contrary. And now the Senator from Nebraska says that the hearings should be open in disclosing the facts, and enable us to unite the people in clearing up the record of a transcript, as we are trying to do today.

Mr. RUSSELL. So the Senator from Nebraska differs with the Senator from Ohio (Mr. Taft). He wants to put the hearings on television and on the radio.

Mr. WHERRY. I don't know anything about what the Senator from Ohio wants. I am speaking as the junior Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is entitled to his opinion. I understood that the Republicans had had a policy meeting.

Mr. WHERRY. The Republicans have had no policy meeting on this subject.

Mr. RUSSELL. I said a policy meeting.

Mr. WHERRY. There has been no policy meeting on this question at all.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Ohio stated that the Republican policy committee had taken the position that the hearings should be open.

Mr. WHERRY. If the distinguished Senator from Ohio called a policy meeting to act on that question, I was not aware of it. He might have done so. I was not at any such meeting. Had one been held, the Senator from Nebraska would have been there. I have been at no meeting called by the Republicans on policy matters such as the distinguished Senator is talking about.

In fact, every Republican I have talked to, and every Republican who has spoken today on this floor has completely disassociated himself from any partisan policy of open hearings.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; I suppose they disassociated themselves from partisan politics when they took the position that the hearings should be closed until after General MacArthur appeared before the Congress and set the country on fire about this issue, and then they immediately took the position that we ought to have several more doses of it going out all over the country. That changed their minds.

Mr. WHERRY. I think more such doses as General MacArthur gave the American people would be welcomed by them, and the only way they can be given will be in open hearings, and not in closed hearings, after which what is said will be translated or misinterpreted or garbled so the American people will not understand it.

There is no Senator more fair than the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. I should like to be fair, and I like to be treated fairly.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator will be treated fairly.

Mr. RUSSELL. I should like to be treated fairly. I will say that General MacArthur is amply able to speak for Douglas MacArthur.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.
Mr. Russell. I hope that is true. But my experience has led me to know that there are a great many leaks that come out of executive hearings.

Mr. Wherry. That is the reason I want open hearings.

Mr. Russell. But there is a great deal of difference between a leak coming out of the executive session where an unidentified source has made a statement—the press saying he would not permit the use of his name—and to hear the same statement come forward from the lips of the Army of General MacArthur, or from the Secretary of Defense, or from the Secretary of State. When statements come forth from the lips of these responsible officials in our Government, then they are the basis of action by our enemies, actual and potential. If it were a question of newspaper reports, magazines, radio, and periodicals, in all the statements given out by them, some of them apparently very damaging, they would confuse our enemies to death, because they are very conflicting. But when you have the words falling directly from the high official, then you are serving notice upon the enemies of the United States. We are not too much concerned when we read an article in Pravda, when an unidentified source makes some statement, but if Joe Stalin goes on the radio and proclaims a piece from Pravda, when an unidentified source makes some statement, but if Joe Stalin goes on the radio and proclaims a piece from Pravda, we are not too much concerned when we read an article in Pravda, particularly if the hearings were covered by the press.

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

Mr. Russell. Yes; I yield.

Mr. Saltonstall. The whole purpose of the hearing is to get at the truth, and to give it to the American people, so they will have confidence in the policies to be enunciated as a result of the hearings and as a result of the discussion.

The Senator speaks about the words of General MacArthur or the Secretary of Defense making statements. Certainly it is not the intention of anyone, I am confident, to force any witnesses to make, in public, statements which are going to help our enemies. Certainly none of us want that. Certainly none of us want public hearings would hope that these gentlemen would be put in such a position that they could not at least say "I believe my answer to that would affect public security, and I will not answer that question." Does not the Senator agree that at our meetings no one who advocated public hearings advocated going so far as to force anyone of our public officials to make statements detrimental to the security in public?

Mr. Russell. I would that the light had appeared to the distinguished Senator on the occasion of the meeting of the committee on April 13 when we arranged to have open hearings and were advocating executive sessions in order to protect the security of the United States.

Mr. President, I do not desire to deny the American people one fact that would cast any light upon this controversy. It is a tragic controversy in its consequences. I am not undertaking to present the President of the United States, nor General MacArthur. Despite differences in the past, I have no desire to smear the President of the United States. It is far from me to have any intent to smear the names of Douglas MacArthur. I want to follow the road that will bring out the facts without injury to this Nation. But I do not believe it can be done at least not at the outset of the hearings—when we are dealing with the first matters, which are so vital, by having open hearings.

The distinguished Senator from New Hampshire, speaking in behalf of the minority members of the committee, has requested me to secure certain documents which would be used as a basis for questioning at the hearings. Among them is a copy of the war plans relative to Korea, approved by the Joint Chiefs of Staff prior to the outbreak of hostilities on June 25, 1950. I have requested that document from the Department of Defense; but if there is any secret document in this land of ours, it is the war plans; and of course all our war and defense plans and operations of the committee, on either the Democratic side or the Republican side, who must realize that situation in respect to such disclosures would be, particularly if the hearings were covered by the press.

Another of the documents which has been requested is the plans of the Joint Chiefs of Staff relative to the policy regarding Formosa in the period from June 1949 to June 1950, together with correspondence and memoranda between the Department of Defense and the Department of State dealing with the subject of Formosa during the same period of time. I have requested that document, Mr. President. However, can it be used in open hearings as the basis for the questioning of witnesses without grave danger to our country? Mr. Knowland. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. Russell. I yield.

Mr. Knowland. Mr. President, do not think the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Burdell] ever suggested that those documents be commented on or be made the subject of question in open or public hearings.

Mr. Russell. Of course not.

Mr. Knowland. As the Senator has pointed out, there is not a member of this committee, on either the Democratic side or the Republican side, who does not recognize that, obviously, matters dealing with the national security, matters dealing with the first matters, which are so vital, by having open hearings.

Mr. Russell. I, of course, realize that the issue is not the one.

Mr. Russell. No, I realize that is not the issue, because since that hearing was had, things have occurred to change the minds of those men. If we wish to get the truth, we cannot do so at a public hearing without disclosing the contents of these secret documents.

Yet the Senator says the contemplated procedure at the hearings would be a star-chamber session, contrary to the principles of Anglo-Saxon justice. He says that would be the result of holding the hearings in closed session.

Mr. President, there is a great deal of difference between trying a man who is charged with a crime and parading all the Nation's vital secrets before all the eyes of the earth and all the ears of our enemies.

Also included in the documents requested was a Joint Chiefs of Staff document dated on or about January 12, 1951, relative to steps to be taken in regard to the Korean conflict in the event of certain eventualities.

Mr. President, could anything be more vital to the safety of our Nation than preserving the secrecy of a plan of that nature?

Also requested is the exact date, subsequent to January 1, 1948, on which the far-eastern headquarters requested additional troops, and the number of troops requested in each case; also, the date of the replies from the Joint Chiefs of Staff, showing the number of troops, if any, supplied in conformity with such requests.

In other words, that information would be exposed to all the world. If that document were used in an open hearing, or even if it were used inadvertently in an open hearing after it had been heard or discussed in executive session; and the cost of such disclosure is almost sure to be the lives of thousands of our boys who now are a long way from home, fighting under the American flag.

Mr. President, I have not prepared a statement to present at this time. I was somewhat interested in the remarks that the cold, written record could not convey what would take place at the hearings. I could not reconcile that statement with the position of the Senator from Ohio, who on occasion is considered the leader, or at least one of the leaders, on the other side of the aisle, because if we hold the hearings in public, if we rent the baseball park, we shall have the hearings in the Senate caucus room in the Senate Office Building. In that case, what will the American people generally get except the written record, unless television or radio were used.

Mr. President, I have wished to have the hearing proceed in a thorough, complete, and dignified manner, in an effort to obtain the facts. However, if we are not to have open hearings, I disagree with the Senator from Ohio. In that case we ought not to play favorites by the cold, written record, unless television or radio were used.

Mr. President, I have wished to have the hearing proceed in a thorough, complete, and dignified manner, in an effort to obtain the facts. However, if we are not to have open hearings, I disagree with the Senator from Ohio. In that case we ought not to play favorites by the cold, written record, unless television or radio were used.
two representatives of Pravda who would attend those hearings; to carry the secrets to the Kremlin. Let the news go out generally, because those who oppose our Nation would get the secret information completely; and there would be denied an opportunity to see the show.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, at this point will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; I am glad to yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I do not wish to detain the Senator unduly, inasmuch as he has said he is in a hurry to leave.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is quite all right; I am glad to yield, for I have had to abandon any thought of being able to complete this discussion within a few minutes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Very well; I appreciate the Senator's courtesy in yielding to me.

Was not the Senator from Georgia, Mr. President, I am not sure whether I understand the Senator's courtesy in yielding to me.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Does not the Senator agree that it would be a great help in getting at the true state of facts, which all of us want to get at, and in working out a solution from these facts, and would not much of our problem be eliminated, if the President or high officials of the present administration were to request General MacArthur to come into conference with them? Then they could see if, after talking with him face to face across the table, they could work out such policies which would justify the statement, from both General MacArthur and the high officials of the Government, that they were in accord and were working together on policies in relation to the Far East. Would not that eliminate many of our problems, if such a request could be made, and would not arrangement from the MacArthur hearings? I think I am in a game in which I cannot win.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one more question?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Does not the Senator agree that what we want today is as complete unity and understanding as possible of the leaders of the Government as to the policies with relation to the Far East, so that the people of the United States, the mothers and fathers of the boys who are in Korea, the mothers and fathers of the boys who are in the Army anywhere, will have confidence in the leadership of our armed services, and confidence that we are going forward, not with a difference of opinion, but with an understanding on the part of those who command?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am all with the Senator in that. That was exactly the point I had in mind when I called the committee together to make plans for the hearing. It was to get unity in the committee. My desire was that we be united, and not have partitionship in the hearings. For that reason I called the committee together and got all the members to express their views. Then, when the motion was made the second time, by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Byrd], the motion was, as I read it from the record:

That the program as outlined by the chairman, which includes the invitation of General MacArthur and others to testify before the committee, be approved, with the understanding that the details and conditions, et cetera, be in the hands of the chairman.

Mr. President, I did not put that motion just then. In the interest of unity, I undertook to outline what I thought was the program for the committee. So I then made this statement:

"I want to make this statement of my views on that. It was my opinion we should invite General Marshall over here, the Secretary of Defense, as the first witness. I think that hearing should be in executive session. Senator SALTONSTALL. No question about it."

I then proceeded:

"After we go through these hearings, we can have a record compiled for security matters rather rapidly, and I think you can always get the evidence out within 24 hours if you desire to take that course, without endangering the matter of security. It is my purpose further—"

I was seeking unity, Mr. President—

In the absence of any contrary action by the committee, to suggest to General MacArthur that his appearance be in executive session, at least the first meeting, but leave it to him in the last analysis if he wishes to appear at a public hearing.

Yes, Mr. President, I am all for unity.

I was seeking unity then, and, after that statement was made, the committee approved the motion unanimously, knowing what plans had been made for the hearing of General MacArthur. But then unity ended through no fault of mine.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Was that not just about what the Senator told me—"You can prove me right to the contrary"?

Mr. RUSSELL. I did not tell the Senator that about General MacArthur, because the Senator from Oregon suggested that General MacArthur have his option, and for that reason, the option was preserved all the way through to General MacArthur as I read from this telegram here; and certainly I would not have undertaken to deceive the Senator, when I had told General MacArthur in the telegram that we would hold an open hearing if he expressed any desire for it.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I may say what the Senator has just read confirms, in my judgment, what he told the junior Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. RUSSELL. If the Senator from Nebraska can get any consolation from the statement—

Mr. WHERRY. I can get a little.

Mr. RUSSELL. I said that I planned to have the hearings in executive session, if the motion carried.

Mr. WHERRY. "Leave it to the committee."

Mr. RUSSELL. I did not say a word about leaving it to the committee. We were agreeing on procedures then.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator was trying to get unity. He was going to get unity, and he was talking to the committee.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator was asking the members of the committee to help him decide what he was to do.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. That was the point.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, with respect to the previous passage.

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator from Georgia agrees, does he not, that we could not hear General Marshall in
executive session and then hear General MacArthur in open session, if that were his expressed desire, but that we either had to hear all the officials in open session, or hear all the officials in closed session. I shall not speak for anyone but myself, but I agree with the Senator that, if the Armed Services committee discussed the matter, there was a feeling that we could not do it that way, but does not the Senator agree that since then it appears more difficult to hold the hearings in executive session, and give the people of the country confidence that we were getting at the truth?

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

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I can't discuss this matter at all.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, is it not the issue now the welfare of the country?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is the only purpose I seek to serve—the protection of the public interest.

Mr. CHAVEZ. It is beyond the matter of personalities, even as to the President and the general, is it not?

Mr. RUSSELL. I have sought to keep that way. I have sought to keep away from personalities in this matter.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I congratulate the Senator.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have endeavored to search for the facts, in order that we may have a thorough inquiry. That is the only purpose the public service requires.

It cannot be done under klieg lights with secret documents, agreeable as that might be to those who would like to respond to the mail that they have received and have not answered, but that we either have to hear General MacArthur on television when he appears before your committee, I will never be for you again.
General Eisenhower and Clay and others whose advice I sought, that until action has been taken on such resolutions I would deem it inappropriate to make the further statement. If this can be approved, I would regard it a great honor and distinction to address the Congress in general terms.

Hon. GEORGE C. MARSHALL, Secretary of Defense.

The Pentagon, Washington, D. C.

My Dear Mr. Secretary: I wish to thank you for transmitting my previous message to General MacArthur and for sending me the general's reply. I hereby extend the request to convey the following message to General MacArthur by the most expeditious means of communication available;

Re your message: Insofar as I am advised, all members of the Senate Armed Services Committee are supporting your resolution for you should address joint meeting of Congress. Suggestion in my wire that committee was expeditious means of communication available to you to address joint meeting of Congress. I am planning to visit my ancestral home in Milwaukee on Friday, going by way of Chicago, and on Monday, April 30, have planned to have MacArthur to her old home in Murfreesboro, Tenn., returning thence to New York. This will complete my immediate commitments and I could appear before your committee Wednesday or Thursday of next week if this would be satisfactory. Cordial personal regards.

RICHARD B. RUSSELL, United States Senator, Chairman, Committee on Armed Services.

April 14, 1951.

Hon. GEORGE C. MARSHALL, Secretary of Defense.

The Pentagon, Washington, D. C.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. I should like to have the distinguished Senator from Georgia know that I am confident, knowing him as I do, that he will give the public the benefit of every fact that can be given him for the protection of security of the United States and the welfare of the country.

I should like to say also, if I may, that I have been present in the Senate in the Senator's fairness. I know he has no other motive than the safety and welfare of our country.

We talk about unity, Mr. President. Unity is a two-way street. We cannot achieve unity by rising on the floor of the Senate and expressing a lack of confidence in the Joint Chiefs of Staff, who are charged with the planning of the defense of the Nation. When I hear such remarks I become alarmed about what may happen. If we cannot trust those who are charged with the responsibility of planning the fighting in Korea and planning the defense of this Nation, in whom can we place our trust, other than in our Maker? I think it would be well that this matter be laid to rest. Mr. President, if we would place a little more trust in Him and do a little bit less talking on the floor, and particularly when such talk is baseless to raise grave, but completely unwarranted, doubts about competent, trustworthy, experienced, and conscientious men who are performing their duty. I am sure that the people of this Nation will properly construe such remarks to be evidence of a deep lack of understanding that unity is a two-way street.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senate from Arizona has just made a very highly idealistic type of statement, with which I entirely agree. He has stated that unity is a two-way street. It seems to me that the best way out of this controversy is a better understanding, a more united understanding, by using both sides of that street, particularly by those who are "in the know."

We have the administration on one side, and—I do not like to say it—somewhere, not quite on the same sidewalk, is General MacArthur, who has been in the Far East for 14 years and who has a great deal of knowledge of the subject. If there could be a greater understanding of the fact that the unity is a two-way street, it seems to me that the troubles of the Senator from Georgia, for whom we all have the utmost of good wishes in general, and in whom we have the greatest confidence, could be eliminated, as would those of other Senators who are on the committee, and the confidence of the American people would be greatly accelerated if that two-way street were brought a little bit more into the center by both groups. It is still possible. As a Senator on this side of the aisle, I pray equally with the Senator from Arizona that it may be accomplished and that from the hearings will come the truth upon which decisions can be based.

Mr. RUSSELL. I share fervently the last wish expressed by the Senator from Massachusetts, that out of these hearings shall come the truth. That is the only objective I have in mind.

Mr. President, I am one of the few Members of the Senate of the United States who never cared particularly to have the chairmanship of a committee. I accepted the chairmanship of the United States Senate Armed Services Committee when my predecessor, through the vicissitudes of politics, was removed. I felt that I should be performing a duty if I did not assume the position.

I had no personal interest in conducting any hearings on the MacArthur controversy. I realized then, and shall realize constantly through the hectic days that lie ahead, that there is nothing political that I could gain from it. But I did feel that the Armed Services Committee had a definite responsibility with respect to the question, and I sought to discharge that responsibility. I went about it in as nonpartisan or unpartisan a manner as I knew, and I shall continue to undertake to be absolutely fair in the matter, even though some changes have occurred in others since the date of the meeting to arrange the hearings. I want the American people to get the truth, the whole truth, and I hope it will be nothing but the truth. Certainly I want them to get the truth as to all the facts and circumstances which are related to this event. In my opinion, we can better secure it by launching the hearing in executive ses-
I shall undertake to make available to the American people at the earliest date.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, if the Senator from Georgia will yield, let me make the statement that I am not a member of the committee. I would have liked to be a member, but I am not.

I have been in favor of open hearings since I have been a Member of the United States Senate, with the exception in this instance. The idea of suggesting on the floor of the Senate that people would drop secrets of national security with open hearings seems to me the only thing to do is to hold open hearings on the global national defense policy, and appropriations which the people of the country feel secure in support. No one is talking about security matters. No one wants to bring them to light. We want them to be secure. Certainly the American people and Members of Congress have the right to know the facts with respect to global defense policy. Testimony can be taken from General MacArthur and other witnesses without jeopardizing the security of the country.

I have had a great deal of admiration for the distinguished Senator from Georgia, and will continue to have it; but I am surprised when he stands on the floor, regardless of what the committee said on April 13, and implies now that we cannot have open hearings. I am not admitting that the Senate is in the ball park, or that we put on a show. Certainly I think that if we hold open hearings the public will get the truth. The people need the truth. It is only when people get the truth that they are made free. I should like to have open hearings.

Long before the creation and his communications with General MacArthur there was talk about whether or not the committee would hold open hearings. I said then, and I now repeat, because nothing has changed my mind, that the hearings ought to be open. I do not mean that we should put on a show. I do not want a show, any more than does any other Senator. To my way of thinking—and I have been here for 39 years—the only way we can get the facts is not by secrecy, secret diplomacy, secret meetings, secret commitments, but by opening the discussions of the truth that they are made free. I should like to have open hearings.
are not addressed to me personally, if such arguments had been made before the joint committees held in executive session, at which time not a single document of the character I have referred to was used. It was merely the taking of testimony. Yet he was heard in executive session. The Senator from Nebraska was present at the hearing.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. I was not a member of the committee.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is not a member of the committee which invited General Eisenhower. If there had been any question raised as to whether or not open or closed hearings should be held, I would have been in favor of holding open hearings just the same.

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course it is easy for the Senator to make that statement, but I will not engage in debate with him on the point. The fact is that the Senator did not do so.

Mr. WHERRY. I was not a member of the committee.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is not a member of the committee now, yet he is undertaking to advise the committee. He says he hopes that the public will rise up and demand open hearings. When we were engaged in hearing General Eisenhower, when the Senator had his resolution pending, which was of great importance, I did not hear him make any such statement. Of course, not quite the same glamour attached to General Eisenhower.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to say to the distinguished Senator from Georgia that I want the Record to show that charges have been made that there has been a change.

Mr. RUSSELL. The record proves charges have been made.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. It is said that a change has been made. I am not speaking for members of the committee. I am not a member of the committee, as I have stated. I was not on the committee when General Eisenhower was invited here. But when I understood that possibly General MacArthur would be the only witness to appear before the committee my position was that I thought I ought to speak to the American people. I have not changed my position. I think if we had more generals like MacArthur and Eisenhower speaking to the American people we would be a great deal better off. It is proposed to take down many of the things which they say, in a cold record, and then let it become garbled and interpreted by this man, that man, and someone in the National Defense Establishment, who will say, "This can go in, but that must go out. What would we have left? We would have only the facts which the American people want."

Mr. RUSSELL. If we were to follow that argument to a logical conclusion, if one could be reached—

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator is now becoming personal.

Mr. RUSSELL. It would mean that everything would be in open session, including the secret documents which have been requested.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I am sorry the Senator made his last remark, to the effect that if we were to follow what the Senator from Nebraska has said to a logical conclusion, it is impossible--

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not make that statement; and I will leave it to the record.

Mr. WHERRY. What did the Senator say?

Mr. RUSSELL. I said, following this to a logical conclusion, if it could be reached, we would have to have everything in open session.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not see much difference.

Mr. President, the logical conclusion is that the American people want the facts. The only way they can get them is in open hearings. I hope that the distinguished chairman may reflect upon the demand of the American people and the Congress, who are entitled to know the facts, and that the hearings will be open, so that we may get the facts, which mean so much to the security of the country.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, all the facts will come out in this investigation. I should like to respond to the public clamor as much as would anyone else, but I shall not in any circumstances, whatever the administration may think, demand that a single line of testimony shall come out which will endanger the lives of the lowliest, humblest privates who are risking their lives in behalf of the American people in combat in Korea.

We cannot have these hearings in open session without risking not only the lives of those men, but the future security of the Nation.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, all the facts will come out in this investigation. I should like to respond to the public clamor as much as would anyone else, but I shall not in any circumstances, whatever the administration may think, demand that a single line of testimony shall come out which will endanger the lives of the lowliest, humblest privates who are risking their lives in behalf of the American people in combat in Korea.

We cannot have these hearings in open session without risking not only the lives of those men, but the future security of the Nation.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, all the facts will come out in this investigation. I should like to respond to the public clamor as much as would anyone else, but I shall not in any circumstances, whatever the administration may think, demand that a single line of testimony shall come out which will endanger the lives of the lowliest, humblest privates who are risking their lives in behalf of the American people in combat in Korea.

We cannot have these hearings in open session without risking not only the lives of those men, but the future security of the Nation.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Does not the Senator from Georgia feel that if some of the documents which have been suppressed for 4 years had been made available to the American people and the American Congress, we would not have risked 60,000 casualties in Korea, with more than 10,000 of them dead? Does not the Senator from Georgia believe that if there has been a consistent policy on the part of the administration to conceal from the Congress and the American people—and we shall document it—information which, if it had been made available to them, might not have resulted in 60,000 casualties?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is certainly on the wrong track if he thinks he can fix on me responsibility for any mistakes made by the administration; but merely because the administration may have made mistakes, I do not intend to compound past mistakes. I do not believe the American lives and the future welfare of the Nation are endangered by holding public hearings on secret documents.

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to say to the very able chairman of the Armed Services Committee, of which I have the honor to be a member, that my resolution for him is without limit. It was not in any way diminished by the exceedingly able argument which the Senator from Georgia has just made on the floor of the Senate. I can admire a man very much, as I admire the Senator from Georgia, and not always agree with every conclusion or observation which he makes.

I do not agree with a couple of observations which my friend from Georgia made in the very able argument which he has just presented to the Senate. Perhaps I should say that I would make certain modifications and reservations with respect to his argument.

The Senator from Georgia is entirely correct when he points out that on April 13 the Armed Services Committee held a meeting to which he referred. He is completely correct in stating that the observations which he read from the Record were made. In fact, I think the Record will show that I seconded the Byrd motion. I shall do whatever I can to make the record complete and full. I believe that at one time, when the observation was made in the committee, the chairman would work out the details in the record. In the hearings, we all agreed. My recollection is that my good friend from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] agreed to that proposal, but made the observation that, of course, it would be with the understanding—I do not quote his meaning—that the chairman would consult with the ranking minority member on the committee, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Barnes]. The Senator from Georgia said, in effect, that the Senator from California need have no question on that score, that he would always consult with the Senator from New Hampshire with regard to matters of procedure which affected the full committee. We certainly were very much of one mind that that was the way it should be left.

Let me say to my good friend from Georgia that I think there are two factors which need to be considered, in priority of the able argument which he has made, and in the light of what has transpired since April 13. I cannot speak for other members of the committee. I can speak only for the junior Senator from Oregon. However, when we discussed this matter on April 13 I certainly had no idea, and I do not believe any other member of the committee had any idea, that the hearing would trans-
form itself into the broad investigation which it has now become. At the time we were discussing the matter on April 13 we were seeking to find out the facts by bringing General MacArthur, General Marshall, and members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff before the committee, to testify as to why the course of action against General MacArthur was taken.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator from Oregon for his kind personal references. I should like to say that the record also shows that it was not indicated that General MacArthur was to be the only witness. The record will show that I stated we ought to have the Secretary of State and others.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. In a moment. It was never intended that this would be a very limited hearing. I believe that even at that distance, every member of the committee saw that some very broad issues were involved in the hearing.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Oregon has the floor.

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will say to the Senator that he is correct. At that hearing the Senator from California suggested the names of two or three other persons who he thought should appear.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from California expressed the name of General Wedemeyer, who had made a report on both China and Korea. He suggested that General Wedemeyer should be one of the witnesses. Also Admiral Badger, who was commander in chief in the Pacific; and Admiral Radford, who was formerly commander in the Far East; and perhaps General Marshall or Admiral Badger, who had formerly commanded in the Far East; and perhaps General Marshall, or Admiral Badger, who had formerly commanded in the Far East.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is correct. We were not deciding merely to hear General MacArthur and Secretary Marshall.

Mr. MORSE. The junior Senator from Oregon neither said that, nor did he mean to imply it.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Oregon stated that the scope of the hearing had broadened.

Mr. MORSE. That is the argument which I now wish to make.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator will forgive me. I am now an hour and 22 minutes late in keeping an engagement with some people whom I assured I would meet at 5 o'clock. I know that the Senator was in the approach to this question. I merely wish to observe that it would have been of great assistance to me in undertaking to maintain the bipartisan complexion of the committee if members of the committee had been generous enough to come to me and show me the courtesy of saying, "I have changed my mind; I think we ought to have other witnesses and change other plans." Instead I was out fighting for the committee plan, upon which the members had all agreed, while members of the committee were changing their minds without apprising me of that fact.

Mr. MORSE. A part of my argument will bear on that subject. I am sure that if the Senator wishes to make comment on it, he will have adequate time to do so tomorrow. I shall be very brief.

Coming back to the argument which I was making, I think it is not my understanding that we were discussing the possible limitation of the hearings to the Armed Services Committee alone. It was primarily a matter of a military committee. When the committee met on April 13, at least it was not my understanding—and I doubt if it was the anticipation of other members of the committee generally—that the investigation which is now pending would ever develop into the broadly sweeping nature which now characterizes it. As the record shows that the Senator from Georgia will show, I am sure, at that time we discussed the possible limitation of the hearings to the Armed Services Committee alone. It was primarily a matter of going into the question of military policy and MacArthur's relationship to the military policy. It was a question as to looking further into the speeches that the President made on the removal of MacArthur.

Mr. President, a great deal of business of the Armed Services Committee of the Senate has been conducted in executive session. It has never been the position of the junior Senator from Oregon that all committees should hold all meetings in public. The Armed Services Committee has held executive sessions on a great many matters that require executive sessions.

Occasionally we consider a question involving discipline. It has been my experience in the Armed Services Committee that when we consider such a subject, unless it involves a great question of public policy, we do conduct a public hearing, at least to make preliminary investigation of the facts. When I said in the committee meeting, as I did, and the record quotes me accurately, that I had great doubt about the necessity of going into the reasons for the President's removal of MacArthur.

Mr. President, I am sure the Senator from Georgia and the President will reply to this argument. I am sure, or he will be free to reply to me tomorrow—that in my judgment, after the general's speech to the two Houses of Congress, a meeting of the Armed Services Committee has been held. We should not be acting now on the basis of the only meeting, that of April 13, prior to the speech of the general, until this morning when there was a joint meeting, apparently, of the Armed Services Committee and the Foreign Relations Committee.

Mr. President, the responsibility cannot be shifted to an individual member of the committee. The responsibility is that of the chairman of the committee. My opinion is that after the speech of General MacArthur and the investigation that has followed, and with publicly published statements appearing in the press on the part of some members of the Armed Services Committee, including the junior Senator from Oregon, the investigation ought to be conducted in public so far as it is possible to conduct it in public. It seems to me the Chairman of the committee ought to have gotten us together before, if we are to broaden the hearing body into a combination of the Armed Services and the Foreign Relations Committee, to which I have no objection. Apparently the members of the Foreign Relations Committee have voting privileges in the joint meeting, and I have no objection to that. That was a matter which could very well have been discussed by the Armed Services Committee on some date subsequent to April 13 and prior to this meeting.

Mr. President, there has been pretty serious indulgence publicly by members of the Armed Services Committee of their views on the controversy. The chairman, who is a brilliant lawyer, has had these views expressed in the press. He did not walk into the meeting this
morning to discuss for the first time that some members of the Armed Services Committee had made it clear or not we should hold the kind of meeting we talked about on April 13, which no longer is possible, because the nature of the whole hearing has changed. I do not think the chairman of the committee had any doubt of the fact that there was quite a different opinion on the part of several members of the Armed Services Committee from what they had been when the tenor of the language of the committee was when on April 13 we thought we were going to conduct an investigation by the Armed Services Committee more limited in scope than it will now be.

Senator from Oregon was surprised. He was perfectly satisfied that that speech broadened the base of the whole hearing, and that we are now in an investigation.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. To that.

Mr. MORGAN. First, the nature of the hearings as to whether or not the hearings should be open or closed.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I think that is one of the major weaknesses of the position of the Senator from Georgia, that this joint proceeding on the assumption that we proceed in open session, the other members of the Foreign Relations Committee as to what will be done in open or closed.

Mr. MORGAN. I think that the arguments of the joint committee are completely unsupported, in my opinion, deals with a set of facts and a question of jurisdiction not now relative to the problem before the Senate, for the Senator from Georgia is dealing with a transcript which has to do with the Armed Services Committee and its contemplation of the holding of an entirely different type of hearings than that now proposed.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. In other words, as a member of the present joint committee, the Senator from Iowa was recognized by the chairman of the joint committee, who is chairman of the Armed Services Committee; and the Senator from Iowa who was a member of the joint committee was put to a vote, was it not?

Mr. MORGAN. That is correct.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. In other words, we now have a voting joint committee which is presided over by the chairman of the Armed Services Committee—which is quite different than the situation—as to the question of the voter of the question of the participation of this country in the preparation of the military, which was taken in the Armed Services Committee on April 13. The record on the desk of the Senator from Georgia will show that at that meeting we discussed the question in terms of keeping the hearings strictly Armored Services hearings with other Members of the Senate, including members of the Appropriations Committee and the Senator from New Hampshire is a member of the Appropriations Committee, if the Appropriations Committee discusses a certain matter and decides at that time that some action should be taken, then, if those Senators go into a meeting of an entirely different committee, they must be bound, in respect to the new committee's action, by some discussion which none had under similar circumstances in the Appropriations Committee, of which they are members.

However, the joint committee is a total new committee than the action of the joint committee was elected only this morning, and this morning was the first time that Senators as members of the committee have had a chance to act.

So I think the arguments of the Senator from Georgia are not quite valid because the committee is a completely new one.

Mr. MORGAN. I thank the Senator from Iowa because the argument was making in reply to the Senator from Georgia is that he is using a transcript which, in his opinion, deals with a set of facts and a question of jurisdiction not now relative to the problem before the Senate, for the Senator from Georgia is dealing with a transcript which has to do with the Armed Services Committee and its contemplation of the holding of an entirely different type of hearings than that now proposed.

I am sorry the Senator from Georgia is not now in the Chamber, but I know he will reply to these statements tomorrow, or at least will be free to do so.

Therefore, I say most respectfully to my good friend, the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee, that I do not think he can escape responsibility, in the matter of holding open hearings, by saying that those who are members of the Armed Services Committee should have come to him some time between April 13 and this morning and should have made it clear that he had come to the conclusion that open hearings should be held.

First, the nature of the hearing had changed. Second, the entire membership of the committee has changed. It is now a joint committee. I think we also see that it is a matter ab initio, insofar as deciding this matter is concerned.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. If the Senator will yield further, let me say that since the Senator from Georgia has read some of the transcript into the Record, I should like to call the attention of the Senator from Oregon to page 11 of
the transcript, where some discussion of this subject occurred. I had this to say:

I think what we should all be striving for is as soon as possible to get away from the obsessions and dogmas of party or any other matter of opinion and in the Congress, and try to see if we can get to a place where we can develop a rational position. Concerning the fact that the Members of Congress are foreclosed now—those who are not members of this committee on Foreign Relations now have—had the chairman of the committee, I think we might find a revolt on our hands in the two houses, which we would like to avoid the horn, rather than unite us. I have no particular comment, but that is at least one thought that I have.

In other words, we have here a problem on which all of us were reserving some judgments. However, as the Senator from Oregon has pointed out, we now have an entirely different situation which grows out of the statement made by General MacArthur on the 19th of this month, almost 1 week—it was 6 days before the chairman. The Senator from Texas, who happens to be chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, moved that the Senator from Georgia, Mr. RUSSELL, be made chairman of the joint committee. Both the members of the Foreign Relations Committee and the members of the Armed Services Committee voted unanimously that the Senator from Georgia be the chairman of the joint committee. At that point—a new, temporary joint committee was constituted.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from California permit me to ask him a personal question?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes.

Mr. MORSE. Did the Senator from California, after the meeting on April 13, believe the committee would not be meeting again, after the chairman had written some communications, which the transcript of the meeting I believe had been written to certain persons in the Department of Defense and the administration, and after the committee obtained information for us in response to other questions which we raised in the meeting on April 13? Did the Senator from California really think that we would not be meeting again to consider matters of procedure until we started the hearings?

Mr. KNOWLAND. No; I will say not. However, in making that statement now, I do not intend to cast any reflection on the chairman of the committee, let me say, because I have, as does the Senator from Oregon, a very high regard for the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Georgia, and he has had many responsibilities and problems, as all of us have had.

However, the fact of the matter is that new events have occurred. For instance, on the 21st of this month there was released—from the White House, presumably—a document dealing with the Wake Island conference, a document which until today I had assumed had been merely an aide memoire. Nevertheless, to-day it turns out that the document was a top-secret document which was not declassified until the last 24 hours. It immediately put all members of the committee, the armed services committee, and all members of the committee to the Senate, into the position of trying to find out as to what the facts are, on that apparently the administration, in order to bolster its ease, is willing to declassify documents in order to give a one-sided version. At that point I think it is a great many of us changed our minds as to how the meetings of the two committees might fairly be conducted.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President—

Mr. MORSE. I will yield presently to the Senator from Michigan. I promised the Senator from New Hampshire some minutes ago, before the Senator from Michigan rose, that I would yield to him.

Mr. BRIDGES. Does the Senator from Michigan desire to ask a question?

Mr. FERGUSON. I have only a few questions I wanted to ask.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. The questions are, First, whether the Armed Services Committee, or the two committees sitting jointly this morning, at any time considered the question of the formation of a joint committee, including the chairmen of the committee, the Senator from Georgia, but it has never come before either the Armed Services Committee or the two committees sitting jointly. Thus it has not been as the result of action either by the Armed Services Committee or by the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Relations sitting jointly, that the Senate is not adorning so as to permit the Senate to vote upon that question. Is that correct?

Mr. BRIDGES. That is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall conclude by saying that in my opinion the situation is quite a bit different today from what it was on April 13. The nature of the hearing has changed materially. It has transformed itself into an investigation rather than a fact-finding hearing to get the facts as to why the break between the President and MacArthur occurred, in regard to its military aspects, which was the subject of the discussion on April 13.

The junior Senator from Oregon even entertained some doubt on April 13 as to that kind of hearing, because he could see that it might transform itself into an investigation. But when we come to deal with the investigation of a question of public policy, the junior Senator from Oregon will always, as in the past, stand for open hearings, because I think that as I said last year, we would then get about as close to the intent of the Constitution of the United States as possible in regard to fair hearings. It has been held many times in court decisions that a fair hearing involves a public hearing.

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

Mr. MORSE. I will yield in a moment.

In view of the fact that we now have two committees sitting jointly, I certainly think the situation is different from what it was on April 13, and
that it was quite appropriate that the question be voted on by the two committees, sitting jointly.

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

Mr. MORDER. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BRIDGES. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Oregon that I think the issue developed on two approaches that we proceed with open hearings, and that there was a closed hearing on a matter affecting the security of the country was involved. The other was a matter affecting the security of the Island [Mr. GREEN] to adopt the plan advocated by the Services Committee, for 15 years. I have a statement made by the former Military Affairs Committee of the Senate.

Mr. GREEN. I refer to the statement in which I have been, however, disturbed me considerably. The President in which he intimated that the White House did not discuss with him such problems as those which have arisen. That is a very unfortunate thing for the country, because the able Senator from Georgia is chairman of one of the most powerful committees, the Armed Services Committee, a committee which deals directly with the defense of the Nation, a committee which helps the Congress of the United States to decide its national policy with regard to raising and supporting armies and navies and providing therefor. I am satisfied that had the President consulted with him, he might have properly have done, he might not have made the tragic mistake of removing General MacArthur in the manner in which it was done, and without at least calling the general back for consultation.

As the Senator from Oregon knows, there are four classes of security matters, namely, restricted, confidential, secret, and top secret, and I believe that if the White House had consulted with the able Senator from Georgia before it allowed the leak of the Wake Island conference to take place in the way it did, the Senator from Georgia knowing about security matters would certainly have advised them that they must not release a top-secret document to one individual without making it available to all people by properly declassifying it, and perhaps giving General MacArthur a chance, at least, to look at the memorandum before it was released. It is very unfortunate that the White House does not call upon the judgment, and the standing, and the ability of the able Senator from Georgia more than it appears they do. It might keep out of trouble if it would do so.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall postpone until another time the speech which I rose to give today on the farm-labor bill. Quite unnecessarily, I am afraid I started something on the floor, and it took more time than I had expected. I am gratified that so many of my colleagues on this side of the aisle care to impress me on this issue. Perhaps the debate will serve some useful purpose.

I yield the floor.

SUPPLYING AGRICULTURAL WORKERS FROM MEXICO

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

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, earlier in the day I discussed the farm-labor bill, and inserted in the Record, by unanimous consent, some telegrams sustaining my position. I have received quite a number of telegrams from Pueblo Indians in my State. There are 17 pueblos in my State, and some of the Indians have sent me telegrams supporting my position that they should be employed before foreign labor is employed. I ask unanimous consent that the telegrams be inserted in the Record, together with telegrams from individuals and associations in my State and some telegrams from other States relative to the same issue.

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

ZUNI, N. MEX., April 30, 1951.
Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ, Senator of New Mexico, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.: The Zuni Tribal Council in behalf of the Zuni Indians want to compliment you on your gallant stand on Senate bill 984. You have our full support on your stand on this bill.

CHAVEZ, COHO, Delegate, Zuni Tribal Council, ZUNI, N. MEX., April 30, 1951.
Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ, Senator of New Mexico, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.: The Zuni Tribal Council in behalf of the Zuni Indians want to compliment you on your gallant stand on Senate bill 984. You have our full support on your stand on this bill.

CONRAD LERARELY, Governor, Zuni Pueblo,
ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX., April 30, 1951.
United States Senate, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.: We members of Isleta Pueblo want to thank you for your gallant fight for your amendments to S. 984. We are opposed to the original Zunie bill; we support your stand.

JUAN R. ARESTA, Governor, Isleta Pueblo,
ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX., April 30, 1951.
United States Senate, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.: We members of the All Pueblo Council are in full accord with your amendments to Senate bill 984. We are opposed to the original Zunie bill as reported to the Senate.

DIEGO ARESTA, Governor, Isleta Pueblo,
ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX., April 30, 1951.
United States Senate, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.: We members of the Isleta Pueblo want to compliment you on your gallant stand for your amendments to Senate bill 984. We are opposed to the original Zunie bill as reported to the Senate.

JOE S. ARESTA, Ex-Governor, Isleta,
ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX., April 30, 1951.
United States Senate, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.: We members of the Isleta Pueblo Council appreciate and will never forget the fight you are putting against the original Zunie bill.

ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX., April 30, 1951.
United States Senate, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.: We members of the Isleta Pueblo Committee appreciate and will never forget the fight you are putting against the original Zunie bill.

JOE S. ARESTA, Ex-Governor, Isleta.
Resolved, That the Senate does hear with profound sorrow the death of Hon. Frank Buchanan, a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania.

Resolved, That a committee of 10 Members of the House with such Members of the Senate as may be joined be appointed to attend the funeral.

Resolved, That the Senate do now adjourn.

Mr. Martin. Mr. President, the people of Pennsylvania were saddened by the announcement of the death of Representative Frank Buchanan. He served as one of the five Members of the House from Allegheny County, Pa. He was from an industrial district. Prior to serving as a Representative in Congress, during his life he had served as a member of the council of his city, and he also served well as the mayor of the city of McKeesport.

Frank Buchanan was a fine friend. He was greatly interested in our form of Government and came up the hard way. I wish to express to the people of his district and to his family our great and profound regret at his passing.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the resolutions from the House of Representatives, which will be read.

The resolutions were read, as follows:


Resolved, That the House was heard with profound sorrow the death of Hon. Frank Buchanan, a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania.

Resolved, That a committee of 10 Members of the House with such Members of the Senate as may be joined be appointed to attend the funeral.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the late Representative Buchanan, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was unanimously agreed to, and (at 6 o'clock and 56 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 1, 1951, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 30 (legislative day of April 17), 1951:

UNITED STATES TARIFF COMMISSION

Oscar B. Ryder, of Virginia, to be a member of the United States Tariff Commission for the term expiring June 16, 1957 (reappointment).

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE

Roswell L. Gilpatric, of New York, to be Assistant Secretary of the Air Force, vice Harold C. Stuart, resigned.

IN THE ARMY

Major George Elies Elliss Armstrong, of the Army of the United States (brigadier general, Medical Corps, U. S. Army), for appointment as the Army’s Adjutant General, and as major general in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of section 206 of the Army Organization Act of 1950 and section 513 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of captain, subject to confirmation therefor as provided by law:

Lance T. McIver
Gordon B. Swango
George H. Elias
James Sharp II
Myron P. Wenzel
John B. Marshall, Jr.
Gustave F. Lueddeke
John Fadachi, Jr.
John H. Campbell
Dwain Wise
Charles C. Ward
Robert Wade
Harold L. Mayfield
William A. Latlack
Robert W. Gallentine
Ernest L. Engelkes
Ernest R. Doyle, Jr.
Nicholas M. Senneloff
Robert H. Cook
Robert J. Craig
Clyde V. Sines
Elmer A. Krieg
John C. Boulware
James W. Luther
Arthur S. Tarkington
Victor E. Johnson, Jr.
Dewey F. Durnford, Jr.
Noble L. Beck
Leroy W. Cobett
Clyde P. Guy
Henry A. Checkow
Levi L. Davenport
Gene K. Senneloff
James P. Bruce
Clyde B. Shropshire
John D. Coleman
Taylor H. Wagner
Robert W. Minick
Anthony Edwards
Lind B. Tucker
William H. Kellogg
Robert C. Evanoff
Marion H. Deckard
Charles H. Ludden

Lawrence McGlaide
John P. Flynn, Jr.
Duane A. Swinford
Edgar A. Monroe
William N. Gustafson
Stanley B. Voth
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The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of captain for limited duty, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

**Alabama**

Bill Cunningham, Jasper, Ala., in place of W. D. Leake, retired.

**California**

Lucile G. Jamieson, Dana Point, Calif., in place of D. T. Prentice, resigned.

Elisabeth Lane, Lemoncove, Calif., in place of F. J. Darby, resigned.

Samuel H. Brandt, Robles Del Rio, Calif., in place of W. M. Sargent, resigned.

Bessie L. McEver, Santa Rita Park, Calif., in place of W. M. Sargent, resigned.

Mildred A. Hauser, Santa Ynez, Calif., in place of V. E. Mackey, resigned.

**Colorado**

George B. Peck, Jr., Estes Park, Colo., in place of T. C. Craig, deceased.

Levi W. Miller, Hot Sulphur Springs, Colo., in place of M. L. Huffaker, resigned.

**Georgia**

William E. Beavertight, Rayle, Ga., in place of Beavertight, retired.

**Idaho**

James W. Hann, Buhl, Idaho, in place of L. P. Runyon, retired.

**Illinois**

Richard J. Schnell, Elgin, Ill., in place of Joseph Kreeger, retired.

Clarence G. Sinn, Marilla, Ill., in place of J. W. Duffey, retired.

**Indiana**

Claude B. Holder, Hope, Ind., in place of A. C. Reeves, transferred.

Norman Brela, Huntingtonburg, Ind., in place of N. L. A. Koerner, retired.

Paul V. Geiger, Markle, Ind., in place of C. A. Eddy, transferred.

**Kansas**

Earl G. Grinstead, Davenport, Iowa, in place of S. H. Siter, retired.

Eugene E. Sinn, Earling, Iowa, in place of J. J. Langenfeld, retired.
Charles E. Hinde, Early, Iowa, in place of R. E. Conklin, resigned.
Clarence L. Suer, Otho, Iowa, in place of O. C. Hanson, retired.

**KANSAS**


**KENTUCKY**


**MARYLAND**

Josephine O. Harding, Berwyn, Md., in place of P. J. Byrne, transferred.

**MASSACHUSETTS**

Ralph R. Wilson, Rockport, Mass., in place of W. D. Powers, retired.
William J. Dowd, South Walpole, Mass., in place of J. J. Easton, retired.

**MICHIGAN**

Thomas H. Branigan, Auburn, Mich., in place of O. W. Murphy, removed.
Charles E. Weaver, Buchanan, Mich., in place of A. G. Haslett, retired.
J. Donald Van Sickie, Carson City, Mich., in place of W. J. Grace, transferred.
Vernon P. McGuire, Detour, Mich., in place of J. A. McDonald, retired.
Albert C. Johnston, Palmyra, Mich., in place of W. A. Thuer, resigned.

**MINNESOTA**

Marcel E. Novotny, Badger, Minn., in place of O. M. Wammer, transferred.
Leon C. Smith, Granada, Minn., in place of C. H. Hiatt, deceased.
William A. Nichols, Wichelman, Hamburg, Minn., in place of M. B. Scheele, transferred.

**MISSOURI**

Michael B. Lee, Milan, Mo., in place of S. G. Morehead, resigned.

**MONTANA**

Roland Keith Taylor, Fairview, Mont., in place of M. H. Johnson, resigned.
Walter J. Meddock, Sunburst, Mont., in place of J. W. Huangstener, retired.

**NEW JERSEY**

Wayne Stahl, Cranbury, N. J., in place of J. N. Stonaker, deceased.
Julian B. Cubberley, Deerfield Street, N. J., in place of C. B. Moore, retired.

**NEW YORK**

John V. Hartigan, Chatham, N. Y., in place of F. B. Brogan, transferred.
Norris F. Patchen, Martsville, N. Y., in place of D. W. Mott, transferred.
Anthony M. Cipriano, Mount Morris, N. Y., in place of L. C. Donovan, deceased.
John F. Harrison, Port Jarvis, N. Y., in place of T. W. Cothran, retired.
Harry L. Gregory, Roxbury, N. Y., in place of M. H. Fanning, deceased.

**OHIO**

Davis Francis Hill, Youngsville, N. C., in place of M. P. Cheatham, retired.
Stanley M. Bardom, Grafton, Ohio, in place of T. C. Washington, resigned.
Raphael J. Frangella, North Olmsted, Ohio, in place of F. E. Fridgley, transferred.
Chester R. Raslin, Otway, Ohio, in place of Frank Koenig, transferred.

**OKLAHOMA**

Alice M. Farhat, Oklahoma, Okla., in place of W. G. Baustert, transferred.

**PENNSYLVANIA**

Stewart S. Young, Duncannon, Pa., in place of W. O. Miller, retired.

**SOUTH DAKOTA**

Harvey O. Eck, Emmaus, Pa., in place of F. B. Burch, transferred.
Elisabeth M. Murphy, Hokendauqua, Pa., in place of M. S. Porter, retired.
Bertina M. Martin, Intercourse, Pa., in place of C. M. Bright, resigned.
James L. O'Toole, Sharon, Pa., in place of J. L. Considine, retired.

**TENNESSEE**


**WISCONSIN**

Carey Spence Nicely, Corryton, Tenn., in place of E. B. Mullins, retired.
Bruce W. Bray, Albany, Tex., in place of P. H. Williams, retired.
Mary E. Russell, Ammons, Tex., in place of T. E. Lawson, retired.
Joe L. Shelton, Brownfield, Tex., in place of J. H. Dallas, resigned.
Billy M. Wall, McGregorches, Tex., in place of Mary Thompson, resigned.

**VIRGINIA**

Thomas G. Cunningham, Mount Vernon, Va., in place of E. J. Monroe, resigned.
Hugh A. Miller, Granite Falls, Wash., in place of C. R. Monk, resigned.

**WASHINGTON**

Arthur L. Peters, Frederic, Wis., in place of Victoria K. Homan, retired.
Donald L. Bennet, Glen Haven, Wis., in place of E. R. White, transferred.
Edwin R. Barden, Platteville, Wis., in place of H. M. Harms, transferred.
Herman J. Glinski, Stevens Point, Wis., in place of F. A. Hrizy, resigned.
Michael W. Murphy, West Bend, Wis., in place of F. P. O'Meara, deceased.

**XCVII-287**

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 30 (legislative day of April 17), 1951:

RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

W. Stuart Symington, of Missouri, to be Administrator of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR CORPS OF THE UNITED STATES NAVY

To be surgeon (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective date of acceptance.

To be a dental surgeon (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective date of acceptance.

C. Dudley Miller

Texas

To be senior assistant dental surgeon (equivalent to the Army rank of captain), effective date of acceptance.
Frank C. Sammis, Jr.

Ohio

To be senior assistant pharmacist (equivalent to the Army rank of captain), effective date of acceptance.
Reede M. Ames

Michigan

To be senior assistant scientists (equivalent to the Army rank of second lieutenant), effective date of acceptance.

To be senior assistant veterinarian (equivalent to the Army rank of captain), effective date of acceptance.

Ladd N. Lounis

To be surgeon (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective date of acceptance.

To be senior assistant nurse officer (equivalent to the Army rank of captain), effective date of acceptance.

To be senior assistant sanitary engineer (equivalent to the Army rank of second lieutenant), effective date of acceptance.

Merri I. Porter

IN THE ARMY

CHIEF SIGNAL OFFICER AND MAJOR GENERAL


United States Army, for appointment as Chief Signal Officer, United States Army, and as major general in the Regular Army of the United States.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

The nominations of William M. Murray et al. for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on March 28, 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 William M. Murray, which is shown on page 2960, and ending with the name of Gordon G. Russell, which is shown on page 3661.

The nominations of George R. Cramer et al. for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on April 11, 1951, and may be found in full in the Senate proceedings of the Congressional Record for that date under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of George R. Cramer, which appears on page 3671, and ending with the name of Harry A. Yoder, which is shown on page 3672.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

The nominations of George Edward Adams et al. for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on April 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 George Edward Adams, which is shown on page 3665, and ending with the name of William Stephen Rooney, which is shown on page 3671.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

APPOINTMENTS IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

The following-named persons for appointment in the United States Air Force, in the grades indicated, with the rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force under the provisions of section 506, Public

To be majors, United States Air Force (medical)
Arthur J. Katzberg, Gordon H. Rhode.

To be captains, United States Air Force (medical)

To be first lieutenants, United States Air Force (medical)

To be first lieutenants, United States Air Force (dental)

The following-named distinguished officers for appointment in the United States Air Force in the grade indicated, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force under the provisions of section 506, Public Law 381, Eightieth Congress (Officer Personnel Act of 1947):

To be second lieutenants

The following-named distinguished aviators for appointment in the United States Air Force in the grade indicated, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force under the provisions of section 506, Public Law 381, Eightieth Congress (Women's Armed Services Integration Act of 1949):

To be second lieutenant
Anita M. Belliuti.

The following-named distinguished persons for appointment in the United States Air Force in the grade indicated, with date of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force under the provisions of section 506, Public Law 381, Eightieth Congress (Officer Personnel Act of 1947):

To be second lieutenant
Lansing G. Scofield.

The following-named persons for appointment in the United States Air Force in the grade indicated, with date of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force under the provisions of section 506, Public Law 381, Eightieth Congress (Women's Medical Specialists Act of 1947):
The following-named persons for appointment in the United States Air Force in the grade indicated, with dates of rank to be determined, by the Secretary of the Air Force under the provisions of section 101, Public Law 56, Eightieth Congress (Army-Navy date of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force).

To be second lieutenants, United States Air Force (nurses)

Helen E. Cahn, Dorothy M. Hord, Jean E. Kelso, Flora E. Mowry, Cyril H. Dingwell, Otis A. Sleep.

The following-named persons for appointment in the United States Air Force in the grade indicated, with dates of rank to be determined, by the Secretary of the Air Force under the provisions of section 506, Public Law 381, Eightieth Congress (Officer Personnel Act of 1947).

To be second lieutenants, United States Air Force (nurses)


The following-named persons for appointment in the United States Air Force in the grade indicated, with dates of rank to be determined, by the Secretary of the Air Force under the provisions of section 2 of Public Law 514, Eighty-first Congress, as amended by Public Law 514, Eighty-first Congress, in the grades indicated, with dates of rank to be determined, by the Secretary of the Air Force under the provisions of section 101, Public Law 56, Eightieth Congress, as amended by section 2 of Public Law 514, Eighty-first Congress.

To be captains, United States Air Force (nurses)

Janice A. Albert, Berniece E. Britton, Bernice E. Britton, Rita Chandler, Geraldine E. Hellen, Margaret M. Kliesch, Lillian M. Kinsella, Lucile C. Slatery, Claire E. Stanton, Margaret Vinard, Genevieve E. Martell.

To be first lieutenant, United States Air Force (nurse)


To be firstlieutenants, United States Air Force, for appointment in the United States Air Force, in the grade of sec-

end lieutenant, effective June 1, 1951, upon their graduation, under the provisions of section 506, Public Law 381, Eightieth Congress (Officer Personnel Act of 1947). Date of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force.


The following-named midshipmen, United States Naval Academy, for appointment in the United States Air Force, in the grade of second lieutenant, effective June 1, 1951, upon their graduation, under the provisions of section 506, Public Law 381, Eightieth Congress (Officer Personnel Act of 1947). Date of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force.
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Donald Anthony Richitt
Raymond Arthur Robbins
Louis Aubrey Roberts, Jr.
Robert Martin Roberts
William G. Rollins
Theodore Chapman Rook
Robert Walker Roy
Anthony S. Rupley
Kenneth James Schlagheck
John Preston Schuler
Leonard Warren Seagren
Louis Walker Sessions
Thomas Llewellyn Sheets
Thomas Weber Shewman, Jr.
Stewart Mitchell Singer
John George Siddmore
Paul Ames Smith, Jr.
William Morris Smith, Jr.
Frank Alan Steizer
Ferry Lee Stephens
William Griffith Stephenson III
Walter Clarence Stevens, Jr.
David Twogood Stockman
William Rex Thomas, Jr.
Anthony Stearns Thorne
Frederick James Tost
Willard Martin Truesdell
Edward Wingfield Verner
Charles Matthew Wasp
Richard Ammisio Wathen III
Clifford Lloyd Ward
William Alexander Weaver
Oscar Werneth
Donald Elliott Westbrook
James Eugene White
Carr Ghiti Whitner
William Alonzo Wilson, Jr.
William Boyd Wilson

IN THE NAVY

The nominations of David E. Allison et al., for appointment in the Navy, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on April 3, 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 David E. Allison, which is shown on page 3155, and ending with the name of Ruth Williams, which is shown on page 3168.

The nominations of Henry H. Adams, Jr., et al., for appointment in the Navy, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on April 17, 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 David E. Allison, which is shown on page 3155, and ending with the name of Ruth Williams, which is shown on page 3168.

The nominations of Henry H. Adams, Jr., et al., for appointment in the Navy, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on April 17, 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 David E. Allison, which is shown on page 3155, and ending with the name of Ruth Williams, which is shown on page 3168.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 30, 1951

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Brandt, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, our Father, who art always mindful of our needs, we rejoice that in our days of confusion and perplexity Thou art our guide and counselor; in our periods of trial and tribulation Thou art our refuge and strength, and in our times of loneliness and sorrow Thou art our companion and comforter.

We pray that these assurances and the abundance of our blessings may never dull us with a sense of independence and self-complacency or make us supercilious and selfishly indifferent to the desperate struggles of others.

Inspire us with an eager longing to relieve the burdens of all mankind and to dedicate ourselves more earnestly to the glorious task of laying the foundation for a better world.

We thank thee for the Christian life and character of Thy servant who labored here so conscientiously and devotedly in obedience to the demands and responsibilities of his high vocation. Grant unto the broken and sorrowing hearts of the members of his bereaved family the healing touch of Thy divine love and the consolation of Thy grace.

Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, April 26, 1951, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Woodruff, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 3336) entitled "An act to suspend certain import taxes on copper," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. George, Mr. Connally, Mr. Byrd, Mr. Miller, and Mr. Taft to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. McCormack. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet tomorrow morning at 11 o'clock.

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

There was no objection.

CONSENT AND PRIVATE CALENDERS

Mr. McCormack. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order tomorrow to call both the Consent and Private Calendars.

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

There was no objection.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. McCormack. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday of this week be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

THE LATE FRANK BUCHANAN

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ERBENHARTER].

Mr. ERBENHARTER. Mr. Speaker, this is personal. A real man, a real friend, a true servant of democracy, a Representative in the Congress of the United States, passed away on Friday.

You all knew him as a fellow Congressman. His name alone was a tribute to his life and to my enjoyment of his friendship that has been tested through the years.

I must break today a silence of love, for no man tells another through days of association that he loves his friend. Unfortunately, the death of a man breaks that silence, when all the words