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

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

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

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, relative to requesting the release of $100,000 appropriation for the payment of war damage claims in the Philippines; to the Committee on Appropriations.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BRAY: H. R. 3589. A bill for the relief of Herman Mahmood; to the Committee on Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRNE of New York: H. R. 3591. A bill for the relief of Paul D. Babcock, disbursing officer, Treasury Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONDINO: H. R. 3592. A bill for the relief of Milton C. Town; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAVENNER: H. R. 3588. A bill for the relief of Eiko Takano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING: H. R. 3587. A bill for the relief of Ethel Cristeta Berner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCDONOUGH: H. R. 3596. A bill for the relief of Frank A. Werie; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MANSFIELD (by request): H. R. 3597. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue to Yellowstone Metals, Inc., patents in fee to certain lands in Meagher County, Mont.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RAMSAY: H. R. 3586. A bill for the relief of William E. Gillespie, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

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

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

TUESDAY, MAY 1, 1951
(Legislative day of Tuesday, April 17, 1951)

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

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

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

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

THE JOURNAL

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

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

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

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

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

Mr. Russell. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the purpose of holding joint meetings in advance with the order of the Senate of April 25, 1951, the Committees on Armed Services and Foreign Relations be constituted a committee of the Senate with all the power and authority vested in standing committees of the Senate.

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

Mr. McFarland. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators be
permitted to present petitions and memorials, submit reports, introduce bills and joint resolutions, and transact other routine business, without debate and without speeches.

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

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

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

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

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

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

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

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

There being objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

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

Whereas the wages of postal employees have been reduced from the cost of living for a period of at least 10 years; and

Whereas according to a recent report submitted by the President and the Civil Service Commission to the Subcommittee on Postal Service of the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, the cost of living advanced 20 percent from 1939 to November 1950; and

Whereas, according to that same report, the average wage of grade 67 increased from $2,165 per annum to approximately $3,500 per annum for the same period, reflecting an increase of only some 61.8 percent, or a net loss of 16.3 percent; and

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

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

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

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

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

RESOLUTIONS OF MICHIGAN LEGISLATURE

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

Senate concurrent resolution of the Michigan Legislature, adopted April 22, 1951, expresses the Michigan Legislature in support of the St. Lawrence seaway project. As such it reflects similar petitions to Congress from the Michigan Legislature over at least 15 years as well as the prevailing opinion in the State of Michigan that the seaway project was never more urgently needed than now, in the light of world conditions and adds that the self-liquidating nature of the project as presently proposed has the hearty endorsement of the people in our State.

A second resolution supports demands upon the Veterans’ Administration that it provide more adequate facilities for tubercular patients in Michigan. The house resolution memorializes Congress to enact legislation amending the Federal income-tax law with respect to exemptions.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution may be printed at this point in the Record.

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

To the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 22"

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

"Whereas, in the year 1919, by Public Act 17 and in 1921 by Public Act 158, the legislature created the Great Lakes Tidewater Commission for the purpose of investigating the feasibility of establishing deep-water connections between the Great Lakes and the Atlantic Ocean, so as to permit passage of seagoing vessels from the Great Lakes to said ocean, which project has since come to be known as the St. Lawrence seaway, and in said acts the legislature authorized the Commission to cooperate with similar agencies of other States to coordinate the efforts of all such States in obtaining the building of the project; and

"Whereas in the decade between 1921 and 1931 the legislature appropriated to said Commission approximately $100,000 to enable it to complete its work; and

"Whereas the Commission has failed to present its arguments for the approval of this international project, and as a result of the work of the Commission and of similar commissions in other States, the feasibility and value of the project was demonstrated to the Federal Government; therefore, be it

"Whereas the Commission has repeatedly made reports to the Governor, and the two houses of the legislature have on numerous occasions expressed their support of concurrent resolutions their desire that the Congress and the members of the Michigan delegation proceed speedily in all steps necessary for the action to be taken by the Federal Government since the project of necessity is international in its nature and its scope, to wit, by Senate Concurrent Resolutions 5 of 1933, 7 of 1933, 1 of 1933, 98 of 1941, 5 of 1947, 33 of 1951, House Concurrent Resolutions 7 of 1935, 5 of 1937, 3 of 1941; and

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

"Whereas the present national emergency and the experiences of the last World War demonstrated beyond a question of doubt, in addition to its basic economical value in the industrial development of the country the need of the project and the industrial capacity of this country for defense may be substantially increased by the construction of this project; and

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

"Resolved by the Senate (the house of representatives concurring), That the legislature reiterates its position in support of the St. Lawrence seaway project and requests each member of the Michigan delega-
tion in the Congress, in view of the importance of the project, both to the State and to the national economic and defense needs, to take its consent DN. Furthermore, adoption of the project by the Federal Government and to complete by way of treaty or agreement its international authorization; and be it further

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

"Adopted by the Senate, February 21, 1951.

"FRED I. CHASE, "Secretary of the Senate.

"Adopted by the House, February 21, 1951.

"NORMAN E. PHILLEO, "Clerk of the House of Representatives."

To the Committee on Finance:

"House Resolution 17

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

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

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

"Adopted by the Senate, March 31, 1951.

"FRED I. CHASE, "Secretary of the Senate.

"Adopted by the House, April 1, 1951.

"NORMAN E. PHILLEO, "Clerk of the House of Representatives."

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION

INTRODUCED

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

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

By Mr. BUTLER of Maryland:
S. 1419. A bill to pay an annuity to Richard W. Goodhart; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:
S. 1420. A bill for the relief of Finfarg Hia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. DOUGLAS:
S. 1422. A bill for the relief of Jerry J. Lencioni; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. IVES:
S. J. Res. 68. Joint resolution to provide burial and hospitalization benefits to certain persons who served in the Armed Forces on and after June 27, 1950, and prior to such date as shall thereafter be determined by the President:

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

BURIAL AND HOSPITAL BENEFITS FOR CERTAIN VETERANS

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, my attention has been called to the fact that members of the Armed Forces now serving in Korea and others who have been in active service since June 27, 1950, when discharged from service, are technically peacetime veterans and not eligible for hospitalization and burial benefits within the meaning of the Veterans' Administration requirements, for appropriate reference, a Joint resolution which provides for burial and hospitalization benefits to any member who has served in the active military, naval, or air service of the United States on or after June 27, 1950, and prior to such date as shall thereafter be determined by Presidential proclamation or concurrent resolution of the Congress.

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

INVESTIGATION OF CRIME AND RELATED PROBLEMS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLOMBIA

Mr. NEELY (for himself and Mr. CASS) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 138), which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia:

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

Sec. 2. For the purpose of this resolution, the terms 'department', 'agency', or any other subcommittee thereof, is authorized to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems advisable, and is authorized, with the consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government of the United States. The expenses of the committee, or any other subcommittee thereof, is hereby authorized and directed (1) to conduct a full and complete study and investigation with respect to crime and related problems, including law enforcement, in the District of Columbia; and (2) to report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of such study and investigation, together with such recommendations as to necessary legislation as it may deem desirable.

THIRD SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS—AMENDMENTS

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

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

PRINTING OF GEN. DOUGLAS MACARTHUR'S SPEECH BEFORE CONGRESS (S. DOC. NO. 88)

Mr. MCCARRAN. Mr. President, I venture the expression that in the history of this country, no more momentous expression has ever been made, either by Members of this body, by Members of the House of Representatives, or by any speaker before Congress, than was made before the Joint meeting of Congress on the 19th
day of last month by General of the Army Douglas MacArthur. It was delivered by him before the joint meeting of Congress, which has been repeated around the world. It has created in this country a thinking people, thinking deeply of their own 1951, welfare as individuals and as Americans, thinking seriously of their own future, and the future of their country. Indeed, it required such a speech to bring the people of the United States to their feet, to stop thinking of the welfare of their nation. I ask unanimous consent that the speech of Gen. Douglas MacArthur, delivered on the 19th day of last month, before the joint meeting of the two Houses of Congress, be printed in a Senate document. It is under 50 pages, and, therefore, does not require an estimate of cost.

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

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

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

BY MR. FULLBRIGHT:
An article discussing the necessity of confidence in government officials, written by Wallace A. Martin and published in the Washington Post May 1, 1951.

BY MR. ATKIN:
Editorial entitled “Case for the Seaway,” discussing the proposed St. Lawrence seaway, published in the Miami News of March 26, 1951.

BY MR. MHAMON:

BY MR. BUTLER of Nebraska:
Three tables making comparisons between tax rates under the Social Security and railroad retirement systems.

BY MR. BUTLER of Nebraska:
Four tables giving comparisons between tax rates under the Social Security and Railroad Retirement Systems.

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

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

BY MR. O’CONNOR:

BY MR. O’CONNOR:

BY MR. MCAFFETH:
Article entitled “Germany Treated Like Stepchild,” written by Constantine Brown and published in The Washington Star of May 1, 1951, referring to the treatment of Germany by other nations.

BY MR. MCAFFETH:
Article entitled “Abandoned Ruins Is Blunderers’ Refuge,” written by David Lawrence and published in the Washington Star of May 1, 1951, having to do with the impending MacArthur investigation.

BY MR. DOUGLAS:
Statements of Nicholas Brown, former Navy Assistant Secretary for Air, and letter from Gen. F. A. Vandegrift, endorsing Senate bill 677, a bill for the reorganization of the Marine Corps and to make Commandant a permanent member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

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

SUGGESTED REPUBLICAN PRESIDENTIAL TICKET OF 1952

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I should like to have inserted in the Record at this point the ticket which is suggested for the Republican convention by the Executive Committee of the Illinois Republican State Central Committee. Mr. MCAFFETH, owner and editor of the Chicago Tribune. He has suggested General MacArthur for President and Senator Robert A. Taft, our colleague, for Vice President.

The colonel also stated that this would be the greatest ticket nominated in his lifetime, and it seemed to me that the ticket would do well in both the East and the West. He suggested MacArthur for President and Senator Robert A. Taft, our colleague, for Vice President.

The colonel also stated that this would be the greatest ticket nominated in his lifetime, and it seemed to me that the ticket would do well in both the East and the West. He suggested MacArthur for President and Senator Robert A. Taft, our colleague, for Vice President.

The colonel also stated that this would be the greatest ticket nominated in his lifetime, and it seemed to me that the ticket would do well in both the East and the West. He suggested MacArthur for President and Senator Robert A. Taft, our colleague, for Vice President.

The colonel also stated that this would be the greatest ticket nominated in his lifetime, and it seemed to me that the ticket would do well in both the East and the West. He suggested MacArthur for President and Senator Robert A. Taft, our colleague, for Vice President.

The colonel also stated that this would be the greatest ticket nominated in his lifetime, and it seemed to me that the ticket would do well in both the East and the West. He suggested MacArthur for President and Senator Robert A. Taft, our colleague, for Vice President.

The colonel also stated that this would be the greatest ticket nominated in his lifetime, and it seemed to me that the ticket would do well in both the East and the West. He suggested MacArthur for President and Senator Robert A. Taft, our colleague, for Vice President.

The colonel also stated that this would be the greatest ticket nominated in his lifetime, and it seemed to me that the ticket would do well in both the East and the West. He suggested MacArthur for President and Senator Robert A. Taft, our colleague, for Vice President.

The colonel also stated that this would be the greatest ticket nominated in his lifetime, and it seemed to me that the ticket would do well in both the East and the West. He suggested MacArthur for President and Senator Robert A. Taft, our colleague, for Vice President.

The colonel also stated that this would be the greatest ticket nominated in his lifetime, and it seemed to me that the ticket would do well in both the East and the West. He suggested MacArthur for President and Senator Robert A. Taft, our colleague, for Vice President.

The colonel also stated that this would be the greatest ticket nominated in his lifetime, and it seemed to me that the ticket would do well in both the East and the West. He suggested MacArthur for President and Senator Robert A. Taft, our colleague, for Vice President.
their investments in the stock of that company. Much of this loss ultimately comes out of the Federal Treasury as tax deductions. For if the automobiles were made by our government-owned companies the Treasury would collect taxes from the stockholders’ dividends as well as from the manufacturers to the profits in making the automobiles.

As for the Tex-Mass loan, there is no lack of other successful private enterprises that would make and administer the loans to banks that is to be used in making payments on loans now held by large life insurance companies, and a substantial sum to pay bank examiners to prevent the propriety of the RFC. If the loans are good the insurance companies and banks would want to keep them. If they are bad, they should not be unloaded on the Government.

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

When the Government finances business it is doing a private enterprise’s business, in which it gets much of its income. When it finances improvident business it takes from the profits of competing business, gets no tax from the improvident, and loses on its loan.

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

I doubt that there is a county in the United States that the RFC could not make its credit available to.

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

While I do not believe there is any lack of justifiable credit anywhere in the country, if the RFC continues to make loans to business and industry, it will get applications for loans. Some people would prefer to borrow from the RFC rather than their local banks. Some may feel that they can go to their Congressman or their United States Senator or possibly to the White House and bring political pressure on Government banking officials. The lending agent may feel that his job is a political one and that to hold it he must make loans to banks that should not make loans.

Without any information on the subject, that must have been the situation existing before the RFC was made.

With the RFC all set for business, it is natural that those in charge of it would rather make loans than not, in order to justify their job. They are maintaining the pretense of the RFC being an agency of the Government that requires its directors to certify to the propriety of the RFC.

During World War II, as many people want to borrow money would like to be in a position to make loans, especially if “If you don’t let me have the money, I will get it from the RFC.”

Money lending is just as much a vocation as any other calling in life, including that of politics and statesmanship. A successful money lender must make much of a success in politics, and the reverse is probably true. Particularly, Members of Congress, those in the executive branch of the Government, if they have to interpret the act for, or otherwise influence, the directors of the RFC in making specific loans.

I have not read the act since leaving the Corporation, but there was a provision in it that it should be continued by the Congress as long as the Congress felt it could be, and that it be liquidated. I have made these observations, comments, and suggestions drawn from my experience with the Corporation, and wish to remind you that where the sugar is you will always find the beet.

Sincerely yours,

Jesse H. Jones.

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

Mr. Hoover on the RFC

Herbert Hoover added his own vigorous arguments yesterday to those of such veteran bankers as J. J. Thompson, Robert P. Fairbank and Marvin E. Rozelle in advocating the liquidation of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

Mr. Hoover’s views are highly pertinent to the debate, since it was he who, as President in 1933, fathered the RFC. At that time, however, as Mr. Hoover told the Senate Banking Committee yesterday, the institution was created to assist a temporarily crippled private banking system in protecting the solvency of agriculture, commerce, and industry. Its purely emergency character was reflected in the restrictions which were placed upon its activities as described and in the fact that its life span was set at 1 year.

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

Mr. Hoover’s testimony was particularly devastating when it dealt with the argument (the last stronghold of the RFC’s defenders) that the RFC is needed to prevent a crippling blow to small business. If it is solvent, he said, small business "can get all the help it needs from the 17,000 banking services.

Where long-term venture capital or credit is required, the answer, he suggested, is the bringing together of state and federal resources, but in "the mutualization of credit" with, say, Federal Reserve backing. Meanwhile, said he, we should put an end to the fantastic practice of lending to such enterprises as theaters, theaters, poolsrooms (and even snake farms) on the theory that such loans are somehow in the public interest. Small business loans are genuinely necessary from the standpoint of the public interest, he went on, but they might be guaranteed by the Federal Reserve.

Mr. Hoover succeeded in showing, taking his testimony as a whole, that so long as there are institutions of the kind with public funds to lend and no legitimate function to perform it will not only rush away from the Congressmen that sooner or later it will succeed in creating new vacuums, which it will then proceed to fill.

Testimony of Senator Harry F. Byrd on S. 1780 Before Banking and Currency Committee Providing for Liquidation of RFC

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

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

PARADISE, CALIF.

Dear Harry: I have your letter and your bill—which I approve. I am, of course, shocked at the exposures Senator Patman’s committee has brought to light. It is clear that he has more than scratched the surface. If we cannot have integrity in our Government why sacrifice our boys in Korea and our billions in defense of our country? To me it is beyond understanding, how good men can countenance the things that are going on and 1, of course, know we have many fine men in the Congress, but they should stop the graft or acknowledge that right is not with fighting for.

Your friend,

Jesse Jones.

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

"The people who are called upon to make sacrifices are not made happy by the disclosure of disloyalty of an employee of the Atomic Energy Commission. The shocking disclosures before the Senate committee investigating the Reconstruction Finance Corporation show that there is no legitimate excuse for the existence of the organization. Why should your Government lend public funds to manufacture automobiles and fabricated houses or to build tourist hotels in Florida?"

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

"In March 1945 I expressed this view to President Roosevelt. In his administration the RFC had been wisely administered by Jesse Jones. But President and I both realized the danger. He said it had served its purpose and when peace was restored it should be liquidated. He advised us to liquidate it.

"Because of the war situation, it may be necessary to make loans to a few manufacturers producing weapons of war. But these may be made by Charles E. Wilson, Defense Secretary, who has the original idea for such use, and not by the people. The Congress should promptly enact legislation to liquidate the Reconstruction Finance Corporation once and for all."

So, we have here the testimony of President Hoover, who established the RFC, Mr. Jesse Jones, who administered it for many years, and Governor Byrnes, who has had as close a connection with the Federal
Government as any man living over a long period of years, and his direct quotation from President Roosevelt that it was his intention to liquidate the RFC.

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

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

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

The bill provides that all funds of the RFC should go to pay on the public debt. We must remember that every dollar the RFC has borrowed adds to the public debt; the Federal Treasury. It has added to the public debt.

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

At this time I will not discuss the question of whether the RFC has made any loans or not to business enterprises or to communities, banks or industries. It has made loans at 5 percent and 4 percent previous to November. With that margin it continues to loan, but the extent to which it may extend its activities indefinitely shall be determined before the RFC is liquidated. There is an old saying in the Blue Ridge Mountains of Virginia, "That you cannot measure a snake until it is dead." This applies to the RFC. We cannot take an appraisal made by its own officials as a basis of its financial standing. If these appraisals have been made in the same manner in which some of the loans have been made, they might be reclassified under new categories, as follows:

1. The old line lending programs which are currently inactive, such as loans to financial institutions including banks and insurance companies, for the purpose of providing financial resources to business, industrial, and other subdivisions and public bodies to finance public projects, and purchase of securities are currently inactive, such as loans to business enterprises and the purchases of their obligations, and loans to meet catastrophes in the form of grants.

2. The old line lending programs which are currently inactive, such as loans to financial institutions including banks and insurance companies, for the purpose of providing financial resources to business, industrial, and other subdivisions and public bodies to finance public projects, and purchase of securities are currently inactive, such as loans to business enterprises and the purchases of their obligations, and loans to meet catastrophes in the form of grants.

3. The servicing of the new defense production loans, under the Defense Production Act of 1941, and the defense mobilization loan made to the President's emergency fund by the Corporation, together with the other agencies engaged in the production of munitions, and civilian defense loans as authorized by the Executive Order of January 31 this year totaling more than $358,490,444.

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

Briefly, Senate bill 1370, sponsored by Senators Robinson, Reucker, Kem, Wingo, and others, would continue RFC activities in the first two categories, and provide for the continuation elsewhere of the activities listed in the second categories.

OLD LINE RFC LENDING ACTIVITIES

The sponsors of this bill take the position that the old line lending activities of the RFC are defensible from a standpoint of the public interest. The RFC constitutes an investment in the future, particularly in the nation's defense, under present conditions, and the requirements of the foreseeable future, are non-necessitous, and constitute a temptation for abuse. And under provisions of the bill these activities and programs of the RFC are to be continued indefinitely.

The RFC has been utilized largely for the servicing of defense production loans and without standards fixed whereby they can be measured, it is nearly inevitable over a period of time that political favoritism, if not corruption, will creep into these agencies. The RFC has no standard except the discretion of its officials. It has been too costly to abolish RFC, as represented by the chairman of the RFC Board, in a letter to the Senate Banking and Currency Committee on April 1, and by a letter from the Defense Mobilization Director to the Senate Committee on Expenditures in Executive Department April 19. It would interfere with the defense loan program and disrupt the operations of defense plants now under the supervision of RFC. Senate bill 1370 spells out in specific terms the precautions to be taken to preclude delay or disruption of any kind.

LONG TERM AND DISASTER LOANS

Another argument for continuance of RFC is that it would provide long-term loans for small businesses which have already been turned down by RFC and other private-lending institutions, and to provide loans in cases of disaster. This contention is not borne out by the facts. Figures contained in a table submitted to the Senate Committee on Expenditures in Executive Department March 26, 1941, along with a letter by the chairman of the RFC Board. These figures show that business loans of over $100,000 outstanding as of January 31 this year totaled more than $138,800,000 as compared with outstanding loans of $100,000 or less which, as of the same date, totaled $174,690,000. In 1940 RFC made 4,904 business loans of less than $100,000, and of these approximately 3,000 were for less than $25,000. In connection with RFC loans such as these 3,000 the Hoover Commission task force found:

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

Catastrophe Loans

Ample funds short-of-war catastrophes are provided through the Farm Home Administration officials. This includes the emergency act of the Housing and Home Finance Agency and the President's emergency fund.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

In an effort, as far as possible, to be sure that the details of the defense production program a ramified operation as the RFC have been taken care of in Senate bill 1376, the Senate Banking and Currency Committee has prepared answers, representing their best judgment, to a series of questions which either have been, or might be raised. These questions and answers may be summarized as follows:

1. Question. What would be the effect of the bill on old-line loans (exclusive of Defense Production Act loans) of the RFC prior to dissolution upon which there are still disbursements to be made?
Answer. Under the terms of the pending bill it clearly would be the duty of the Secretary of the Treasury as liquidator to provide for disbursements legally obligated by the Corporation through the bill.

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

Answer. The servicing of loans in existence prior to enactment would become the duty of the Secretary of the Treasury as liquidator. Actually, in most instances, servicing is provided in loan contracts and therefore constitute legal obligation on the part of both parties to the loan. The liquidator will therefore perform such work as will be determined administratively by the Secretary of the Treasury as the liquidator. This would be a new or an insurmountable task for the Secretary of the Treasury who has previously used the Bureau of Accounts to liquidate the residual affairs of war agencies. Whereas, RFC now has 33 regional offices, the Bureau of Accounts has 20 similar offices throughout the United States and Territories.

3. Question. What would be the effect upon participation agreements with banks where the liquidation is complete? The amount of the loan has not been disbursed or the bank has not exercised its option to have the loan in default?

Answer. The effect is to be identical to the question No. 1. Agreements to participate where the RFC would constitute legal obligation which must be met in all respects.

4. Question. How would this bill affect the new laws originally made prior to enactment?

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

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

Answer. The pending bill provides for an uninterrupted continuance of the defense production loan program. The RFC is currently performing certain functions with respect to this program. The authority of section 10 of Executive Order 10161, under which the President vested in the RFC functions conferred upon him by section 302 of the Defense Production Act.

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

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

Answer. The pending bill would permit RFC to continue to administer the loans of this act but as of July 11, 1951, there are no loans outstanding. Thereupon or before, it is indicated if disruption is precipitated, the program would be transferred to the Secretary of Defense, the Federal Reserve Banks, or any existing department, agency, official or corporation of the Government who would administer it in accordance with the Civil Defense Act.

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

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

8. Question. Are there funds available to the President for use in emergencies affecting the national interest or security without regard to provisions of law regulating expenditures of Government funds and to supplement efforts of State and local governments or other agencies in alleviating hardship or suffering caused by flood, fire, hurricane, earthquake, or other catastrophe.

The President through the Farmers Home Administration, may make emergency loans for damage to agricultural crops and livestock.

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

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

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

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

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

11. Question. What would be the effect of the other Government agencies make or authorize the making of loans similar to the old-line loans now made by RFC?

Answer. There are a number of other Federal departments and agencies which can make loans similar to those now being made by RFC, although none of them has quite the reputation in the field of business analysis. The latter is being done by the Senate legislative drafting counsel and it represents the combined judgment of practically all of the lawyers on the counsel research staff. In addition they have checked out many of the details with the Bureau of the Budget, the General Accounting Office, and the RFC itself.

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

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

Answer. The pending bill would permit the bill to continue to be applicable. Beginning administrative expenses incident to the liquidation would be paid from the proceeds of the Corporation's loan control fund, and the proceeds of the Corporation's loan control fund would not be needed.

PERFECTED BILL

It is obvious from this analysis that Senate bill No. 153 will be able to produce no substantial novelty or detail, and be drafted with extreme care. It has been introduced to substitute for Senate bill No. 1114, introduced at an earlier date.

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

Unqualified support for the objectives of this bill has been given, among others, by the Honorable Herbert Hoover, former President of the United States, and the Honorable Jesse Jones, former Secretary of Commerce and present Chairman of the RFC.

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

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

USE OF RFC TO AVOID THE APPROPRIATION PROCEDURE

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

"It is characteristic of such loose financing methods that they lend themselves to abuse and greatly increase the Government's exposure to unnecessary costs and losses."
hope that its existence may mitigate the effects of a future crisis, the date, the nature. RCF cannot obtain the services of first-rate personnel at normal times.

"Outstanding executives who would be willing to service during emergencies would not be available to the government in forms and by the operating practices developed under nonemergency circumstances by less able, or with less extensive business experience.

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

"The contention that RCF breaks even on profits is based upon the $532,000,000 net profit reported by the Corporation through June 30, 1947, and there may therefore be a fallacy in the related contention that the continued existence of RCF will cost the Government very little.

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

"It should not be presumed that the Corporation's present operations can be continued with the Government.

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

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

Some of the difficulties which beset the Commission in discharging the function of the Executive Branch of the Federal Government in arriving at a recommendation with respect to this question are indicated in the unpublished individual views by Commissioners Dean Acheson, James E. Pollock, and James H. Rowe, Jr., who, among other statements, says: "In no other field of public activity is there any question whatever in the material submitted to us to justify the blustering attack on the Commission that direct lending by the Federal Government * * * opens up dangerous possibilities of waste and favoritism to individuals or private enterprises."

A NONESSENTIAL CORPORATION

Without going into the recent disclosures by the Senate Banking and Currency Subcommittee under the chairmanship of Senators Fulbright, Mease, Acheson, Pollock, and Forrest, the Senate has refused to make a nonessential, inflationary agency indulging in activities detrimental to the public interest.

While the Commission has been emphasizing the restriction of private credit to curb inflation, the primary purpose of RFC is to make easy money available.

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

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

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

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

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

5. It is estimated that RFC loans and investments in the current year will total $629,000,000 and in the coming fiscal year 1952 they would increase to $941,000,000. Its total assets in the current year are estimated at $869,000,000 while next year the estimate is more than $1,000,000,000.

6. Its interest-bearing obligations to the Treasury for the current year are estimated at $861,000,000 and for next year the estimate is $441,000,000.

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

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

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, Senate bill 1376 protects and preserves all requirements for defense production that have been created by the Senate this date.

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

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

LOANING ACTIVITIES BY FEDERAL CREDIT AGENCIES

Authorized to make loans

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

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

(b) Production credit corporations and associations (12 corporations and 550 associations) to provide short-term credit for farmers for farm and farm facilities. (One hundred and seventeen associations have paid off all Government capital.)

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

3. Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation: To insured banks to facilitate bank mergers or consolidations and to reduce risks or avert threats of loss to the public.

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

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

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

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

8. Housing and Home Finance Agency: To local public bodies for slum clearance and planning; to public or nonprofit private institutions of higher learning for housing and for和技术

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

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

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

12. Federal Reserve banks: Directly or in connection with a number of other associations for working capital, and for not exceeding 90 days on promissory notes secured by direct obligations by the United States, and in unusual and exigent circumstances by discount notes, drafts, and bills for individuals, partnerships, or corporations.

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


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

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

17. Other: Including Indian and reclamation loans.

In a special Federal credit analysis the budget document for the fiscal year 1952 states "Federal credit programs, in the main, are designed to supplement or reinforce private financing", and that, "Most lending agen-
MR. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the hour of 12:30 o'clock today, namely, on the calendar day of May 1, debate upon any amendment to the pending bill be limited to not exceeding 40 minutes, including appeals, which may be pending or which may theretofore be proposed to the said bill (S. 984) to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 shall be limited to not exceeding 40 minutes, to be equally divided, and controlled, in the committee of individual amendments, by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. ELLENER] and by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], respectively, and, in the case of individual amendments or motions, by the mover of any such amendment or motion and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], respectively, provided, first, that in the event the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and also by the majority leader in favor of any such individual amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be limited by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] or some other Senator designated by him; and second, that after Monday, April 30, 1951, no amendment submitted by a Senator— that is, any amendment that may not already have been submitted—intended to be subsequently proposed by him and ordered to lie on the table which is germane to the subject matter of the said bill shall be received.

Ordered further, That debate on the question of the final passage of the said bill shall be limited to not exceeding 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] or some other Senator designated by him, respectively; provided, however, that during the consideration of any individual amendment or motion either of said Senators may yield to the mover of any such amendment or motion, or to a Senator who is opposed thereto, any portion of such time of 1 hour allotted to him under this paragraph as he may desire.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? MR. WHERRY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may I inquire of the distinguished majority leader whether he has read the identical agreement between the Senators from Nebraska [Mr. McFARLAND] that is, any amendment that may not be accepted thereto, any portion of such time of 1 hour allotted to him under this paragraph as he may desire.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? MR. WHERRY. It is the identical agreement. MR. WHERRY. It is the identical agreement. MR. WHERRY. It is the identical agreement. MR. WHERRY. It is the identical agreement. MR. WHERRY. The reason why I ask the question of the distinguished majority leader is that I must provide some time for the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse] which was requested by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. McFARLAND]. That is all provided for in the proposed unanimous-consent agreement.

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

MR. McFARLAND. Yes.

MR. WHERRY. It is a long unanimous-consent agreement. However, if the majority leader assures me that such time is provided, I will have no objection. MR. McFARLAND. The Parliamentarian drew up the unanimous-consent agreement.

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

MR. McFARLAND. Yes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

MR. McFARLAND. The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

MR. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, on April 23, 1950, the Secretary of the Air Force, on the assumption that this property would not be needed in the foreseeable future, negotiated a lease for this property with the National Terminals Corp., of Cleveland, Ohio, for an annual rental of $25,000 per year, or $2,083 a month. The officers signing the lease for the National Terminals Corp. were Mrs. A. B. Ehrman, president, and Mr. L. A. Kraus, secretary.
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On May 16, 1950, 3 weeks later, National Terminals Corp. executed a standard storage contract with the Commodit-ity Credit Corporation—another Government agency—for the use of this same property, upon which they collected an average of $12,000 per month. As I said before, they leased it for $2,083 a month, just 3 weeks before.

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

The Commerce Credit Corporation, during the 5 months in which it rented the property, paid to the National Terminals Corp. $58,601.68, or an average of about $12,000 per month. This represented a profit to National Terminals of nearly 600 percent, without any investment whatever.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

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

S. 900. An act for the relief of Lloyd F. Stewart.
S. 464. An act for the relief of Willard Cheek and Louise Cheek.
S. 568. An act for the relief of George W. Purdy.
S. 613. An act for the relief of Ernestine Bacon Jacoby.
S. 768. An act conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims of the United States to hear and render judgment on the claims of G. T. Elliott, Inc., and M. F. Quinl.
S. 803. An act to authorize the sale of pole, wire, and rural delivery maps, opinions of the Solicitor, and transcripts of hearings before trial examiners, at rates to be determined by the Postmaster General; and
S. 991. An act to facilitate the financing of the defense contracts by banks and other financing institutions, to amend the Assign­ment of Claims Act of 1940, and for other purposes.

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

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

It is time for us to be reminded in particular for the stand against communism it has expressed in a series of public-service advertisements. I read from one of its weekly broadcasts:

Think what you would lose if communism wins. You won't be able to insure your family's future. You won't be able to pray in your home. You won't be able to argue your brand of politics. You won't be able to work where and how you want to. You won't live as a free man.

Elsewhere it is stated:

Listen for the death knell that promises new freedom become promote slavery.

Freedom is never lost by a single act. It is stolen by innocent-sounding words that breed down by insinuation.

Communism thrives on sugar-coated promises with pink centers.

Our country is not free, only if we listen for the lies, the half-truths, and expose them.

Mr. President, that indicates the high standard of public service we may expect from the televised American Forum of the Air and Mr. Granik, under his new sponsor. Mr. Granik's program is well known to Members of the Senate from their participation on it. Last Sunday his program rendered a service which is worthy of recognition by Congress.

I feel, therefore, that the Senate should order the printing in the Record of the proceedings of the American Forum of the Air for Sunday, April 29, 1951. The title of the discussion is "The Task Ahead for the Crime Committee." Four of the distinguished representatives of that committee were on the televised program at that time.

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

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

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

THE TASK AHEAD FOR THE CRIME COMMITTEE

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

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

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

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

Moderator GRANIK. Senator WILEY, Senator HUNT, Senator TOBEY.

Senator WILEY. Senator HUNT, Senator TOBEY. Senator WILEY.

Senator WILEY. Senator HUNT.

Senator TOBEY.

Senator TOBEY. Senator HUNT. Senator WILEY.

Senator WILEY. Senator TOBEY.

Senator HUNT. Senator WILEY. Senator TOBEY.
est praise from his country. And I pay him that tribute sincerely.

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

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

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

I think I should mention also that in Rudolph Halley and his associates we have had very excellent teamwork on our staff. I do think there is still much to be accomplished.

I agree with Senator Wiley that the first thing to do row is to try to press for legislation to stop any one of interstate commerce in the furtherance of organized crime; to try to break it up, reduce it to a level, local level, so that local people can deal with it.

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

Senator KEFAUVER. Yes.

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

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

Senator TOBEY. No, I do not.

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

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

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

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

Senator TOBEY. Why do you not try to get away from the charge of collusion to begin with? Why is it the committee found corruption among so many law enforcement officials, particularly among sheriffs and policemen?

Senator HUNT. Why is it? Because the human spirit is despicable and wicked in all things in its normal state. Men have been guilty of avarice for filthy lucre, and they have sold their souls across this country, whiskey, gin, etc., where gangsters are involved. Senator TOBEY. That is, let the Federal Government do it. And I make the point now, as this goes over the air and television, to everyone who wants to see this country remain American in its morality, in its political system and economic system: each one in his community must do what has been said here: exercise his franchise and see to it that good men go into office—good, moral men, as well as men with intelligence.

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

Senator HUNT, would you care to comment on that?

Senator HUNT. That is getting to be a very serious situation. It is a known fact that in New York they own the controlling stock in one bank. It is a known fact they are getting into utilities all over the country. It is a known fact they are buying into organized crime and into utilities and into legitimate business, they are in the hotel business, and when they get themselves thoroughly situated and in control of legitimate business, they are going to operate it in the same way that they operated in the underworld, to make a lot of money in that legitimate business.

Moderator GRANIK. Senator KEFAUVER, do you have any comment on that?

Senator KEFAUVER. Of course, organized crime is a fact, and Senator TOBEY says, cannot operate without a multiple or a one kind or another. It may be in the ability to influence votes, but there must be corruption.

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

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

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

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

Senator WILEY, Mr. Chairman.

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

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

And ancillary to finding the facts, of course, on which to recommend legislation to the Congress, probably another objective is, as has been said so dramatically here by my associates, to arouse the people to the fact that it is their job, not the Congress's job. We can pass a thousand pieces of legislation, but unless there is a rebirth in the minds of the people as we have for the calendar year. And paid out for the calendar year.

Have we been holding hearings for the calendar year? That is, let the Federal Government do it. And I make the point now, as this goes over the air and television, to everyone who wants to see this country remain American in its morality, in its political system and economic system: each one in his community must do what has been said here: exercise his franchise and see to it that good men go into office—good, moral men, as well as men with intelligence.

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

Senator TOBEY. I would like to see the recommendations we are going to make.

Moderator GRANIK. It would be wonderful if you would.

Senator TOBEY. Or would you rather we talk about it except in general terms.

Senator KEFAUVER. I don't think we ought to talk about it except in general terms. Senator TOBEY. I see. And I think they are going to take action on that sort of trouble. We have found a third type as to lawyers and as to some few CPAs, who have their own part of the enterprises right along with the criminals and gangsters and racketeers. The evidence is known, the bar associations know they ought to take action and they are going to do something about it. That is one of the particular things that Judge Patterson's Committee of the American Bar Association is looking into.

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

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

Moderator GRANIK. How about that, Senator TOBEY?

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

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

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

Senator TORY. In a moment we will take questions from the audience.

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

Senator KEFAUVER. Senator TOBEY, you want to comment on that?

Senator TOBEY. I see one of our distinguished newspapermen, Mr. Smith.

Senator CHARLES E. FAUVER. Senator Mitchum is going to report on that. Senator Hunt.

Senator HUNT. I think the responsibility for the local men behind the bars and what action do we have to take on horse races in the States?

Senator TOBEY. I might say that I, too, have thought of the question the gentleman just asked. In the States there are five members on the committee. We have covered 12 or 13 of the 48 States. I don't see how we could have done a better job or more complete job in that time. We are not through yet—there are 4 months to come, and if I have my way we are going to go to New England, which would embrace New Hampshire, as part of the New England States. And it is needed up there in the New England States very, very strongly.


Senator KEFAUVER. Senator Hunt. I'm going to make a comment about his political future. Senator Wiley. That's no crime.
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COMMITTEE WORK REQUIRED MUCH OFFICE STAFF Aid

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

I Trust Suggested Bills Will Be Enacted

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

My Own Comments on Commission
Complied Only Dissent

I do want to say a further word, be-
cause the only dissent from the entire
195 pages of the report comes in
connection with my opposition to one
of the committee's recommendations,
namely, for the establishment of a Fed-
eral Crime Commission.

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

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

Why I Introduced Wile-Yohey Resolution

I am glad that the committee will be carrying on. As I have previously stated in the Senate, thousands of appeals came to me for the committee's extension and such extension. I have in my hand at that time, in the form of a petition, the annual meeting of the International Christian Leadership held in Washington on March 31:

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

WHEREAS the Kefauver crime committee has unearnt conditions not hitherto known to most citizens;

WHEREAS, as a result of these disclosures, there has been a rekindling of civic and Christian interest in the nation; and

WHEREAS, by reason of the shortness of time, the Kefauver committee has been able to do only a part of that which only 1es should be done; and will not be able appreciably to add to its accomplishments in the 90-day extension voted by the Senate on March 30; and

WHEREAS a congressional investigation is the surest instrument for the information and education of the American people; now, therefore, be it

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

Edward M. C. CABANIS.

President.

ARMAB LAVERDE.

Executive Director.

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


Vice president and chairman, executive committee: Senator A. Willard Robertson.

Chairman ICCL: Senator Ralph E. Flanders.

Chairman national advisory committee: Nathaniel Leverone.

Vice presidents: Donald C. Stone; Nathan Bushnell; J. R.; O. Harold Polk.

Secretary: Hon. Cloyd Doyle, Member of Congress.

Treasurer: James G. Gore.

Attorney: Robert B. M. Hong.

Executive director: Abraham Yerexle.

Associate executive director: Robert B. Dugan.

Members of the board: Edward W. Allen; Edward Cabaniss; Howard Cooley; James D. Cunningham; Hon. Paul Cunningham, Member of Congress; B. Dagus; Member of Congress; Hon. Clyde Doyle, Member of Congress; Dr. John Evans; Vicc Adm. Hays, Member of Congress; Hon. C. S. Herndon, Member of Congress; Maj. Gen. Cari R. Gray; Dr. Ernest S. Griffith; Henry Gund; Hon. Brooks Hays, Member of Congress; Hon. E. M. Johnson, Member of Congress; John P. Hild; Roy C. Ingersoll; Mrs. Aymar Johnson; Chief Judge Marvin Jones; Hon. Walter H. Judd, Member of Congress; Senator Robert S. Kerr; Jesse Loeb; Paul Matthews; Arthur J. Morris; Hon. Norris Poulson, Member of Congress; Hon. H. J. Prow, Member of Congress; George H. Roberts; William M. Scott; Hon. Katharine S. George, Member of Congress; Harvey Swenson; Dr. J. B. Thompson; Thor Tofte, Chairman of Congress; Edward B. Wilber; Senator Alexander Wiley; Leonard C. Worthington; Edmond F. Wright; R. R. Zimmerman.

Field representatives: Dr. Harry E. Burke; George Everfield; Yvone Gardner, Dr. J. Edwin Orr, John W. Young.

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

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

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

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

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

Another feature of the report, as will be found, is its reference to the ease with which the gangster interests have evaded the rules which circumscribe you and me and all other citizens in respect to the payment of income taxes to the Federal Government. In that connection, of course, there are definite rules requiring the disclosure of income and the deduction for "miscellaneous" from their income from gambling speculations, whereas you and I have to set down the individual items of exemption, and they have to be blanketed in and definitely listed before such deductions can be made from gross revenue before income taxes are computed. The average citizen is very definitely bound by those rules. However, the gangster interests have done the opposite. You can be made from gross revenue before income taxes are computed. The average citizen is very definitely bound by those rules. However, the gangster interests have done the opposite. You can be made from gross revenue before income taxes are computed.
So, Mr. President, in that connection we need regulations which have teeth in them. A measure incorporating such regulations in a time bill, or if the one we recommend is enacted into law, it will require the Bureau of Internal Revenue to assess all gangster interests for income taxes on the basis of their gross income without being able to make any deductions for expenses. If such a measure does not have a punch in it and is not a solar plexus blow, I do not know what is. If we adopt the program, it will be most beneficial. I shall have more to say about that matter later on.

Mr. President, today we have, as a result of this crime investigation work, an aroused public opinion the like of which I have never seen before. In my own little office I have receive 15,300 letters from persons in all walks of life—from Catholic priests, Jewish rabbis, Protestant ministers, businessmen, college professors, husbands and wives, college students, even young boys and girls, some of whom have in their humble way sent cash to the committee, with the request that it be used to continue the committee's work. All of them bespeak their genuine and earnest interest in having the work continued—at the request of an outraged America. That public interest is a wonderful thing; but if it is only a transient interest, it will be entirely in vain! However, Mr. President, I believe in my heart that we are on the eve of a great moral awakening in America. Time magazine has received 115,000 letters in that connection, and, as I have received 15,300 letters, and my colleagues have received other letters of a similar tenor. It is evident that a great moral awakening is occurring throughout the Nation.

Thomas Carlyle said, in an essay which he wrote years ago, "The American people is that people which think they can avert fate and postpone doomsday by an act of Providence." That is the blind faith of so many of the American public, Mr. President. A very different opinion is now focusing upon those who have prostituted their office for paltry gain; but in America we need something deeper than that. We need a revival in the spiritual qualities, a revival in the souls of men and women, all over the land. That is what will save America, and I believe it is coming. Whether one is a Catholic, a Protestant, a Jew, or a Gentile, let all of us examine ourselves and bring to focus on these matters the great spiritual teachings of the Master of men, so that our Americanism will be a land in which dwelleth righteousness, for all the people to come.

I say now, Mr. President, not only God bless America, but thank God for America. It has been a great privilege to sit on the committee. I indulge in no exaggeration when I say that the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], a noble Christian gentleman, has done fearlessly and on a nonpartisan basis, a wonderful job for the American people.

So, Mr. President, to each of my associates and to the very able staff of the committee, I pay tribute. I reverently thank God for the privilege of being a humble member of this committee as we have tried to face up to the task of the plain people of the United States. God bless America.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I should like to speak in connection with the filing of the third interim report of the Special Committee to Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce. First, I want to say that the knowledge with which we have been endowed by the remarks which have been made by my able colleagues, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOEY], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HURST], we feel that the facts presented in the interim report, largely present the picture of organized crime in interstate commerce across the Nation, as we are able to get it. I have always felt that the purpose, and the only purpose, of an investigating committee is to obtain facts for legislative purposes. Of course, as a byproduct, it has the purpose of arousing public interest, which, of course, is vitally important and necessary.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Throughout the year's activities on the part of the committee, while we have been dealing with a new job, and while our work has not been pleasant, we have had, in our committee of five, a splendid working organization. It has been free from partisan dispute. We have never had any differences on any policy matters, and I could not pay too high a tribute to the part each member.
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of the committee, aside from its chairman, has played. Each member of the committee—Senators O'Connor, Tower, How, and Win — has carried his share of the load and has done his work and done it well. Early in the life of the committee we determined that we were going to get the facts without regard to political or any other considerations. To the best of our ability, we have tried to do that and I think we have succeeded. This has not been a smear and it has not been a whitewash. We have tackled the rotten situations as they show up and have tried to report the facts. We have had more than 650 witnesses before us and have investigated dozens of situations which have not been presented in committee hearings. I think we have gone straight down the line in presenting the true picture. We have let the chips fall where they may.

Mr. President, it has not been pleasant to present the facts in connection with certain people, either in business or political life, whose names are mentioned in the report; but we have endeavored to present the facts fairly, and we have leaned forward in our effort to present the facts without smearing anyone. It is quite possible that in the report of 105 pages an improper adjective may have been used, or that someone may feel that he has been unfairly dealt with in the report. The committee desires to be entirely fair, and if it can be shown that mistakes have been made, the committee will be only too happy to endeavor to rectify them.

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

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

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

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

Mr. KEFAUVER. In a moment.

In that connection, Mr. President, the listing of 5,000 racketeers and criminals, which was recommended by our committee and upon which action was taken a few days ago by the Internal Revenue Bureau, will be of tremendous assistance.

Informally, I might say that we recommended that we should have discussed with the Bureau of Internal Revenue the formation of a special fraud squad which would give special attention to income-tax returns and cases against big-time racketeers so that the handling of cases against them can be expedited both in the investigation and their prosecution. That, I think, will be one of the most effective steps which can be taken to secure tax money for the United States, but also to see that those men are brought to justice as expeditiously as possible.

I yield to the Senator from Delaware.

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

Mr. KEFAUVER. I am glad the distinguished Senator asked that question.

The testimony we have taken will contain the names of a number of which the last one has not been printed. We found, as a matter of fact, that the Department has not taken full steps to go after racketeers. They explained that part of the difficulty has been the lack of sufficient staff; that they did not have full information about some criminals until more facts had been brought out; that some changes in the law were needed relative to the keeping of books and records, the violation of which, while now a misdemeanor, they feel should be made a felony. Yet, as the law now stands, they have not used it as they should.

In California and other places racketeers had connections with, and attempted to secure protection from, a few members of the Internal Revenue Bureau. Some of them were prosecuted in New York and in Boston some time back. Those whom we have ferreted out in California and New York have been brought before and indicted by a grand jury. I believe there has been a general lack of appreciation of the fact that a great deal has been done. There has been indifference in going after these people with sufficient vigor, but I am happy to say that the situation is very much better at this time, and the steps which are being taken are effective.

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

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Is it not a fact that some of these activities on the part of employees of the Bureau of Internal Revenue on Washington, D.C., are known to the Department officials in Washington, and they had concealed the evidence, sitting tight on the information until it was exposed, and that some of those employees were dismissed or reprimanded, and yet others were allowed to keep their jobs or their duties, nor were they prosecuted, until after the facts were made public?

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

In California certain people were being investigated by the intelligence unit of the Department at the time the committee was holding a hearing in California. Some of the facts had not been brought to light until after the facts which the committee recommended to the Internal Revenue criticized us for holding hearings before they had had an opportunity to complete their investigation by the intelligence unit. We felt that for one reason or another the investigation was taking too long and that it should have been finished. The fact was that about 5 or 6 months before that time the former head of the Intelligence Section in the area held a meeting and a new man had taken his place who had to be oriented. We felt that in the public interest the facts we had, some of which had been brought out by the California crime committee, should have been presented. That was when we had our executive hearing. Following that time, the Internal Revenue Bureau discharged or suspended some of the persons involved. Some of them have been indicted; some are still under investigation. When we were in California holding public hearings, and also in Washington, we brought the facts of the situation up to date. I think too much time was being taken in the investigation, and we were justified in bringing out certain facts which were brought to the attention of the top officials in a Midwestern office was merely transferred by the Department to another office at a comparable salary, instead of being dismissed or prosecuted. He was not removed from the payroll of the Bureau until after the facts were exposed and an indictment was brought against him. I am wondering if in his investigation he found who in the Treasury Department in Washington was sitting tight on the committee reports and not referring them to the Department. I want to know that in one specific instance one of the top officials in a Midwestern office was merely transferred by the Department to another office at a comparable salary, instead of being dismissed or prosecuted.
Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes. Is that quite true. It is pointed out definitely in the report that as the facts stand now, without further explanation of a great many matters contained in the hearings and summarized in the report, I would not vote for the confirmation of Mr. O'Dwyer if it were submitted to the Senate today.

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

Mr. KEFAUVER. That is the way I feel.

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

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

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

Mr. KEFAUVER. That is the way I feel.

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

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

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

Mr. KEFAUVER. That is the way I feel.

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

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

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

Mr. KEFAUVER. That is the way I feel.
Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a very brief observation?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. KEM. Certainly.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. George S. Robinson was our original associate counsel. He handled all the hearings in Chicago and conducted the office here for a considerable length of time. Due to his previous experience in the Annenberg wire service case he was of great value to our work. He has now returned to the San Francisco police force, and in accordance with our previous agreement, Harold G. Robinson, whom we obtained from the California Crime Commission, was head of the investigative staff of our committee. He is one of the best men in his line of business in the country. He brought the committee many years of experience with the FBI and the Truman committee. He is now serving as deputy to the attorney general of California.

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

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

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

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

Patrick Killey did outstanding work for our committee in Florida, New Orleans, Chicago, and elsewhere. His long years of experience and great energy were of tremendous benefit to the committee. He is now serving as deputy to the attorney general of Tennessee.

W. Edward Vining served as associate counsel in New York during the Judge Johnson investigation many years ago, has served ably as director of information and as a skilled investigator for our committee.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I wish to acknowledge with much appreciation the loyal and untiring efforts
of the permanent secretarial and clerical staff in the Washington office, consisting of Julia Arnold, Edie V. Hileman, John E. Hirtzen, Jr., Mary E. Longland, Herbert K. Connell, L. Carl Melton, Mary V. Mitchell, Paul A. Newland, and Lillian L. Sears. Mrs. Agnes Wolf and Mrs. Louise Bowie did extensive work in the research and preparation of the report.

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

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

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

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

As chairman of the committee, I acknowledge with much appreciation the great assistance of Judge Morris Shirey, Edward Leahy, of the Chicago Daily, and our other crime commission heads. I also wish to say to the Senator from Missouri [Mr. WILEY], who attended most of the hearings with us. He has worked very hard and with much ability on the report. His services and suggestions have been of great value to us.

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

I now yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I should like to say to the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. WISE], that there is no one in the committee more desirous of getting to the bottom of every small offense than myself. It was committed in the nighttime, never to have been discovered. If we had tried to get to every little detail in every small offense of criminals and public officials, we could have spent all our time and money and done no good. If you will read the committee's recommendation on page 88, I think you will find that it is as thorough as it is fair. The committee has given the first attention to the small matters which are of greatest importance to the individual citizen.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I should like to say to the Senator from Missouri [Mr. WISE], that there is no one in the committee more desirous of getting to the bottom of every small offense than myself. It was committed in the nighttime, never to have been discovered. If we had tried to get to every little detail in every small offense of criminals and public officials, we could have spent all our time and money and done no good. If you will read the committee's recommendation on page 88, I think you will find that it is as thorough as it is fair. The committee has given the first attention to the small matters which are of greatest importance to the individual citizen.

Mr. KEFAUVER. That was one of the most shocking crimes that I have ever known to be committed, and it is certainly deplorable. It was committed on May 27, 1947, and the statute of limitations ran in 3 years. Our committee got its start as a Senate committee, and it has had a long and difficult task. It has done its work with great thoroughness and has reported the facts as it found them. The committee has been working for a long time, and it has done a good job. The report of the committee is a valuable contribution to the study of organized crime.

Mr. KEFAUVER. That was one of the most shocking crimes that I have ever known to be committed, and it is certainly deplorable. It was committed on May 27, 1947, and the statute of limitations ran in 3 years. Our committee got its start as a Senate committee, and it has had a long and difficult task. It has done its work with great thoroughness and has reported the facts as it found them. The committee has been working for a long time, and it has done a good job. The report of the committee is a valuable contribution to the study of organized crime.

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

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

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

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

Mr. KEFAUVER. In that connection I think I should call the Senator's attention to the fact that after our hearing in New York Governor Dewey named a State crime commission to investigate the conditions in New York. Of course, our committee had already revealed a good many conditions. The splendid district attorney, Mr. Rosenthal, and Mr. Howard McDonnell, had made startling revelations. A citizens' committee headed by Spruille Braden, former Assistant Secretary of State, was appointed under the New York Legislature. The New York Legislature set aside $250,000 for the State crime commission, just to make an investigation in the State of New York. I think our total appropriation up to date has been $275,000. So necessarily we were only interested in the over-all picture. I believe that from the legislative viewpoint that is all we were justified in being interested in. We considered only the big over-all inter-state transactions. I am sure the Senator understands the reason for that.
Mr. KEM. The Senator is familiar with the fact that the hands of the FBI were originally tied in that investigation, and that at the outset the FBI were not permitted to make a full and complete investigation by the Attorney General; is he not?

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

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

Mr. KEFAUVER. Just one moment. So soon after, I think, that the FBI would be called in? My understanding is that when once they got in they had the full backing of the Department of Justice, and that they used more manpower and spent more money in that investigation than they have in any other investigation in the history of the FBI.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. KEFAUVER. I will have to say to the Senator that I do not remember all the details about the early part of the investigation. I cannot say about it on the floor of the Senate.

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

Mr. KEFAUVER. Well, of course, I will have to say that I do not know the Senate's position on whether the Senate would consider it proper for the Senate to make recommendations in that connection are not quite those. I believe there was some little delay in the calling in of the FBI pending a determination whether it was a matter over which they had jurisdiction.

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

Mr. KEFAUVER. Just one moment. So soon after, I think, that the FBI would be called in? My understanding is that when once they got in they had the full backing of the Department of Justice, and that they used more manpower and spent more money in that investigation than they have in any other investigation in the history of the FBI.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. KEFAUVER. I will have to say to the Senator that I do not remember all the details about the early part of the investigation. I cannot say about it on the floor of the Senate.

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

Mr. KEFAUVER. Well, of course, I will have to say that I do not know the Senate's position on whether the Senate would consider it proper for the Senate to make recommendations in that connection are not quite those. I believe there was some little delay in the calling in of the FBI pending a determination whether it was a matter over which they had jurisdiction.

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

Mr. KEFAUVER. Just one moment. So soon after, I think, that the FBI would be called in? My understanding is that when once they got in they had the full backing of the Department of Justice, and that they used more manpower and spent more money in that investigation than they have in any other investigation in the history of the FBI.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. KEFAUVER. I will have to say to the Senator that I do not remember all the details about the early part of the investigation. I cannot say about it on the floor of the Senate.

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

Mr. KEFAUVER. Well, of course, I will have to say that I do not know the Senate's position on whether the Senate would consider it proper for the Senate to make recommendations in that connection are not quite those. I believe there was some little delay in the calling in of the FBI pending a determination whether it was a matter over which they had jurisdiction.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Of course, this strikes directly at our free institutions, because a Member of Congress was involved in a primary election frauds. I would agree with the Senator that any recommendations they bring in for the prevention of that sort of thing would certainly be in the public interest, and I would be strongly in favor of them.

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

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

Mr. KEM. I do not wish to be in the position of being captious about the work the committee has done in Missouri, because I think it performed a very valuable public service. I attended some of the hearings and I think that the Senator from Missouri is quite correct. However, I think our committee would have been criticized if it had spent all its resources and efforts on that particular matter.

Mr. KEFAUVER. We thank the Senator from Tennessee for the good contributions to good citizenship in our State.

Mr. KEM. We thank the Senator from Tennessee for the good contributions to good citizenship in our State.

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

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

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

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. KEM. I should like to ask the Senator whether he has any ideas as to what steps we should be taking at this time, if we are going to put first things first, that there is nothing more important than to guarantee the integrity of the ballot and that the public officials who receive at an election the majority of the votes for which such candidates are permitted to take the office to which they have been elected?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes; I agree very fully with the Senator on that. I think the election laws ought to be tightened up, and certainly any case like this ought to be fully investigated. I doubt, however, whether that was exactly within the province or jurisdiction of this committee. Our job was to investigate transactions between the States. I do not know that that was a transaction between States, which was the kind of case that an investigating committee was charged with investigating.

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

Mr. KEM. I agree with the Senator that there is no interstate angle; but certainly there is a Federal angle, because a Member of Congress is being voted on in an election. If an honest election does not occur, certainly that is something in which the Congress should concern itself.
would investigate the type of crime the Senator from Missouri is discussing and would have special jurisdiction of it and would see that the cases are immediately brought before the grand jury.

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

Mr. President, I now yield the floor.

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

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

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

A few minutes ago the Senator from Tennessee referred to laxity in the Bureau of Internal Revenue in regard to collecting income taxes from gangsters. I am not of the opinion of the committee the Treasury Department or the Department of Justice was more or less aggressive in collecting income taxes from racketeers and rackets than it was in the case of collecting such taxes from the average citizen.

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

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

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

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

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Of course, the Senator from Tennessee knows, and already has stated, that it is now the law that every taxpayer must keep records available to the Internal Revenue. In the case of his income and his business expenses, I wonder whether the committee found that the Treasury Department is enforcing that law or is calling upon racketeers to keep books to the same extent that books are kept by the average American citizen. Certainly under existing laws the average citizen is expected to keep books. Several cases were brought; but I think one of them was thrown out of court, so the Bureau or the Department says it got discouraged. Those in charge of such matters say they wish to be able to prosecute such persons for the commission of a felony, rather than a misdemeanor—of course, a violation of the statute regarding the keeping of books for income-tax purposes is now a misdemeanor—and also that the language of the statute is not entirely satisfactory. However, I think those prosecutions could have been brought to a much greater extent than they have been. The committee was not at all satisfied in this respect.

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

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

I yield the floor.

SUPPLYING OF AGRICULTURAL WORKERS FROM MEXICO

The Senate resumed the consideration of H. R. 4686 (6, 944) to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949.

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

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

"Report on Migrant Labor"

"This report," said President Truman on April 7, "makes an impressive contribution..."
to a subject which should be of serious concern to all of us. It will be useful to Government officials and the general public alike."

Mr. MCCALLSTER. Mr. President, I hope we can proceed now with the consideration of the pending measure. Mr. MCINERNEY. Mr. President, I shall take a few moments on the pending bill. The chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has stated, as the overwhelming reason for speedy enactment of Senate bill 984, a need for legislation to validate and implement an agreement made between the Government of the United States and the Republic of Mexico in May, 1951.

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

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

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

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

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

In fact, Mr. President, I wish that all persons who are interested in the problem of agricultural labor, including a great many of the farmers themselves, could read the report. It is stated that American agriculture has not been established in this country by agreement with the neighboring government, and that the labor which we have supplied has been adequate.

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

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

If past experience can be trusted, the measure now before Congress will go to the bitter end against these and all the other reforms proposed by the Commission. It is not necessary that we adopt some such amendment as that proposed by my colleague, the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON]. That amendment, of which I am pleased to be one of the sponsors, will provide us with the machinery to accomplish the objective of the country, to bring about the adequate labor supply, such as the port of Portland, Oreg., with the understanding that the Government will transport the workers from whatever country they are being taken, as, for example, in this instance, Mexico, to the port of entry, and then the farmers will be able to work out with the Government at the point of entry a contract for the use of such workers, under acceptable terms and conditions, in the food-processing plants or in the orchards during the harvest season.

The President pro tempore. The question is on agreement to the first committee amendment, on page 1, line 9.
The information which I receive in my office from the growers and processors of my State is to the effect that, unless such a port of the Government made possible, unless the Government makes it possible to get
the workers to the port of entry, at Gov-
ment expense, it will then be a finan-
cial impossibility for them to hire the
workers and pay the transportation costs
from Mexico, for example, which, as is
suggested in certain quarters, they would
have to pay in order to obtain the foreign
laborers. They have had just a few weeks in
the orchards and in the processing plants of
the Pacific Northwest.

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

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

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

MR. MORSE. I yield.

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

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

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

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

I have gathered a number of letters and
extracts from letters from farmers
showing the need for deferment if farm-
ers are to be successful in meeting the
food requirements of the Department of
Agriculture.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous
consent to include extracts from these
letters in the Record. There being no objection, the extracts
from letters were ordered to be printed
in the Record, as follows:

MAHATTAN, KANS., APRIL 21, 1951.

Dear Mr. Curtis: In regard to your 7
o'clock broadcast, we are writing con-
cerning the draft of my boy. I am about 69
years old and have one boy here with me.
We are taking care of 497 acres of ground.
We have 150 acres of wheat, 125 acres to
go to corn, 20 acres of alfalfa, 22 acres of
oats, and 20 acres of a pasture in good shape.
It is impossible for me to handle all of this
land if they draft my boy. I have rheuma-
tosis in my shoulders and can hardly lift
my arms. We have farmed in partnership
for 3 or 4 years now. My boy has some ma-
chinery. We also have 40 head of cattle and
about 20 brood sows. It is impossible to hire
help, so this work will just not be done if
my boy is drafted. I for one believe that
farming and raising food is as important as
any occupation and should receive a little more
consideration.

Sincerely yours.

T. C.

MOXHORN, MO., APRIL 20, 1951.

Dear Sir: You have just finished your 7
o'clock broadcast and said to write you
about things on the farm. I will try and
tell you what it would mean to us to have
all the help taken away from the farm.
Now our son had not intended to go to col-
lege. He wanted to be a farmer. So as his
father is 60 years old, they intended to
work a plan whereby in a few years the son
by a sort of partnership deal, where the father
furnishes the work and the son the
labor, that the son can earn equipment to
farm this place and the father would retire.
And the son would get the kind of farm
that he needs to keep on the farm.
Now the old one can't just be thrown away.
It is important to that boy as a college
education is to some other boys, and would
it be fair to take him away from this and let
some boy go to college that would only be going
as a way out. That is not a fair order.
We farm 346 acres of good land, and the
greater part of that is pasture. We plant some
alfalfa and 30 acres of grain sorghum; 12
acres of beans, 240 acres of dairy
coy, 100; feeder pigs, 100 or more; chich-
ens, 500.

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

Yours truly.

R. C. CURTIS

MOLINE, KANS., APRIL 20, 1951.

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

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

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

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

Yours truly.

SALINA, KANS.

DEAR SIR: I thought I would write you a
few lines in regard to my boy that is sup-
posed to go to the Army soon.
I had three boys in World War II. There
is going to be a big demand for men's help
for defense plants, with the result that they
expect us farmers to increase our crops with less
help. And I'm sure not going to hire for-
ign help on the farm. A 20-year-old boy
cannot raise, harvest, and care for the crops
that these two older boys have been doing.
My older boys at present have 195 acres
under cultivation and are producing six cases
of eggs a week, 50 head of registered white
faces, and 10 sows that will farrow this
spring, and yet he's only waiting for the
word, and will have to sale a sale and go
as they tell him.

Yours respectfully.

CHANUTE, KANS., APRIL 20, 1951.

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

The 24-year-old boy at home was classified
I-A the first of the year, so he had no choice.
He was a very skilled dairy man and the
boy is also in the Reserves. No other choice
when the draft board classifies them I-A.
We have four boys to raise, two older boys
who do the work and the farm, the draft board
will not let him go, and the younger boys
who can hardly raise any food at all.

Yours respectfully.

W. H. FLETCHER

RILEY, KANS., APRIL 21, 1951.

MR. ELMER CURTIS.

DEAR MR. CURTIS: We are farming 366
acres of land and 200 under cultivation and
milking 18 cows, forty-five head of other
cattle. Only my son, his mother and myself on
the farm, and we are up for induction in
May. I will have to sell my milk cows and
some other stock, and cannot farm all of the
land. It will have to lay idle if he is taken.
He is serving his country much better on
the farm than in the Army. He is at home
where he was born all of the time.

Yours truly.

BELLOIT, KANS., APRIL 20, 1951.

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

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

We have 200 acres of wheat, 80 acres
of alfalfa and could put on 360 acres of corn,
but it was 800 acres and put up the hay, etc., so
we have no choice but to sprinkle some clover seed on the
300 acres labor, because.

Sincerely yours.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I ap-
preciate very much the courtesy of the
Senator from Oregon in yielding. The problem is a very serious one in my section of the country, the farmers there, and I am asking for deferment in order to avoid military service. The serious question is, can we afford to take these skilled farm boys off the farms at a time when increased production is necessary? We defer some persons in industry because they are in critical positions; and we must give some consideration to the deferment of farm boys who are needed in farm work.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I know of no one who has followed this point more closely than has the Senator from Oregon. The Senator is one who has taken an active part in the debate on the manpower problem. It is a question of using our men to the best advantage. I am entirely in accord with the stand of recruitment of college students, and I have expressed myself on that subject. I am opposed to any blanket deferment of any group.

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

We have the statement of the President's Commission that there is an adequate supply of United States citizens for farm work, if an effort is made to recruit them. We have the statement of the senior Senator from New Mexico that, as chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee considering Labor Department requests, he has found that the United States Employment Service has not even assembled the facts about the numbers and locations of workers in the United States available for farm labor, much less conditions and the recruiting and placement campaign.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

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

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

The ones who faced the music, the ones who would have made the supreme sacrifice, 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 imported labor. Thousands of children of veterans are not able to enjoy good health because veterans and their families are forced to work for starvation wages because of imported labor. Americans of Mexican origin in Texas must have opportunity to live like human beings and first-class citizens. Best way to do it is to stop all imported labor.

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

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

Third, let us examine the suggestion that we pass this with, without amendment, limited to Mexican labor alone and for the convenience of some large commercial farms along the Mexican border, and that we postpone until a later date action on the vastly greater and more important problem of an over-all defense emergency farm-labor program for United States citizens, including residents of Puerto Rico and Hawaii and British nationals from the British West Indies.

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

As a matter of practical reality, the suggestion that the major problem be handled later by the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee comes too late in this session.

That suggestion should have been made last January, before the United States-Mexican conference in Mexico City at which the agreement was worked out. It should have been made when the bill was introduced. The bill should have dealt with the whole problem. And the bill should have been referred, not to the Agriculture Committee, which, under the La Follette-Momory Reorganization Act has no conceivable claim to jurisdiction, but to the Labor and Public Welfare Committee which, under that act, has complete, sole and exclusive jurisdiction in the fields of labor and related immigration.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point, as a part of my remarks, the provisions of the Reorganization Act, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, which deal with the standing committees of the Senate, in respect to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, as contained on page 4 of the printed copy of the record of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, as contained on page 8 of the reprint of the act.

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

(a) Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to consist of thirteen Senators, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects:

1. Agriculture generally.
2. Inspection of livestock and meat products.
3. Animal industry and diseases of animals.
4. Adulteration of seeds, insect pests, and protection of birds and animals in forest reserves.
5. Agricultural colleges and experiment stations.
6. Forestry in general, and forest reserves other than those created from the public domain.
7. Agricultural economics and research.
8. Agricultural and industrial chemistry.
10. Entomology and plant quarantine.
11. Human nutrition and economics.
13. Agricultural educational extension services.
14. Extension of farm credit and farm security.
15. Rural electrification.
16. Agricultural production and marketing and stabilization of prices of agricultural products.
17. Crop insurance and soil conservation.

(*) Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, to consist of thirteen Senators, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects:

1. Measures relating to education, labor, or public welfare generally.
2. Mediation and arbitration of labor disputes.
3. Wages and hours of labor.
4. Convict labor and the entry of goods made by convicts into interstate commerce.
5. Regulation or prevention of importation of foreign laborers under contract.
6. Farm labor.
7. Labor statistics.
8. Labor standards.
9. School-lunch program.
10. Vocational rehabilitation.
11. Railroad labor and railroad retirement and unemployment, except revenue measures relating thereto.
13. Columbian Institution for the Deaf, Dumb, and Blind; Howard University; Freedmen's Hospital; and St. Elizabeth's Hospital.
15. Welfare of minors.
16. Vocational rehabilitation and education of veterans.
17. Veterans' hospitals, medical care and treatment of veterans.
18. Soldiers' and sailors' civil relief.
19. Readjustment of seamen to civil life.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, if the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare were to have jurisdiction over the matter, a representative of the committee should have been sitting in Mexico City at the time the agreement was drawn. We are faced, as is so frequently the case in the Congress, with an accomplished fact. We are being asked to put our finger on what labor already is. If the agreement contains some of the things which I believe it contains, although I have not been privileged to read it, I am sure that a consideration of the proposed provisions of the agreement by someone representing the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare at the time the Mexico City conference was held might well have brought about some changes in its language.

Now, seriously to propose that the major problem of farm labor during the defense emergency be postponed and handled in a separate bill to be referred to the Labor and Public Welfare Committee in the Senate and by the Labor and Education Committee in the other body would be a great mistake at this late date.

The majority leader was recently quoted in the press as announcing that he planned to do everything he could to bring about an adjournment by August 1. I am willing to take judicial notice of the fact that if now we should put aside consideration of the problem and should hold new hearings and have further discussion before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare of the Senate and the Committee on Labor and Education of the House, we would be doing well to get through with the hearings by August 1.

We are faced with a bill which we must do the best we can to amend on the floor of the Senate, so that it may meet some of the major objections, and then start planning for a long-term legislative program in connection with the whole problem of migratory labor, to be taken up in the next session of Congress. Because the farm-labor market of the country is disjoined I am willing to admit that there is need now for some legislation on the subject. I hope we can get the bill patched up on the floor of the Senate with appropriate amendments, so that it will at least be serviceable for the present harvest season.

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

Mr. MORSE. Yes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Everyone, I believe, is willing to admit that there is necessity for legislation. The case is of us who are opposed to the bill as reported to the Senate object only because we feel that, inasmuch as labor is needed, we should provide in the bill for the importation of labor from Mexico or elsewhere, only after an adequate investigation has been made as to whether American labor is available. I do not think it is an object of the Senate to consider an amendment which would provide for the protection of the American laborer, who is willing to suffer the fatigue of stoop work, to the same extent that protection would be given to a laborer who came from a foreign country. I do not think it is too much to ask of the Senate.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to be recorded at this point as being in agreement with the Senator from New Mexico in the comments he has made.

Mr. President, the plain legislative and political fact is that this bill is the only bill of this type that is likely to get to the floors of both Houses in this Congress. Unless it can be broadened to deal with the whole problem, to provide for the recruitment, transportation, housing, placement, and employment of United States citizens, including Puerto Ricans and Hawaiians and British nationals as well as Mexican nationals, the whole farm labor problem is going to be left untouched, except for the Mexican segment thereof. This is the only train that is going through. Unless it is strong enough to couple in cars for United States citizens and other nationals they are not going to be treated with the same consideration given Mexican nationals under the bill as it was referred to the Senate. The Republic of Mexico is going to provide more protection for its citizens than the Republic of the United States of America is going to provide for its citizens. Protection as we do provide will be given, because, in complying with the United States-Mexican agreement, we will have to pay some attention to the wages and conditions offered our own citizens.

Fourth, I want to raise a basic and fundamental issue that affects the rights, powers, and responsibilities of every standing Committee of the Senate. To my mind, it is a legislative scandal that, in the first place, the State Department and the Labor Department passed over the Labor Committees of both Houses and instead for their invite and include in the United States delegation to the Mexico City conference at which the agreement was agreed upon last January only representatives of the Agriculture Committees of both Houses. Second, in my opinion it is a mistake and an outright violation of the words and intent of the LaFollette-Monroe Act to have referred the bill to the Agriculture Committees of both Houses.

With what were the conference and the bill primarily concerned?

With farm labor, of course.

But with farm labor considered as human beings or as an article or commodity of commerce?

That, Mr. President, is the test. Considering if more than 500,000 farm workers are considered as a commodity, as human livestock, as work animals, to be imported, deported, housed and treated as animals, can the assignment of such a bill to an Agriculture committee be explained or defended?

Mr. President, were I to follow my inclination as a lawyer, as a Member of the Senate and as a member of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee, I would call for the defeat of this bill or its referral to the Labor and Public Welfare Committee on this ground alone. But in this case, and all other cases, I try to be practical. We are faced with somewhat of an emergency. We certainly are faced with a time emergency, as I have heretofore stated in these remarks. I do not believe that the time available in this session of the Congress will permit us, if we want to get the crops harvested, to follow the course of action of referring this bill to the Committee on Agriculture and for its consideration. Harvesting the crops is a matter of first importance.

As I have stated, I think there are areas where there is need for some labor from the outside to meet the shortage of domestic labor in order to do the crop processing, the fruit picking, and the harvesting. Therefore, even though I think it means condoning this breach of the LaFollette-Monroe Act, I propose that we work this bill into proper shape by adoption of the amendment proposed by the senior Senator from Minnesota (Mr. HUMPHREY), so that the bill as passed will deal with the entire problem of farm labor with fairness to workers and employers.

Mr. President, this morning my attention was called to a proposed amendment which was sent to the majority leader (Mr. McFARLAND) by the leaders of organized labor and by the leader of the Farmers Union, concerning the farm labor bill now under consideration. I
have been advised that these telegrams have already been considered to a certain extent in this debate. Nevertheless, I would like to have them incorporated in the Record, as part of my remarks, because I wish to make a few very brief comments on them. I ask unanimous consent to have them printed in the Record at this point, as a part of my remarks.

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

WASHINGTON, D. C., April 24, 1951.—The Railway Labor Executives' Association today appealed to the majority leader of the Senate, Senator Ernest McFarland, for assistance in opposition to the Ellender bill, S. 984, providing for the importation of Mexican workers to be employed on corporate farms in this country. Telegram of the Railway Labor Executives' Association to Senator McFarland follows:

"The bill as reported by the committee does not provide adequate safeguards to protect the interests of American labor, and is contrary to the findings and recommendations of the President's Commission on Migratory Labor, which was issued March 26, 1951.

"The report clearly indicates that the importation of foreign farm labor would be to depress still further wages and working conditions of American farm labor, a group which is worse off economically than any other in our country.

"The A. F. of L. firmly believes that the need for the importation of foreign labor is overwhelming and that there are approximately 150,000 agricultural workers in Puerto Rico unemployed, and there are 190,000 partially employed—working less than 30 hours per week. However, if there is a genuine need for agricultural labor, the present domestic and labor market should be fully utilized before importing foreign labor.

"We strongly urge that S. 984 in its present form be recommitted to committee with instructions to provide for the recruitment of American workers wherever they are available, to prevent the decent working conditions and adequate wages, before any attempt is made to bring in foreign farm labor."

WILLIAM B. FINN, "President, American Federation of Labor."

WASHINGTON, D. C., April 25, 1951.—In a telegram sent today to Senate Majority Leader ERNEST A. MCFARLAND, James G. Patton, president of the American Federation of Labor, urges the defeat of the Ellender bill (S. 984) providing for the importation of cheap foreign labor.

"The text of the telegram is as follows:"

"National Farmers Union believes S. 984 should be defeated. Bringing in cheap foreign labor without setting decent standards and without trying to recruit tremendous numbers of underemployed Mexican agricultural workers breaks faith with the American people and their ideals. This supply of cheap foreign labor threatens both the family farm and the hard-earned gains of American agriculture and the hard-earned gains of American labor. This bill violates President Truman's manpower policy declaration of January 17 giving full assurance that full use of domestic manpower resources will be made before bringing in foreign workers. It ignores careful findings of important committee report and was made by a group of outstanding men.

"The hostility which has been shown to this bill by responsible representatives. They have been quick to point out some of the defects in it and to show that they have repeatedly indicated that it will be impossible to harvest the large crops needed in this critical period of defense mobilization without the importation of farm labor. When it is suggested to them that they may not look toward the underutilized American workers they become angry and say there is no time for social revolution.

The moral issue here is quite clear. These migrant workers have been abused and ignored for many years now, and their conditions have gotten worse rather than better. Recent stories such as those in the New York Times have emphasized how shocking are the living and working conditions. The mobilization situation seems equally clear. At a time when the Nation is seeking to employ to the fullest capacity its total manpower resources, it is wasteful to ignore this potential pool. Yet the proponents of the Ellender bill propose to do just that.

The Report of the President's Commission on Migratory Labor, which I am enclosing, offers abundant evidence to document the miserable and abusive conditions of these people. It is practical and urgent. Practically every page offers illustrations from the field of what is happening in America in 1951. The New York Times has emphasized how shocking are the conditions of the people, and this report makes it equally clear.

It is understandable if these workers are unhappy. They have been shown the door. They have been abused, and they have abundant reason to be unhappy. They are entitled to full employment and working conditions.

"Chairman, Railway Labor Executives' Association."

WASHINGTON, D. C., April 26, 1951.—A. F. of L. President William Green today made the following wire opposing the Ellender bill (S. 984) providing the recruitment and importation of Mexican farm workers. This telegram has been sent to Senate Majority Leader McFarland:

"Senator ERNEST W. MCFARLAND, "Senate Office Building, "Washington, D. C."

"The American Federation of Labor offers its objections to the enactment of S. 984 to provide for the recruitment and importation of Mexican workers for agricultural labor in the United States, which is now pending before the Senate.

"The Federation is the strongest and most vigorous labor organization in this country and it is concerned with the fate of the American worker. The Federation does not believe that the American worker is better off under the provisions of this bill. The Federation believes that the American worker is better off without the provisions of this bill."
based upon a conviction that its advocates are not interested in such prior considerations.

If we can be of any further help to you, please do not hesitate to call on us. We shall greatly appreciate your interest in this matter.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT ENGLER.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, while I am inserting material in the Record, at this point, as a part of my remarks, I should like to have printed in the Record a letter which I have received from the president of the Oregon Farm Bureau Federation in regard to the problem which is involved in the pending legislation, including a copy of a letter which he addressed to my senior colleague (Mr. CORDON), with copies to the other members of the Oregon delegation, and my reply to his letter.

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

FEBRUARY 19, 1951.

Mr. Marshall Swearingen, President, Oregon Farm Bureau Federation, Salem, Oreg.

Dear Mr. Swearingen:

Thank you very much for your letter of February 13, enclosing a copy of a letter addressed to my senior colleague (Mr. CORDON), with copies to the other members of the Oregon delegation, and my reply to his letter.

I am, indeed, very much interested in having Portland made a point of entry in regard to any program for getting offshore labor. You may be sure that I shall carefully scrutinize any administrative or legislative proposals on this problem with that in mind.

With kind regards,

Sincerely yours,

WAYNE MORSE.

OREGON FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
Salem, Oreg., February 12, 1951.

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE.
The United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse:

A series of meetings recently held in Washington, D. C., with representatives of the various grower organizations and the Department of Agriculture, while of considerable importance has been undertaken with a workmanlike fashion, and we believe the steps on the general problem will lead to proper handling of the problem. None the less it appears that the Pacific Northwest, due to its geographical problems, has become a second cousin as compared to the over-all picture.

We refer to the great area of the South and to the East Coast, with the other States near or bordering on the Mexican boundary. These facts apparently seem to be quite satisfied that the program is going, and are not interested in any payment of transportation beyond the nearest point of entry.

As you know, the nearest port of entry for even the Portland area is some 800 miles from San Francisco, and therein lies our suggestion for a partial solving of the Northwest problem.

We believe that Portland should immediately be made a port of entry and would like to submit that nearly all of the area which would be served from that point including Washington, Oregon, and the Tulelake portion of California is within the 500-mile limit.

Probably the establishment of Portland as a port of entry would do more to give the Northwest a break than any other move we might make at this time, although other alternate proposals may be made.

We have talked this matter over with Mr. Snyder of the Blue Lake Cannery, some of the raisins of the Rogue Valley Traffic Association, and we are now contacting the Farm Bureaus of Washington, Idaho, and the labor users in northern California.

We would appreciate your interesting yourself in this matter if you have not already done so. We see no reason advising us what further steps we might take to urge the establishment of Portland as a port of entry.

Yours very truly,

MARSHALL SWARINGEN, President.

OREGON FARM BUREAU FEDERATION
February 12, 1951.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I also ask to have printed in the Record at this point as a part of my remarks another letter which I sent to my senior colleague, with copies to the other members of the Oregon delegation, from Robert K. Norris, of the labor committee of the Rogue Valley Traffic Association and Fruit Growers' League.

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

APRIL 28, 1951.

Senator GUY CORDON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Cordon:

Thank you for your letter of April 13, relative to the importation of foreign labor, together with copies of the Senate and House reports.

We have gone over both bills, and while in our opinion, some additional Federal funds should be appropriated, and might have to be appropriated in the future, to aid the farmer in carrying the very heavy added financial burden of importing foreign labor, we realize that because of other pressure, these bills are probably about the best that can be obtained at this time.

Medford growers, for example, have put a lot of money in the past years into their labor camp, but are digging up another $10,000 at this time to put the camp in shape for the coming season. Payment of going wages for the foreign labor is fixed and satisfactory, but the three quarter guaranteed working time clause plus board payment for non-work days, together with transportation costs to and from the border, as well as per man at the border will run our costs very high.

It is anticipated that the labor market will run out of foreign labor by the end of May.

We are perhaps more fortunate at Medford than most other districts in that barring the bad weather, we can give reasonable steady employment to these men for 2 months. Under the 4-month contract we plan to work with peas in eastern Oregon, which tie-in the 6 weeks ahead of Medford. If possible, we plan to work the Klamath potatoes on the tail end of the season. This combination should work fairly well and provide a minimum expense for loss of working time.

We do not expect to break even on the allowed $1.75 per day for board. Our total cost, including the use of the Federal bonded warehouse, transportation, loss of time, additional board cost, crop maintenance, $20 per man to the foreign laborer for transportation, will run to approximately $70,000 over and above normal wage payments. I hope the return for the fruit will warrant this expense.

The set-up in other districts of the State is more serious as indicated by a meeting in Salem last Monday of representatives from different parts of the State, where the reports are worst and the harvest labor situation. When the picketing of added costs above normal wages for this help was given to them, many of them shook their heads and left the meeting. They felt the added costs of qualifying to employ foreign workers would be prohibitive to their farmers.

A part of this would be caused by the required 4-month contract which does not lend itself too well to short peak use of foreign labor. Cherries, hops, beans, and other truck crops, all call for rather large numbers of workers, but only for a 2- or 3-week period. Foreign laborers overlap and all want them at the same time, with large gaps of unemployment between.

Loss of time and board payment runs up the costs per man in eastern Oregon. While the period ties in pretty well with Medford's 8 weeks. Loss of working time and board payments would not be too severe. Sugar beets also have reasonably long runs in the spring and fall, and can probably qualify.

But there will be such sizable gaps between cherries, the different truck crops, hops and late fruit in Hood River, and potatoes in Klamath County, that some are discouraged about the whole deal. They feel that with unemployment pay and board payments for loss of time between jobs, plus going wages and transportation for peak short time usage of foreign labor, the farmer cannot get out with a whole skin. Undoubtedly, most of these farmers will not sign up for foreign labor and will try to get by. As a result there will be a severe labor shortage, particularly in the Willamette Valley and probably in Hood River, and Klamath potatoes. A part of the crop will not be harvested. Looking ahead in 1951, when more men may be under employed in war industry, unless some help is given these farmers in the way of shorter contract periods, or part payments and transportation of foreign labor, you would do as the farmers will do, simply not plant as much acreage and in many cases move to employment in war industry.

If foodstuffs are needed in the future and labor does not become more available, Federal assistance over and above mere recruitment at the growers' expense at the border will have to be given. We still feel that emergency funds are used to transport labor across country to shipyards and other centers of industry and to subsidize industry in the case of re-tooling and manufactured of needed goods. Certainly food is also a necessary part of the program and it is the hope we must be given the farmers of the Northwest to help in covering some of their unusual expenses or products as the labor market continues to tighten. The Northwest, we believe, is a bit different from many other sections of the country in that most of these high producing and specialized crop districts lie many miles to hundred's of miles from large centers of population. Farmers are not so dependent upon migratory labor, which supply dries up in times of heavy employment in industry.

Therefore an anticipated shortage of migratory labor will be with us for the next
In a report Sunday, President Truman's migratory labor commission said there are about 1,000,000 Mexican workers in this country, half of them from Mexico. Some 80 percent of the Mexican workers, it said, crossed illegally. Other than foreign workers were brought into agricultural areas to meet local labor shortages.

In five-man commission, named by Mr. Truman just last June 3, said foreign workers depressed the compensation of Americans and brought on serious health situations. It noted that some foreign workers also took nonfarm jobs, lowering the average pay.

In connection with this, one source in the Northern States, as the real troubles we run into is the unemployment pay and pension question and we are endeavoring to overcome this. It is the going to be early yet, with a big crop is coming up this year and our chief difficulty will be to get it off the fields. We work certainly welcome as to how to get people to work when they do not want to.

Illinois Viewpoint

In Illinois, the first meeting of the State placement advisory committee was held in January, together with members of the State Employment Service and the Illinois Industrial office. Responsible representatives of general farming felt that if a solution were not found there would be a great increase in farm production by 1952. Out of that meeting came the agreement that a method should be devised for deferring key men in agricultural positions to the draft service to some reasonable extent. It was also felt that as more farm workers are taken for military service, farmers will take advantage of intimate acquaintance of long standing with their county agents, might like feel that such agents could better handle the job of farm labor recruitment than the employment service. If this were the case, there might be developing pressure to remove agricultural labor procurement from the Employment Service once more and return it to agriculture.

Hawaii Possibilities

As far as Hawaii is concerned, there appears to be no anticipated shortage of harvest labor in 1951 and, according to published figures, labor shortage is already largely solved, there were some 17,000 unemployed persons of whom 6,000 are Filipinos agricultural workers (80 percent of the alien labor force which has the closest interest and it seems there is a possibility that recruitment of labor in Hawaii for the mainland may be undertaken under official auspices. The situation there has started there with the determination of that possibility as one of its goals. Here, too, such pressure and Welfare Department has been carried on has been unsatisfactorily in reported cases.

Send aliens from Hawaii to the mainland, many obstacles must be overcome and
MEXICAN PROBLEM

Despite the efforts of most farmers, carriers and packers unhesitatingly recommend Mexican farm labor, this problem, at present, is a burning one and, unless government history is given, it is very likely to build up. In 1942, the sugar-beet industry brought 1,500 Mexican nationals into California to grow their carrots, and the present Mexican national program is an aftermath of this federal action. In 1944, they were soon realized that larger numbers of such workers were necessary and California received their treaty in a cooperative fashion. In 1946, 30,000 of them were placed under contract. This number has gradually decreased since then, but as in 1944, II more than double the enrollment of Mexican workers became available until 7,000 were working in California this year, most of them in areas close to the Mexican border.

After the close of World War II, Congress discontinued the appropriation of funds for a governmental program. The Farm Placement Service was taken from the Department of Agriculture and placed within the Department of Labor. This meant that the program was now available to the various departments of employment.

While the program was operated by the Federal government, the Mexican and the individual contracts became more and more in favor of the worker. This trend increased after the Department of Labor took over. Today, we find the contract which does not contain any semblance of the factor of worker responsibility. A prominent Southwestern labor leader explains it thusly:

"Early in 1947, a simple workable agreement was reached by the growers with Mexico covering the placing of agricultural workers under contract with our Immigration Service approving and certifying as to need. It seemed this agreement was too simple and workable for governmental efficiency, so a Conference was held in El Paso, Tex., attended by Mexican officials, brass from our own Immigration Service, Department of Labor, and United States Employment Service, together with subrepresentatives of the users of foreign labor.

"The conference met and to offer suggestions as to details of the proposed agreement but were barred from the actual conference and finally told what the terms and conditions were, whether they like them or not, even though the user would foot the bill. This attitude has prevailed in all subsequent negotiations and most do not appear probable."

This situation does exist and is evidenced by the fact that the workers are the same. In the recent hearings before the Senate Committee on Education and Labor, the concrete evidence of the workers was heard in the form of a statement saying that it was the government's responsibility to hire the Mexicans and not the government's responsibility to hire the American.

A special farm labor committee, a 46-man advisory group to farm placement on the Federal level, meeting recently in Washington, D. C., gave considerable time to discussion of the Mexican labor problem and unanimously agreed to a recommendation. It is as follows:

"The present contract under the international executive agreement is completely unsatisfactory, and almost entirely ineffective, and the committee cannot state too strongly its urgent recommendation that the Department of Labor and the Mexican government implement its policy of recommendation and negotiation with the Mexican Government to give American agricultural workers a contract to that accorded political and economic Interests.

"The Mexican Government has consistently and demands conditions in the contract which are in excess of those afforded the Mexican worker in his homeland and better than the domestic worker enjoys in the United States. Even after an agreement has been adopted by both Governments the Mexican Government continually violates the spirit of the agreement.

"This situation, grievous as it has been to many, must be solved by an act which will operate for a period of time because while it caused irreplaceable damage to many producers it did not constitute a menace to our national economy. However, we are entering a period of extreme shortages of agricultural manpower which will retard production so that a great many farmers may find themselves unable to provide the food and fiber necessary to meet the demand of our own citizenry, the armed forces, and the peoples of friendly nations.

Therefore, the committee recommends that in considering this situation, the Department of State with the advice and aid from the Mexican Labor Committee, make a more complete and determined effort to work out a new agreement in which the Mexican workers accept working conditions identical to those afforded the domestic worker by which both parties will abide. If this is not possible, the Mexican Government is requested to take the necessary steps, either through legislation similar to that now before Congress, or by other means, to make available to the American producers the Mexican Nationals who desire to work in the United States under the same conditions as our domestic farm workers during the present emergency.

Mexico City reports that the Mexican farm workers' attitude toward American farms is so enthusiastic that they are rushing to get over the border into the United States for agricultural employment, with United States agriculture without waiting for the formalities of any diplomatic decisions. If this news be accepted, it would seem that the greatest problem is getting the Mexican Government to allow their agricultural workers to leave and the American government to allow them to arrive.

A complete reversal of opinion are the views voiced by union officials. Their contention is that while the amount of agricultural labor which United States agriculture without waiting for the formalities of any diplomatic decisions. If this news be accepted, it would seem that the greatest problem is getting the Mexican Government to allow their agricultural workers to leave and the American government to allow them to arrive.

A complete reversal of opinion are the views voiced by union officials. Their contention is that while the amount of agricultural labor which United States agriculture without waiting for the formalities of any diplomatic decisions. If this news be accepted, it would seem that the greatest problem is getting the Mexican Government to allow their agricultural workers to leave and the American government to allow them to arrive.

STATE APPOINTS EMERGENCY
Joseph R. Bradley, vice president of Rich­ mond-Chase Co., San Jose, Calif., has been appointed by Gov. Earl Warren to the State board to carry out the unexpired term of Ralph E. Sanborn, California Packing Corp., San Francisco, who resigned because of ill health.
Barden is a member of the waste disposal committee of the Oregon Farm Bureau League of Washington, San Francisco, and is president of Santa Clara County Canners Association, a group of 14 canning companies in Santa Clara County organized for the purpose of keeping a saleable product of fruit and being available to the farmers of that area. Be it explained by the Mexican. This is a matter of great concern with direction of the Cannery waste disposal experimental plant at San Jose, where with USDA's western region of California, is organized for the purpose of developing waste disposal and water-pollution problems.
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one and it would certainly make the proposed legislation much fairer. But if it is adopted, should there not be some limitation on the number of the reception centers provided for, and some definite localities indicated where they should be located?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Will the Senator from Oregon indulge me?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I have delved deeply into the problem from the Mexican border, and am brought into contact with the problem daily. It affects the people in my State intimately. I fully understand the Senator from Maryland that something definite should be provided. That is why I insist that an adequate investigation be made of the supply of American labor before any foreign labor is allowed to enter. If sufficient labor can be secured in Maryland, New Mexico, and Oregon, let us utilize it. I cannot see how we can be justified in bringing in foreign labor to work in this country when there is a sufficient number of American laborers available. I believe we should investigate and ascertain whether a sufficient number of American laborers is available. If a sufficient number is not available, very well, let the necessary number of foreign laborers come into the United States.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator has made a very meritorious point. I feel that consideration will have to be given both to the total number needed, and also as to the ports of entry.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to my good friend from the Pacific coast.

Mr. CAIN. I should like to ask the Junior Senator from Oregon if, as he understands, it was not the intention of his senior colleague in his proposed amendment to be fair with respect to the rights of farmers in every other section of the United States, as well as being fair to the farmers of the Pacific Northwest?

Mr. MORSE. That is correct; and I have said in my remarks that the bill in its present form discriminates against everyone except those in close proximity to the Rio Grande. I believe we have to perfect it in such a way that it will be fair to farmers everywhere in the United States.

Mr. CAIN. Then the Junior Senator from Oregon agrees, does he not, that his senior colleague has no interest in sectionalism in this question at all, and that his amendment is a complete contradiction to the sectional flavor?

Mr. CHAVEZ. It does away with sectionalism.

Mr. MORSE. I am sorry that my sentiments are engaged in an Appropriations Committee meeting at the present time and is not present to give his own testimony, but I am sure I can testify for him that the answer to the Senator is an emphatic affirmative. By his amendment he has no intention whatsoever of fostering sectionalism, or discrimination in terms of section of the States?

Mr. CAIN. If Senators generally are trying only to accommodate the reasonable need of farmers throughout the country, every Member of the Senate can find legitimate value in the Cordon amendment.

Mr. MORSE. That is my opinion.

Mr. CAIN. I am about through, Mr. President. In conclusion, it seems to me the issues involved in this bill are of such a fundamental character, both from the point of view of our national economy and from the point of view of our relations with the nations with which we are importing workers, that the bill must be considered solely from the point of view of the Nation as a whole. I feel that we must assess the problem with careful deliberation and must weigh the evidence and recommendations adduced by the President's Commission. The work of these public-spirited Commission members, of the highest reputation for character and intellectual attainment, should certainly be given very careful consideration before we enact any legislation.

Let me discuss long enough to pay a personal compliment and tribute to Professor Van Hecke, formerly Dean Van Hecke. I knew him for many years in law school work. In fact, it was my privilege to be a student during one summer session. I cannot imagine anyone who could be motivated with finer public spirit, and a devotion to serve the country without fear or favoritism, than Professor Van Hecke. I think he has done his typically fine job as a member of the President's Commission in coming forward with a report which I believe should be studied by every agricultural group in this country.

It is plain that the pending measure does not even nearly approach answering any of the recommendations of the Commission. In fact, I think quite the opposite is true. Consequently, since time does not permit the bill being sent back to committee, I believe it should be amended in major respects on the floor of the Senate if we are to get the workers who are needed in the various sections of the country where in fact a shortage exists.

Therefore, Mr. President, I sincerely hope that my colleagues in the Senate will give very careful consideration to the amendments which are being proposed to the bill. So far as I am concerned, I trust we will proceed with the consideration of this bill until it is finally disposed of, because if any legislative action is to be taken at this session, it ought to be taken now. Therefore, the Junior Senator from Oregon does not favor any postponement of the final consideration of the bill, but does urge the adoption of the major amendments as recommended by his senior colleague from Oregon (Mr. CORDON), and by the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. MORSE).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the first committee amendment, which will be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On page 1, line 9, after the word "from" it is proposed to strike out "the United States and such countries or from Hawaii or Puerto Rico," and insert "to the Republic of Mexico (pursuant to arrangements between the United States and the Republic of Mexico)."

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Mr. CAIN in the chair. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CHAVEZ. If the committee amendment shall be adopted, that would preclude offering any amendment to it?

Mr. CAIN. From the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. From the floor.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, if that is the case, I submit to the committee amendment my amendment marked "A-25-51-1."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland be kind enough to tell the Senate that the amendment is adopted by the Senator from Maryland.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be adopted.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. EASTLAND), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. HUMPHREY), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. HUBERT), and the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. UNDERWOOD) are absent on official business.
Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, if I properly understand the parliamentary situation, we are now considering the amendment on page 3, line 15.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is correct.

Mr. CORDON. May I inquire of the Senator from New Mexico whether he desires to offer his amendment to change the dollar figure in line 23 of the committee amendment? I take it that such an amendment would be in order at this time.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I intend to offer my amendment H relating to page 3, line 23. I send it to the desk and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico to the amendment of the committee.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, line 23, it is proposed to strike out "$200" and insert "$200."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico to the committee amendment.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, whether we adopt this amendment or not, it would appear to me that the question is whether the proposed amendment to provide agricultural labor for the farmers so as to make it easier for them to produce and make a good profit, or whether we intend the bill to be a measure to aid the country in producing more food and fiber. If it is the latter, as I suppose it to be, we should make labor available to whatever section of the country needs it; but that if the farmers offered by the Senator from New Mexico were adopted farmers far away from the Mexican border would not get labor, because, very obviously, a farmer who had a crop of fruit to pick would not want to pay a transportation expense of $200 to and from the port of entry. So, if the purpose of the bill is to aid in the production and harvesting of crops, we should make the labor available in whatever areas of the country it might be needed.

The senior Senator from Oregon has an amendment which would cover that point.

I am afraid that if we adopted a requirement that the farmer had to pay up to $300, unless that were the average cost for the whole country we would find most of the labor within a couple of hundred miles of the Rio Grande and the Mexican border, and Minnesota, Washington, and Oregon would find themselves quite short. I hope the Senator from New Mexico will explain why his amendment would provide labor at a cheaper cost in various States other than those near the Mexican border.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I have been working in this body for many years with the Senator from Vermont, and I have yet to find him wrong. He might reach an incorrect conclusion. I tried to state what I had in mind, and to make myself understood, in connection with the amendment which I have offered, I agree with the remarks of the Senator from Vermont that all farmers should be helped. I have that in mind, and I want to accomplish that purpose, either by what I think might be the best way of doing it, through my...
amendment, or possibly by accepting the amendment of the Senator from Oregon. I have no pride of authorship. I want to carry out the idea that all farmers in the United States should be helped. Whether by my amendment or by some other amendment, I want to reach that result.

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

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. I am quite sure the Senator from New Mexico has exactly the same idea in mind that others of us have, however, the Senator, I believe, is in error in seeking to add this amendment to the bill. I ask him to go back to the beginning of section 602 and notice the first sentence to which the several subparagraphs refer.

I read:

Sec. 502. No workers shall be made available under this title to any employer unless such employer enters into an agreement with the United States—

(1) to indemnify the United States against loss, reason of its guaranty of such employer's contracts; or

(2) to reimburse the United States for essential expenses, not including salaries or expenses of department or agency personnel, incurred by it for the transportation and subsistence of workers under this title in amounts not to exceed $50 per worker.

According to the Senator's amendment and according to the committee amendment, the change, I believe, would result in an obligation on each employer up to $200 for all expenses connected with the transportation of each worker. That would be an obligation which each employer would have to undertake.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes.

Mr. CORDON. Would not the Senator then agree that this amendment would simply guarantee that the inequity which the Senator has indicated would not exist, must exist?

Mr. CHAVEZ. It must exist.

At least it would put the employer on some kind of parity with the man who pays only $200 for all the getting labor is concerned.

Mr. CORDON. I am hopeful that the Senator from New Mexico will withdraw the amendment. I do not believe it carries out his intention.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The provision applies to Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I do not know about the Senator from New Mexico; as to getting labor is concerned.

Mr. CORDON. I hope that after careful consideration the Senator from New Mexico will withdraw the amendment.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The $200 is intended to reimburse the United States Government for the cost of transportation from centers within Mexico to centers within the continental limits of the United States near the border. That is what it would result in, and nothing else.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The item came under discussion during the Senate hearings. A statement was made by Mr. Ernest Falk, manager of the Northwest Agricultural Labor Cultural Council, and representing the Northwest Agricultural Labor Association at Yakima, Wash. Perhaps some of the Senators from the Northwest know Mr. Magleby, representing the Northwest Agricultural Labor Association of Walla Walla, Wash., also testified.

Mr. Falk before the committee made this statement which appears at page 83 of the hearings:

"Mr. FALK. And we would assure a constant complete utilization of the force. It contemplates the purpose of the expense of transporting them from these various areas when they are once brought to the Northwest.

"The CHAIRMAN. To a given place?

"Mr. FALK. To a reception center, and we would take it on from there.

"The CHAIRMAN. And you would expect someone else, that is, probably the Government, to pay for the transportation from the border to the center wherever it is fixed?

"Mr. FALK. We would very much like to have that. In our statement we do make an additional proposal.

"The CHAIRMAN. All right, proceed.

"This is the significant part of his testimony:

"Mr. FALK. If we were required to pick these workers at centers at, or near, the Mexican border it would cost us approximately $50 each way or $100 per man to get them to and from the border, then these moves within the area already referred to, will cost at least $30 per man for transportation and subsistence. Then, Senate bill 984 provides that we reimburse the Government for recruiting expense up to $30 per man.

"Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator from New Mexico would make the figure $200 on a man.

"Mr. CHAVEZ. Let me see what was testified. I do not want to starve the laborer.

"Mr. ELLENDER. The laborer would not get the money.

"Mr. CHAVEZ. The testimony continues:

"This would mean that under such a program it would cost us a total of $180 a man in addition to camp costs and food and wage compliance.

"Mr. Magleby of the Walla Walla pea growers tells me that each of the Mexican nationals they brought in cost them $2.72 per man per day in addition to their wages. They used 940 Mexican nationals.

"He then goes into further statistics. I personally prefer the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon.

"Mr. CORDON. I am hopeful that the Senator from New Mexico will withdraw his amendment. He could ask unanimous consent to his amendment, even after the committee amendment was adopted. I believe it would be helpful to do so.

"Mr. CHAVEZ. In order to expedite the passing of the bill, which I know is important, and with the understanding that, if necessary, I may present the pending amendment at a later time, but also with the hope that the amendment of the Senator from Oregon may be accepted, I withdraw my amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Mexico withdraws his amendment. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment at page 3 on line 15.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 4, line 2, after "501 (5)", it is proposed to strike out the comma and "an amount determined by the Secretary of Labor to be equivalent to the cost of returning such worker" and insert "an amount determined within the United States, an amount determined by the Secretary of Labor to be equivalent to the normal cost to the employer of returning such worker."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I have a copy of the amendment which the Senator from New Mexico intends to offer to section 501. May I ask the Senator a question with reference to the amendment?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I shall be delighted to answer it, if I can.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I observe that it reads as follows:

On page 1, beginning with line 6, it is proposed to strike out through line 3 on page 2 and insert the following:

"For the purpose of assisting in such production of agricultural commodities and products as the Secretary of Agriculture deems necessary, by supplying domestic agricultural workers (including those of the continental United States, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands) and, if a sufficient number of such workers cannot be supplied, by supplying (pursuant to formal agreements between the United States and foreign countries within the Western Hemisphere) agricultural workers recruited in such foreign countries, the Secretary of Labor is authorized.

It seems to me that it would be rather vague, and difficult of enforcement, unless the Senator should amend it so as to provide that there shall be a finding by the Secretary of Labor.

Mr. CHAVEZ. It was intended so to provide. One of the objections to the pending measure is that any certification made with reference to labor—in this instance, alien labor—shall be made by local agencies and States.

The purpose of the amendment is to protect domestic labor by making it a national proposition. I should be very glad, because it is what I had in mind, to adopt language providing that the proper agency, which is the Department of Labor, should make certification as to the adequacy or inadequacy of the supply of labor.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Inasmuch as the first sentence—

Mr. CHAVEZ. I may say to the Senator that I have another amendment which I withdrew my amendment as the Senator has in mind. It is amendment D. Will the Senator turn to the bill at page 4?
Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator does not intend to offer the amendment, does he?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes; I intend to offer it. I thought it would take care of the situation. However, I think the suggestion of the Senator from Wyoming is a good one. I believe that in the amendment to which the Senator refers the word "should" should be inserted language specifying that the Secretary of Labor, or an agency which Congress may designate, shall make the certification of adequacy. My only purpose was to call to the Senator's attention that when I am ready to offer my amendment I may have the benefit of his suggestion.

Mr. WHERRY. Was he discussing some amendment which may later be proposed?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, for the information of the Senator from Nebraska, because it was necessary for me to leave the Chamber I merely addressed an inquiry to the Senator from New Mexico whether he expects to offer his amendment, or amendment which he proposes to offer later, and made a suggestion with respect to it.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator. Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. President, I should like to have my good friend from Wyoming, who knows how to frame correct legal language in legislation, make a notation so that when I am ready to offer my amendment I may have the benefit of his suggestion.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 6, beginning in line 2.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I should like to inquire of the Senator from New Mexico whether he expects to offer his substitute. I do wish to suggest that it be offered, but I happen to have had prepared several copies of the bill showing the amendments intended to be offered by several Senators. On my copy of the bill, with the proposed amendment of the Senator from New Mexico, I have indicated a proposed amendment of section 503. I simply call it to his attention in order to offer it.

Mr. ELLENBERG, Mr. President, there are no committee amendments to section 503. We are now dealing with section 502.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 4, beginning in line 2.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, line 21, after the word "employer," to add words "includes associations or other groups of employers" and insert "shall include an association, or other group, of employers, but only if (A) those of its members for whom workers are being obtained are bound, in the event of default, to carry out the obligations undertaken by it pursuant to section 502, or (B) the Secretary determines that such individual liability is not necessary to assure performance of such obligations."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I should like to state it.

Mr. AIKEN. As I understand, the only amendments now in order are committee amendments or amendments to committee amendments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct.

The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 4, beginning in line 2.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the next committee amendment. The next amendment was, on page 4, at the beginning of line 23, to strike out "shall" and insert "may," pursuant to page 10, after the word "from," to strike out "foreign countries within the Western Hemisphere" and insert "the Republic of Mexico."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, line 10, after the word "from," to strike out "foreign countries within the Western Hemisphere" and insert "the Republic of Mexico."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, line 6, after the word "amended," to strike out "horticultural employment, cotton ginning and compression, crushing of oilseeds, and the packing, canning, freezing, drying, or other processing of perishable or seasonal agricultural products."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, after line 4, to insert a new section, as follows:

Sec. 505. Nothing in this act shall be construed as limiting the authority of the Attorney General to execute immigration laws, to permit the importation of aliens of any nationality for agricultural employment as defined in this act or to permit any such alien who entered the United States legally to remain for the purpose of engaging in such agricultural employment under such conditions as may be required; and for such time as he, the Attorney General shall specify.

The amendment was agreed to.

The President pro tempore. That completes the committee amendments. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 6, beginning in line 6, it is proposed to strike out through line 3 on page 2 and insert the following:

Sec. 501. For the purpose of assisting in such production of agricultural commodities and products as the Secretary deems necessary, by supplying domestic agricultural workers (including those of the Continental United States, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands) and, if the Secretary of Labor finds that a sufficient number of such workers cannot be supplied, by supplying (pursuant to formal agreements between the United States and foreign countries within the Western Hemisphere) agricultural workers recruited in such foreign countries, the Secretary of Labor is authorized.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico."

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I desire to make a very brief statement as to this amendment. It is simple. Either we are willing to treat American labor on an equal basis with foreign labor, or we are not. I wish to take my stand and to make it clear that this legislation we should first concern ourselves with the welfare of our own United States citizens before considering employment opportunities for others. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Labor Appropriations of the Appropriations Committee, I have come to the conclusion that we have not made a
reasonable attempt to recruit domestic farm workers or to pay them decent wages. I am sure that if a national farm labor program were to be undertaken we would certainly have a sufficient labor force to meet the goals of our agricultural production. I would be against the stanch support of fair and reasonable prices for the farmer. Likewise I have fought for fair and reasonable wages for the American worker. The producer should have a reasonable living to make his enterprise a capitalistic enterprise. The worker should realize a reasonable income because he is a capitalist. In our economy the worker and the farmer are dependent upon each other. I feel that all American workers, regardless of whether they are office workers, miners, oil drillers, railroad workers or Government employees, should have decent standards of living. I cannot allow myself to think that because an individual decides to follow agricultural pursuits he should be regarded as a type of worker. To me the manual laborer is just as important in our society as the white-collar worker.

Given decent wages and conditions, hundreds of thousands of American farm workers would be available. Today there are available in Puerto Rico 50,000 United States farm workers who are good enough to become cannon fodder and to be slaughtered on foreign battlefields; good enough to have their legs amputated and to be at Walter Reed Hospital; good enough to die in Korea; to fight with the marines on Guadalcanal and on Okinawa, but discriminated against by legislation which would import foreign labor to their detriment. I say such discrimination is un-American.

I want Senators to listen to the argument and take sides on the question, so that noses may be counted. I say we should have decent standards of living. A laborer in Hawaii and get him to a Nebraska farm to work in the sugarbeet field?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I assure the Senator from Nebraska, or the Senators from any other States, that if work is made available for American laborers, they will get to the location of the employment somehow, provided wages are not paid. I know no one wants starvation wages to be paid.

Mr. WHERRY. As in the case of any other laborer, he should have to make his own contract.

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

Mr. CHAVEZ. Let me go a little further. What is wrong with the amendment?

Mr. WHERRY. I did not say there was anything wrong with it.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I am not accusing the Senator of having said there was.

Mr. WHERRY. I am trying to obtain information with respect to it.

Mr. CHAVEZ. What is wrong with it? If we were to say to the Secretary of Agriculture, “Look into the matter of farm labor; we need it,” and he found that American labor could not be obtained, then the farm laborer from Mexico, the provisions of the legislative bill by the Senator from Louisiana would prevail. All I am asking is that we take care of our own American labor, if that is what it is. If we can make American labor available, very well. I am against legislation that picks out one country from which to secure labor which might be subjected to exploitation. I do not like “one country legislation,” except for our own country, and in that case I want it to apply to the entire country.

I now yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator from New Mexico whether there is now any restriction on citizens of Puerto Rico coming to this country, or on citizens of Puerto Rico from coming to this country now. My understanding is that they can come in and go out freely.

Mr. CHAVEZ. They certainly can.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. So what is the use of the amendment that applies to Puerto Rico and Hawaii? There is no restraint in the matter of buying mink coats, but many people do not have the necessary $8,000. There is no restraint in the matter of flying an airplane at San Juan, P. R., or Puerto Rico and coming to the United States, but many people do not have sufficient money to take that journey.

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

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. As I understand the Senator in Nebraska an moment ago—and if I am in error I want to be corrected—he said in answer to the Senator from Nebraska, who asked him how the Nebraska farmer was going to get the imported labor to work for him in his beet fields, that if work was available there was no need to worry, that the workers would find their own way to reach it. What is the need of legislation, if they can come here without restraint, if they can find their own way here? In that case there is no need for the proposed legislation.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Would the expenses of a Puerto Rican or a Hawaiian before I would pay the expenses of one of His Majesty’s subjects from Jamaica, yes. If necessary, I would do something. We did so during the war. What is wrong with doing so now?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Without the assurance of the amendment an employer could pay the expenses of a laborer from Hawaii to the United States or from Puerto Rico to the United States. He does not need the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico to do that.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Oh, yes, he does.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. That is the point I am trying to have cleared up.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The point I wish to make is that the Government should be made conscious of the fact that there is American labor available, and that it should be utilised, and the Government should not make that legislation. That is why the amendment is necessary.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Does the Senator now propose to avoidize these workers by paying their transportation?

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Senator from New Mexico contends that there is as much need for the amendment to the proposed legislation as there is for the legislation itself. If the Senator from Iowa is correct, and laborers can come in from Hawaii and Puerto Rico, and if they are available for the farmer, the farmer from Iowa is willing to bring them in, then why pass legislation providing for the importing of thousands and thousands of foreign laborers.
complete breakdown of the immigration laws. As I understand, the only necessity for the bill is that there be proper compliance with our immigration laws. Under the conditions you have stated, that persons will come into this country legally and will leave the country legally, it is the only reason for the bill. We do not need it for Hawaii and Puerto Rico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I know it is not needed for Hawaii and Puerto Rico, but I still insist that even in dealing with international questions some consideration should be given to our own citizens who may need work.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The employer can go to Hawaii and secure laborers.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Oh, yes, certainly he can; but he will not.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Does the Senate intend that the Government shall subsidize the workers by paying their transportation, yes, and, as proposed in the bill, even to the extent of $20. I should like to ask another question about the mechanics of the amendment. Let us say that the Secretary of Labor finds that there is in Hawaii a surplus of labor—to the extent, say, of 20,000 persons; and let us say that ample information is made available in Hawaii in regard to agricultural jobs which are available in the United States; but let us say that none of the 20,000 surplus laborers in Hawaii wish to come to Nebraska to work, but, instead, wish to remain in Hawaii. Let us say that a similar condition is found to exist in Puerto Rico; in other words, despite the fact that those workers, if they come to this country to work, are offered regular wages and the regular scale of wages, nevertheless they refuse to come. Perhaps I am stating a theoretical case which never will occur, but I am worried about the question of how they are offered regular wages.

Senators vote on it one way or the other, and let their stand on it be clearly understood. If Senators prefer Argentine beef, to American beef, let them vote for cheap foreign labor, as provided in this bill. If Senators favor the importation of Mexican labor, they can go to Mexico and secure laborers. If Senators favor the importation of the foot-and-mouth disease from Mexico, when we have spent $120,000,000 to keep that disease away from our borders, let them so vote, but likewise they should vote for the cancer bill, because it affects human beings and the basis of human life and the entire economic system of our country and the things that Lincoln stood for.

Senators who favor the appropriation of funds to enable the Department of Agriculture to eradicate the Mexican fruit fly, for this bill, because the effect of the bill on health conditions and on labor and on the economic life of our country will be more disastrous than all the damage which can be done by the Mexican fruit fly. Senators who wish to exterminate the foreign boll-weevil should help us exterminate a thing which is much more dangerous and can be much more disastrous. Let us not take advantage of human misery.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one more question? Mr. CHAVEZ. Let me make a further point. In our international relations we should treat all foreign countries alike. Our international relations should be as the phrase itself implies—international relations. We should not show preference to any country by leaving it out of the effects of the proposed legislation. It is not right to reach formal agreements with only one country, establishing standards and conditions for the importation of its agricultural workers. In this instance the only reason why one country was picked out was because the available labor in that country was hungry and poor, because need existed there because in that country there was a class of labor which could be employed at starvation wages. However, I want to emphasize the use of that labor at such low wages and under such bad living conditions will interfere completely with our economic system, will break down the thing we love to brag about, the American standard, will establish different standards and conditions for imported agricultural workers, and will leave the door wide open for the transfer of surplus labor into the United States. Therefore, all importations of foreign labor should be made under formal agreements, and then there will be no danger of having international tensions later on.

Last, but not least, I should like to call attention to the fact that in my home State, more American Indians could be recruited if decent working conditions were made available to them. There are approximately 52,000 Navajos in the States of New Mexico and Arizona. We have perhaps 60,000 Pueblo Indians there. We also have the Mescaleros, the Zuñis, and the Apaches. Yesterday I inserted in the Record telegrams from the governors of various of the Pueblos who are opposed to the original Ellender bill.

Mr. President, it is not easy for me to oppose the Ellender bill. It would have been much easier for me to keep quiet and thus satisfy a few greedy people in my home State. But I refuse to do that. When many people of my State have to leave New Mexico in order to find work in the sugar-beet fields of Colorado or Wyoming or to herd sheep in Montana, simply because a few greedy, selfish slave drivers would bring in to supplant them at their homes, Mexican labor that I wish, I will not agree that that should be done. I would rather lose my seat in the Senate than agree to have that done.

Mr. President, the issue is clear. Let Senators vote on it one way or the other, and let their stand on it be clearly understood. If Senators prefer Argentine beef, to American beef, let them vote for cheap foreign labor, as provided in this bill. If Senators favor the importation of the foot-and-mouth disease from Mexico, when we have spent $120,000,000 to keep that disease away from our borders, let them so vote, but likewise they should vote for the cancer bill, because it affects human beings and the basis of human life and the entire economic system of our country and the things that Lincoln stood for.

Senators who favor the appropriation of funds to enable the Department of Agriculture to eradicate the Mexican fruit fly, for this bill, because the effect of the bill on health conditions and on labor and on the economic life of our country will be more disastrous than all the damage which can be done by the Mexican fruit fly. Senators who wish to exterminate the foreign boll-weevil should help us exterminate a thing which is much more dangerous and can be much more disastrous. Let us not take advantage of human misery.

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

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

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

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

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, the issue is clear. Let Senators vote on it one way or the other, and let their stand on it be clearly understood. If Senators prefer Argentine beef, to American beef, let them vote for cheap foreign labor, as provided in this bill. If Senators favor the importation of the foot-and-mouth disease from Mexico, when we have spent $120,000,000 to keep that disease away from our borders, let them so vote, but likewise they should vote for the cancer bill, because it affects human beings and the basis of human life and the entire economic system of our country and the things that Lincoln stood for.

Senators who favor the appropriation of funds to enable the Department of Agriculture to eradicate the Mexican fruit fly, for this bill, because the effect of the bill on health conditions and on labor and on the economic life of our country will be more disastrous than all the damage which can be done by the Mexican fruit fly. Senators who wish to exterminate the foreign boll-weevil should help us exterminate a thing which is much more dangerous and can be much more disastrous. Let us not take advantage of human misery.

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

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

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

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

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, the issue is clear. Let Senators vote on it one way or the other, and let their stand on it be clearly understood. If Senators prefer Argentine beef, to American beef, let them vote for cheap foreign labor, as provided in this bill. If Senators favor the importation of the foot-and-mouth disease from Mexico, when we have spent $120,000,000 to keep that disease away from our borders, let them so vote, but likewise they should vote for the cancer bill, because it affects human beings and the basis of human life and the entire economic system of our country and the things that Lincoln stood for.

Senators who favor the appropriation of funds to enable the Department of Agriculture to eradicate the Mexican fruit fly, for this bill, because the effect of the bill on health conditions and on labor and on the economic life of our country will be more disastrous than all the damage which can be done by the Mexican fruit fly. Senators who wish to exterminate the foreign boll-weevil should help us exterminate a thing which is much more dangerous and can be much more disastrous. Let us not take advantage of human misery.

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

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

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

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, the issue is clear. Let Senators vote on it one way or the other, and let their stand on it be clearly understood. If Senators prefer Argentine beef, to American beef, let them vote for cheap foreign labor, as provided in this bill. If Senators favor the importation of the foot-and-mouth disease from Mexico, when we have spent $120,000,000 to keep that disease away from our borders, let them so vote, but likewise they should vote for the cancer bill, because it affects human beings and the basis of human life and the entire economic system of our country and the things that Lincoln stood for.

Senators who favor the appropriation of funds to enable the Department of Agriculture to eradicate the Mexican fruit fly, for this bill, because the effect of the bill on health conditions and on labor and on the economic life of our country will be more disastrous than all the damage which can be done by the Mexican fruit fly. Senators who wish to exterminate the foreign boll-weevil should help us exterminate a thing which is much more dangerous and can be much more disastrous. Let us not take advantage of human misery.

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

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

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

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, the issue is clear. Let Senators vote on it one way or the other, and let their stand on it be clearly understood. If Senators prefer Argentine beef, to American beef, let them vote for cheap foreign labor, as provided in this bill. If Senators favor the importation of the foot-and-mouth disease from Mexico, when we have spent $120,000,000 to keep that disease away from our borders, let them so vote, but likewise they should vote for the cancer bill, because it affects human beings and the basis of human life and the entire economic system of our country and the things that Lincoln stood for.

Senators who favor the appropriation of funds to enable the Department of Agriculture to eradicate the Mexican fruit fly, for this bill, because the effect of the bill on health conditions and on labor and on the economic life of our country will be more disastrous than all the damage which can be done by the Mexican fruit fly. Senators who wish to exterminate the foreign boll-weevil should help us exterminate a thing which is much more dangerous and can be much more disastrous. Let us not take advantage of human misery.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.
Mr. CHAVEZ. I do not think it is a big job to protect American labor and American agriculture.

Mr. WHERRY. I am not quarrelling about that at all; that is not the reason why I am asking the question.

On the other hand, if a contract is entered into, making Mexico or an international basis, the Mexican labor will be brought to the border, and there will be proper distribution, for the Mexican authorities know how to contact those laborers. After all, they have been doing that for many years.

However, let us assume that under the provisions of this amendment, if it is agreed to, it is determined that we do not wish to contract any longer for such possibly we would have a little happier result in blocking negotiations with Mexico, if in the final analysis it is determined that there is a surplus of 20,000,000 in Hawaii.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The amendment will not do that.

Mr. WHERRY. That is what I wish to know.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I am as anxious as any other Senator that American farmers shall have the labor they need. All I am asking by the amendment is that we find out whether sufficient labor is already available. If it is not, then let us import it.

Mr. WHERRY. I am not troubled about the labor we have in the United States; I am referring to the labor that may be available in Puerto Rico or in Hawaii. If this amendment is adopted, we shall have to determine what the situation is in Puerto Rico and in Hawaii.

Mr. WHERRY. The Secretary of Labor will have to make that finding and will have to certify as to that situation before we shall be entitled to contract for the labor of Mexican labor. If the Secretary of Labor finds there is a surplus of labor in Puerto Rico or Hawaii, we shall be unable to make such contracts for the importation of Mexican labor.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Very well. General Hershey sends out his agents, and they have no difficulty whatever in saying, "Come here, Manuel; we are going to ship you to Fort Benning, and later on you will go to Korea." In view of that system, what is wrong with having the Secretary of Labor, for whom the Department appropriate millions of dollars, operate in a similar way in serving an even better purpose?

Mr. AIKEN. New Mexico has a very laudable motive that we should come to the aid of all American farm labor before we import any. However, I recall that each fall a few thousand Canadians come into Maine to help harvest the potato crop; they come into Maine after year for that purpose. They are experts at that job. I wonder whether, if the Senator's amendment is adopted, those Canadians could be admitted for that purpose, so long as there were Puerto Ricans or Hawaiian who would go to go to Maine to help harvest potatoes.

Furthermore, would not the amendment call for a formal agreement between the United States and Canada in that connection? We are endeavoring to carry out the basic concepts of those who dared to write the words, "We, the people of the United States, are endeavoring to effectuate all the words of the humble and meek man who was murdered at Ford's Theater in Washington, a man who did away with human slavery—in a word, those who believe in the noble purposes of those who signed the Declaration of Independence, of those who, like Thomas Jefferson, dared to think and to believe that all men were created equal, of those who believed in the fundamental tenets of Andrew Jackson, of those who would put into effect the philosophy of Jefferson, of those who believe in the deeds and the words of the humble and meek man who was murdered at Ford's Theater in Washington, a man who did away with human slavery—in a word, those who are endeavoring to carry out the noble purposes of those who are apostles of real Americanism.

Mr. President, I leave the subject there. No motives will be questioned. I am stating my opinion of what I believe and of how I feel about the matter. I still believe in majority rule, I still believe in this body's deciding for itself. My purpose in discussing the bill and in discussing the amendment is to contribute my opinion for what it may be worth in assisting other Senators finally to come to a definite conclusion as to what they should do. I thank the Senate.

Mr. ELLEN. Mr. President, a good way to scuttle this bill would be to adopt the pending amendment. To begin with, the Secretary of Labor is now authorized to recruit domestic workers. Under the law he is in a position to recruit Hawaiians, Puerto Ricans, and those who live in the Virgin Islands. When the committee considered this bill, we intended to cover all of the countries of the Western Hemisphere, including Canada, Hawaii, and the islands off the eastern coast of our country. During the hearings it was brought out that under the existing law there is a procedure which has been in effect for quite some time in regard to recruiting workers from offshore, such as the residents of the Bahamas and Jamaica, as well as Canadians. The method pursued in those islands was that the United States Employment Service should certify that within a certain period there was a scarcity of domestic farm labor. And when the certificate is obtained, employers could then go to the islands and make individual contracts with the islanders residing in the Bahamas and in Jamaica, and could do the same with Canadians. The plan has been found very well. Employers furnish subsistence and pay the cost of transporting workers from their places of residence to the United States. If they are sent back at their own expense. The contract is signed and executed by the employer under existing laws. There can be no necessity for disturbing that method of dealing with these foreign
workers. As I have said on many occasions, it is necessary to enact the pending measure, because Mexico has refused to enter into agreements similar to those which can be entered into with Canada, Jamaica, the Bahamas, and other countries of the Western Hemisphere.

In other words, with Mexico refusing to continue the program under the law as it now exists, our employers will be precluded after June 30 from contracting with Mexico as heretofore been the case; therefore, the necessity for enacting this legislation without delay.

My distinguished friend from New Mexico has been pouncing along with the argument that domestic workers should be taken care of first. I agree to that. The whole Committee on Agriculture and Forestry agreed to this, and we have placed in the bill a provision, under section 563, which states that—

No workers recruited under this title shall be assigned to any area in which the Director of State Employment Security for such area has determined and certified that (1) sufficient domestic workers who are able, willing, and qualified to do the work are available for employment in any area where agricultural workers similarly employed.

In other words, it is incumbent on the Administrator first to see to it that there are no domestic laborers in the area, which would include Indians and other Americans, who are able, willing, and qualified to do the work. If he should find there is not sufficient domestic labor, and then in that event the certification can be made which would permit the importation of Mexican workers. And in that case the employer, for the simple reason that there was no way by which the employer could make the worker remain on the farm. If the worker left, the employer could be made not only to forfeit the bond, but also to reimburse the Government for the entire cost of returning the employee to Mexico. It was shown that in many instances employers had forfeited, employees had already returned to Mexico, but it was not done in accordance with the Immigration Service regulations. They wanted certification that he had returned, and they wanted evidence of the fact, but in many cases, although letters were presented to show that the employee had returned, the bonds were forfeited nonetheless.

Under the terms of this bill, the United States Government, acting through the Labor Department, the Immigration Service, and the health authorities, will make selection of Mexican employees who are eligible to work in the United States. Those employees are brought to the border and there a contract is entered into voluntarily between the employer and the employees, with the understanding that the Government will guarantee to each worker the performance of the contract insofar as wages and transportation are concerned. That is why is it necessary that authority be granted for an agency of Government to enter into the kind of a program.

M. Chavez. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. Chavez. As I understand the Senator, the function of the Department of Labor is to go to Mexico and recruit employees.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. Chavez. Who makes the contract?

Mr. ELLENDER. The workers and the employers. I do not know that my good friend heard what I said, but before certification can be made, which would be followed by recruitment, two things must be found, namely, that sufficient domestic workers who are able, willing, and qualified to do the work.”

Mr. Chavez. Qualified to labor?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes, that they are not available at the place and time needed to perform the work requested; secondly, that the wages and working conditions of such workers will not adversely affect the wages and working conditions of domestic agricultural workers similarly employed.

Mr. Chavez. What is the period of time as to domestic wages?

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, under the circumstances, it is the purpose to state to my good friend that there are two or three amendments which will be presented to change that provision by designating the Secretary of Labor to make the certification, so that certification can be made on a national level.

Mr. Chavez. Will the Senator pardon me for a moment on that point?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. Chavez. I am the chairman of the committee willing to accept such an amendment?

Mr. ELLENDER. I shall leave that to the Senate, I am directed by the Committee to present its findings, but I will say to my good friend that I shall urge no serious objection. On the contrary, it is my purpose to present to the Senate some of the statements made by Mr. Chavez. I am glad the Senator from Louisiana thinks that some consideration should be given to the state of mind of the Mexican Government. I certainly would recommend for his consideration, before final determination, some of the statements made by American citizens on the same subject.

Mr. ELLENDER. Further to answer the question of Mr. Chavez, as I have indicated, two things would have to be determined on a national level should this amendment prevail, as it possibly will.

Mr. Chavez. I wish the Senator would say “Yes.”

Mr. WHERRY. Which amendment is going to prevail?

Mr. ELLENDER. An amendment is pending to place certification on a national rather than on a State level. I am sure it would meet many of the arguments which my good friend has been making for the past few days.

Mr. Chavez. I think it would improve the bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am sure the Senator knew about it right along. He was aware of the fact that the amendments were pending, and he knew my attitude toward them. I pointed out to the Committee that any Mexican labor can be recruited, if the amendment pending with reference to placing the certification on a national basis is adopted, the Secretary of Labor would be bound to determine whether or not there was sufficient domestic labor available to do the work. If he found that there was sufficient domestic labor available Mexican labor would be.
could not be recruited. On the other hand, if he found that there was not a sufficient amount of domestic labor available, he would take the further step of finding that the employment of such foreign workers would not adversely affect the wages and working conditions of domestic agricultural workers similarly employed.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. When we have records and statistics showing that local labor in the States of Texas and New Mexico is paid $1.75 a day, and Mexican labor is paid 83 a day, what can we expect?

Mr. ELLENDER. My good friend refers to wetbacks. To my knowledge, he has read into the record.

Mr. CHAVEZ. From a Catholic archbishop.

Mr. ELLENDER. No; from some veterans.

Mr. CHAVEZ. If the Senator will look at the telegram again he will see that I am not discussing wetbacks. It is true that the situation on the Mexican border at times is very unsatisfactory. The so-called wetbacks swim across the Rio Grande. They know they are violating the law. They want to work for an American employer. In many instances the employer hides them out and pays them very little. In some cases the employer does not even pay the worker for the work he has done. In other words, under such conditions would be willing to work for a bare subsistence.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. If the Senator were as well acquainted with conditions around the Rio Grande as are the junior Senator from New Mexico and the senior Senator from New Mexico he would not say that the wetbacks swim across the river. Sometimes there is not sufficient water in which to cover their feet. They simply walk across.

Mr. ELLENDER. Would they then be called drybacks, instead of wetbacks?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Drybacks and wetbacks.

Mr. ELLENDER. I repeat that the amendment which is now pending is absolutely unnecessary, in that the Department of Labor now has the authority to recruit domestic labor.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, may I ask a question?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I have inquired along that line of the Labor Department, particularly its Employment Service. I may say that I have been very close to the problem of labor and what it is supposed to represent than the average member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I have been very close to it, I may say to the Senator from Louisiana. I have helped appropriate millions of dollars which they get for employment. When an inquiry was made of Mr. Goodwin, of the Employment Service, as to what they had done, he answered that they had done very little with reference to finding out about American labor. What does the Senator think we can expect from the Department under such conditions?

Mr. ELLENDER. I am sorry that the distinguished Senator has so little respect for the Department of Labor.

Mr. CHAVEZ. After dealing with them for 10 or 12 years, I have come to that conclusion.

Mr. ELLENDER. I think if the Secretary of Labor is empowered to do the things that we propose he should do, he will do his duty.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I say that after we have given millions of dollars to investigate unemployment or employment—and Congress does it every year—and they still cannot come before a committee and give us definite information as to what labor is available, why should we not lose a little faith in them?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I am trying to understand the pending amendment. Mr. ELLENDER. I ask the question, and perhaps the Senator's answer will help me to understand it. Is it not the purpose of the amendment to provide the same protection and services to American workers, including those from Puerto Rico, Hawaii, and other areas in the Western Hemisphere, as the measure proposes to give exclusively to Mexican workers?

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not interpret it that way, for the reason that the bill simply provides a method of importing Mexican labor. Under the law today the Secretary can recruit all the domestic labor that is required. The amendment as now presented does not change the present set-up. As I understand it, the Senator's amendment is that the Secretary of Labor is not to assist Puerto Rican or any other labor, but I presume the Senator will call up another of his amendments which in effect provides for a subsidy of domestic labor, but I presume the Senator will call up another of his amendments which in effect provides for a subsidy of domestic labor as an incentive.

Mr. ELLENDER. It is the Senator's privilege. I am trying to answer the question of my distinguished friend.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. If the Senator from New Mexico were to make such a suggestion, which the Senator in his own mind anticipated, what would be the difference between that and voting for a subsidy on cotton or tobacco?

Mr. ELLENDER. It is the Senator's privilege. I am trying to answer the question of my distinguished friend.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I should like to give one answer to the distinguished Senator from New Mexico. Large groups engaged in agriculture in this country, utilizing offshore labor, do not want any subsidy in connection with their labor. They carry the full expense of bringing in the labor, putting up the bond, and returning the foreign laborers to their own country. They do not want to saddle their business upon the Federal Government. They do not in any way want a subsidy. It is certainly one good reason why no subsidy should be included in any legislation of agriculture which uses foreign labor does not want a subsidy.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I think that is correct. Mr. ELLENDER. I so indicated to the Senator in my opening remarks. I said that relationships which now exist between employers of this country and employees in offshore areas are very satisfactory. The employers and the workers pay all the expenses. The Federal Government is not put to any extra expense at all with respect to the importation of labor by employers on the Atlantic coast.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Suppose we agree that the Federal Government does not pay one penny. Does the Senator think it is fair that the Federal Government should act in that manner? I presume the Senator agrees that is correct. The Federal Government does not pay one penny. What difference does it make whether the Federal Government pays a part of the expenses in this connection, or whether it pays a subsidy on cotton or something else?

Mr. ELLENDER. It brings me to the next point, and that is that the bill places upon the shoulders of the employer the burden of the payment of practically all the expenses. In other words, under the terms of the bill the recruiting is done within Mexico, at certain points agreed upon by the Mexican Government and the United States Government. The exportation from those points to a point determined upon in the United States will be paid by the employers, up to a maximum of $20 per worker.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. In one moment. The cost of transportation from the United States to the points where the contracts are entered into by employers, to the place of employment, is to be paid by the employer. The Federal Government pays no expense. Under the proposal which will be made, I presume, by my distinguished friend— Mr. CHAVEZ. We are now discussing taking care of American laborers, and not some amendment which I may propose in the future.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator proposes to have the Federal Government take care of American labor. It has nothing to do with paying a subsidy to any laborer. Is that not correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. The question of subsidies is not involved in the Senator's amendment that is now before us; but I presume that he is going to submit such an amendment a little later.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I do not know. Let us approach one question at a time. Let us discuss whether the Senator wants American labor or Mexican labor, or whether we are going to pay a subsidy to
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Mr. ELLENDER. I am not anxious to accept this amendment with his subsidy amendment which has been on the desk for some time, I do not see any point in the pending amendment, for the simple reason that Senator of Labor can now recruit domestic workers.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I try to deal with each point in turn as it is reached. If the Senator does not want to accept this amendment, I might feel kindly enough, or pleasantly shocked enough, so that, in order to comply with his wonderful idea of getting labor to the American farmer, I might not even suggest another amendment. However, I do not promise.

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not want to make the bill unworkable. If the Secretary of Labor now certify that there are 50,000 workers in Hawaii, but he cannot bring them over, the certification might go so far as to say that they could be brought over if the employer wanted to send for them. But I do not want the American farmer to be put in that position. I would rather follow the thinking of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and that is to let the bill operate solely with respect to the Republic of Mexico. As I have stated, we have been put on notice that we cannot after June 30 recruit workers in Mexico unless a new agreement is reached between our country and Mexico. This bill does nothing but carry out the purposes of the proposed new agreement.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President.

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I have the greatest respect for the ability, loyalty, and patriotism of the Senator from Louisiana. However, let me ask him this question: Has he reached the point in life where he considers it necessary to sacrifice American institutions in order to comply with the wishes of a foreign government?

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, to begin with, we are not doing that.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The reason we are proposing to take this action is that we agree.

Mr. ELLENDER. It was the only way by which we could come to terms. I think it was reasonable. Mexico did not try to put anything over on us, nor did we try to put anything over on Mexico. We want to preserve the cordial relationship which exists.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Mexican Government today has a very serious problem facing it, with respect to the wetback situation. While I was confering with representatives from Mexico I stated on several occasions that it was my desire to have the bill which takes care of the wetback problem. Where is there anything in the bill which does so? The Senator is talking about legal entry.

Mr. ELLENDER. On several occasions I have told my distinguished friend that with respect to wetbacks, workers who are here illegally, re-contracting is not permitted. We prohibit that in the bill. We say that the employer shall be in a position to enter into between workers from Mexico and employers in the United States unless the workers have entered the United States legally.

Mr. CHAVEZ. They never had a contract. Millions of wetbacks who are now in this country never had a contract; but they are still working.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is in error if he has reference to Mexicans legally in this country.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Who ever made a contract with a "wetback"?

Mr. ELLENDER. I am talking about Mexicans who have been legally contracted.

Mr. CHAVEZ. They are greatly in the minority and would be so, even under the provisions of the bill of the Senator from Louisiana. I think I understand and appreciate the fact that he is trying to legitimate the use of Mexican foreign labor. But the point which the Senator does not realize is that while he would legalize the importation of Mexican laborers and contracts with Mexican citizens, nothing is done about the million or so who are here illegally, and who are not working under contract.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I have pointed out on several occasions during the debate, it is against the law at present for these workers to enter without permits.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Certainly. The passage of more laws and still more laws would not cure the situation.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I believe that if the bill which I introduced a few days ago is considered soon by the Judiciary Committee of the Senate, we may be able to correct that evil to a certain extent.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I beg the indulgence of the Senator. He has been most kind and patient with me, and I appreciate it. I am sure that he is just as sincere in his position as I am in mine. But if the wetback question is serious—and I believe the Senator will agree with me that it is serious not only for our country and our economy, but also from the standpoint of the Mexican Government—why can we not take care of it in this bill?

Mr. ELLENDER. I am willing to do so, but I insist that the Senator would adopt such a provision without hearings on the subject.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Everyone knows that 1,000,000 workers are here illegally.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator has an amendment to propose. No doubt the Senate will have an opportunity to vote on it.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I hope at that time the Senator will be as willing to take care of the situation as he now is.

Mr. ELLENDER. I expect to discuss the Senator's amendment later. At one time I thought that it was along the same lines as the bill which I introduced; but it will not accomplish the purpose.

Mr. CHAVEZ. We might get together.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senate now has before it an amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from New Mexico (Mr. Catav), which has to do with investigation by the Secretary of Labor relative to the question of whether there is a sufficient number of workers in Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands, before contracts such as provided for by the bill can be entered into. Would the distinguished Senator give us a question similar to that asked by the Senator from Iowa. Is the amendment needed in order to protect American labor?

Mr. ELLENDER. No, it is not needed.

Mr. WHERRY. They are protected now?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; the Secretary of Labor is already empowered to recruit domestic labor, including labor from our Territorial possessions.

Mr. WHERRY. Then all that is needed in the way of these workers coming to Nebraska farms is the contact to be made to get them there?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes, and then, I presume, the payment of transportation?

Mr. WHERRY. What about the transportation? Under the contract provided for in the bill, transportation is actually being paid to bring Mexicans to the border?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct. The employers in this country will pay for the transportation of Mexican employees to a point within the United States, and from that point to the place of employment, and there is nothing to stop an employer from doing the same with respect to Hawaiian.

Mr. WHERRY. Any effort being made to accomplish the same purpose in Hawaii that will be accomplished with respect to Mexican? I do not mean with respect to the Government paying subsidies. How are labors in Puerto Rico, for example, to be collected and brought here?

Mr. ELLENDER. The way that is done now is that the United States Employment Service, let us say, will certify that in New Jersey 600 workers are needed to pick the pea crop. This certification can be used by the employers there to go to the Bahamas or to go to Puerto Rico and make arrangements for their labor requirements with Puerto Ricans or with Bahamians.

Mr. WHERRY. Is that being done?

Mr. ELLENDER. Certainly.

Mr. WHERRY. So there is no need for this proposed legislation.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is why we have excluded it from the bill.

Mr. WHERRY. That is what I wanted to find out.

Mr. ELLENDER. I have made a statement to that effect on many occasions. I am sorry the Senator has not heard it.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, if the Senator will bear with me I should like to state what I understand it to mean. The Senator may think they are now doing what he said, but they are not. Mr. Goodman was a witness who ap-
The United States Government. It would have provided that the expense of subsistence while the labor was on the way to the place where it would be distributed and to the farms where it would work, would also be paid by the United States Government. It would have had a tremendous amount of expenses in the United States Government which is now being paid by the local agricultural producers of all the States in the United States, except those who rely on labor.

In other words, in the case of the States which bring in Canadian labor, as was stated by the Senator from Vermont, it was intended to do that at the expense of domestic labor in favor of cheap labor.

Mr. ELLENDER. No, it was not. I repeat there was no such intention. I have read section 502 to the Senate many times. I will ask the Senator himself to read it now, and he will see that before certification can be made the Administration must require that no domestic labor available to do the work.

That, Mr. President, is all I desire to present to the Senate at this time. I urge that the amendment be defeated.

Mr. CHAVEZ. It referred to foreign countries within the Western Hemisphere.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator. It would also have provided that the expense of negotiating the arrangements for bringing in the labor from all those additional places would be borne by the United States Government under appropriations made for the Department of Labor. It would have provided that the expense of transportation, after the labor was contracted with, would lie upon the United States Government. It would have provided that the expense of subsistence while the labor was on the way to the place where it would work, would also be paid by the United States Government. It would have had a tremendous amount of expenses in the United States Government which is now being paid by the local agricultural producers of all the States in the United States, except those who rely on labor.

In other words, in the case of the States which bring in Canadian labor, it was intended to do that at the expense of domestic labor in favor of cheap labor.

Mr. ELLENDER. No, it was not. I repeat there was no such intention. I have read section 502 to the Senate many times. I will ask the Senator himself to read it now, and he will see that before certification can be made the Administration must require that no domestic labor available to do the work.

That, Mr. President, is all I desire to present to the Senate at this time. I urge that the amendment be defeated.

Mr. CHAVEZ. It referred to foreign countries within the Western Hemisphere.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator.
allow the Mexican economy to be properly
considered in connection with this
matter, as well as to give proper consider-
ating to our own economy in the situa-
tions of the United States where such
labor is needed. So the bill is proposed
by the committee to be changed in such
away as to meet that situation.

To answer before the committee the
question of whether the Secretary of
Labor made it perfectly clear, through
the testimony offered by his assistant—
and, incidentally, the answer he gave in
direct response to a question which was
asked of him, the testimony of the De-
partment of Labor, and not solely his own testimony—that
they want a system of motels or tran-
sient camps, is that correct?

Mr. Creasey. That is from the De-
partment of Labor.

That is clear from the testimony of Mr. Cre-
seuy, who said, in response to my ques-
tion on that point, "That is correct."

And I now ask what they propose to
have a series of camps extending from
Homestead, Fla., on the east
coast, to Maine.

I read further from the hearings:

Senator Holland. Mr. Creasey, is it this
testimony your own personal opinion or is it
for the Department of Labor?

Mr. Creasey. Which do you mean?

Senator Holland. The tourist camps.

Mr. Creasey. That is from the Department
of Labor.

So that is the program we have before
us, as proposed at this time.

Now let me go a little further. I read
now from page 31 of the hearings:

Senator Holland. Mr. Chairman, I would
like to pursue one more point. If I un-
derstood the witness correctly, and I am
goin to ask him the specific question as whether
I did, his proposal embodies not only setting up
of this series of tourist camps, but also
the transportation of domestic workers on a parity with the paying of the
transportation of the offshore workers or
other workers who have to go from Mexico and other places; is that correct?

Mr. Creasey. That is correct.

I then asked this question:

In other words, since you have to pay the
transportation of a Mexican worker to work
in the beet fields in the Midwest, all the way
from his home in Mexico, there and back,
you feel that you should be prepared to pay
transportation of domestic farm labor
in similar amounts?

Mr. Creasey answered:

That is correct.

Mr. President, I ought to be very clear
by this time what kind of set-up it is
proposed to create, but there are one or
two other things I wish to mention. On
page 36, in my questioning of Mr. Creasey, I asked the following questions,
to which Mr. Creasey gave answer as
follows:

Senator Holland. I would like to ask
another question to make it clear. Do I un-
derstand that one of your principal grounds of
opposition to S. 984 as now written is that
while it provides for transportation for
foreign workers to this country and return
to recruitment centers from which they
were obtained, which you favor, that you are not
willing for the bill to fail to have a similar
provision or identical provision with refer-
dence to domestic farm labor? Is that it?

Mr. Creasey. Not identical, but similar.

In other words, we say that the offer you
make to Mexicans, you should be willing to
make to Americans.

Senator Holland. In other words, that the
transportation costs to and from the place
of labor should be paid by the Government
in the case of domestic farm laborers just
exactly as in the case of Mexican farm
laborers?

Mr. Creasey. In the same manner and to
the same extent, and no more.

Senator Holland. And that in addition to
that you favor the setting up of these tourist
camps along the lines of migration to house
the migrant laborers and their families as
they go from place to place?

Mr. Creasey. We think it is a very desir-
able thing, Senator.

Mr. President, those of us who come
from areas not contiguous to Mexico are

happy to cooperate with the Mexican Government, and to cooperate with the tens of thousands of Mexican citizens who want this outlet for their labor, this cooperation is necessary if we are to live up to our living standards with better opportunities for themselves and their families. We likewise want to cooperate with the agricultural industry in that portion of the Nation which naturally looks to that source of labor after the supply of domestic labor is exhausted.

During willing to go along with this program if it is enlarged to include all the enmities which I have mentioned, which are shown by the record, which are included within some of the amendments which have been proposed, beginning with the particular amendment which is offered at this time. I hope the Senate will reject the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Chavez] on page 1, line 6.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I ask for the yeas and nays on this amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. CORDON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McCullin in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the suggestion of the absence of a quorum may be withdrawn and that the order for the call of the roll may be rescinded.

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

The question is on agreeing to the substitute amendment of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Chavez]. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll. The legislative clerk called the roll.

BROOKS of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FRAZET], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FRANK], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEMPNER], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. LUGNER], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. PATTEN], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. UNDERWOOD] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official committee business.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. KENGER] is absent by leave of the Senate on official committee business.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is absent by leave of the Senate on official committee business.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SARR] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Minnesota would vote "yea," and the Senator from Mississippi would vote "nay."

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KEEFER] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FRANK]. If present and voting, the Senator from Arkansas would vote "nay," and the Senator from West Virginia would vote "yea."

The Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] is paired on this vote with the Senator from California [Mr. WELKER]. If present and voting, the Senator from California would vote "yea," and the Senator from New York would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PLOMAR] is absent by leave of the Senate, and, if present, would vote "nay."

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGE] is absent by leave of the Senate on official committee business.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] is necessarily absent, and, if present, would vote "nay."

The Senator from California [Mr. NIXON] said that yesterday was the day Idaho [Mr. WELKER] was absent on official business.

Mr. GILLETTE. If present and voting, the Senator from California [Mr. NIXON] would vote "nay."

The Senator from California [Mr. WELKER] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. BUTLER] is absent by leave of the Senate.

Mr. WELKER. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The question is on agreeing to the amendments which have been proposed, beginning with the particular amendment which is offered at this time. I hope the Senate will reject the amendment.

So the amendment of Mr. CHAVEZ was rejected.

AMERICAN POLICY IN THE FAR EAST—SENATOR TAFT'S SPEECH BEFORE THE UNITED STATES CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Mr. MCMAHON. Mr. President, yesterday the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LONG] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MOSSE] made very strong pleas for more rapid arming of our country. During the recent visit of the Senator from Oregon, at my request, he yielded to me, and I read to him a short dispatch which appeared on the Associated Press ticker. It was the report of a speech which had been made by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] before the United States Chamber of Commerce. I did not pursue the matter at the time further than to read the dispatch. I regret that the Senator from Ohio is un­avoidably detained and is absent today. I did not pursue the matter further at the time I thought, after I read the dispatch, that it could not possibly be a correct report of what the Senator from Ohio had said. I today sought to find a transcript of the Senator's remarks, but was unable to do so. However, I find a story by Joseph A. Loeb in today's New York Times which bears out the Associated Press account of the Senator's speech. I believe now that the AP quoted him correctly.

What the Senator proposed to the United States Chamber of Commerce yesterday was that we cut the budget $20,000,000,000, that we cut the Armed Forces 500,000 men, and that we pursue a more aggressive course in Asia; in other words, that we enlarge the war in Asia. I further note that the Senator's audience cheered him at the conclusion of that kind of speech, which leads me to observe that they cannot have truly appreciated the situation.

I have rarely seen anything more illogical than the statement made by the senior Senator from Ohio. I know of no Senator who would not like to cut the budget $20,000,000,000, and who does not regret that we are saddled with the tax load with which we are burdened at the present time, and with which we are going to continue to be burdened. I do not know of any Senator who would not wish that our Armed Forces numbered 300,000 men instead of 3,500,000. But I know of no Member of the United States Senate, except the Senator from Ohio, who believes that it is possible to cut the budget $20,000,000,000, and to cut the Armed Forces by 500,000 men, and still carry on an invasion of the Chinese mainland. Yet, in my opinion, that is exactly what the Senator is advocating when he supports the proposals which have been made by General Mac-Arthur for the very soft term—"logistical support."

It is time that proposals of that kind cease, if we are to make the American people aware of the kind of situation we confront.

I thought it only right that this statement should be made for the record and the attention of the Senate called to the fact that this kind of proposal has been made by the senior Senator.
from Ohio, who in the press of the country has been termed “Mr. Republican.” I call upon responsible leaders of the Republican Party to repudiate this kind of statement, which I think is truly a most unfortunate approach to the problems of our time.

ACQUISITION OR DISPOSAL OF REAL ESTATE BY DEFENSE DEPARTMENT

Mr. SALTONSTALL and Mr. CHAVEZ addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, on Monday, April 23, the Senate passed Senate bill 265, a bill relating to the acquisition and disposal of real property by the three military services. This bill was unanimously reported by the Armed Services Committee and was passed by the Senate without objection. On the same afternoon, the House of Representatives passed House bill 3096, which is identically the same as the bill passed by the Senate, except for the insertion of one word. As passed by the Senate, these agencies are not required to report inter-service transfers of real property while under the House bill they are required to report such transfers.

In order to correct this minor difference between the bills as passed by the respective Houses of Congress, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate Services Committee and was passed by the House. I refer to the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts by unanimous consent will not affect the present status of the pending measure.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is what I would like to ask the distinguished Senator what the one word is to which he refers.

Mr. THYE. I thank the distinguished Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. President, I am in receipt of a number of telegrams from the State of Minnesota as of this United States Senate. These telegrams have been sent because of the roll-back in beef prices as promulgated and issued on April 29 by Mr. Michael P. DiSalle, Director of the Office of Price Stabilization. These are one telegram which I received from a gentleman living in the southwestern part of Minnesota, which I should like to read:

Please explain how a farmer is going to feed cattle on the proposed roll-back. It is stated that machinery and labor might work. Many farmers put feeders in at 30 to 40 cents a pound.

That is, they put them into the feed lots at 30 to 40 cents a pound.

Is the farmer supposed to take the whole cut? Please answer at once. Three to five hundred farmers will be out sale this afternoon. I want to get your answer to them.

This is the reply which I sent within the past hour:

Replying to your telegram I wish to say that I have objected to beef price control as announced by you. The price you raised cannot be answered in any other manner than that farmer is going to suffer the loss. The consumer will lose also as livestock today is going to market unfinished, and ultimately there will be less beef because this unnecessary OPs order. I shall continue to protest order.

Mr. President, I received another telegram from Mr. C. S. Carlson, manager of the Superior Packing Co., St. Paul, in which he says:

We have just sent the following wire to Donald L. Leach, OPS, room 1504, Temporary S Building, Washington, D.C.:

"Regarding the congested conditions in our yards and our inability to relieve the situation account of quotas, will you be good enough to contact and see if you can get a quick answer?"

That is signed by C. S. Carlson.

The Superior Packing Co. yards in St. Paul are so congested that their quotas forbid them to take any more livestock.

The same situation is found in South St. Paul, so far as it relates to Armour, Swift, and Cudahy. I called by telephone within the past 30 minutes, and was told that the trucks are lined up for miles waiting to be unloaded.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President—

Mr. THYE. Will the Senator permit me a couple of minutes more?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Very well.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, my only reason for bringing this matter to the attention of the Senate is that cattle are coming in droves, which means that they are coming in unfinished, and that thevals are 200 to 300 pounds light. The consumer is going to be faced with less market next fall, and rationing will have
to be put into effect. The farmer who pays $2 a pound for feeders has been taking a cut of from $2 to $3 a hundred pounds with the past few days. The price of unwholesome cattle has gone down from $2 to $3 a hundred pounds. If the able Senator from New Mexico will permit me to take a few more minutes, I will show what some of the producer’s costs are and how they have gone up.

Soybean meal is the only high-protein feed that has gone down in price. It went down from $4.69 to $4.48 a hundred pounds. Linseed meal is one of the high-protein feed which is fed the cattle to make high quality meat. It has gone up from $4.64 to $4.48 a hundred pounds. Cottonseed meal has gone up from $2 to $2.89 a hundred pounds. Tankage has gone up from $6.49 to $7. Tankage is a part of the ration in production feeding business, but he knows it so well.

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

Mr. THYE. I shall be happy to yield to the Senator from Nebraska for a question, if the Senator from New Mexico will yield for that purpose, without denying me the right to continue for a few more minutes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I am willing to let the Senator from Nebraska continue for as long a time as he has something to say.

Mr. THYE. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. WHERRY. Is it not a fact, if a roll-back had to be imposed, that if opportunity had been given the feeders to keep the cattle in the feed lots for 30 to 34 cents a pound, there would have been an orderly marketing of the cattle which had been placed in the feed lots 60 or 90 days ago?

Mr. THYE. The Senator from Nebraska not only knows the livestock feeding business, but he knows it so well and presents the question in such a clear-cut manner that the answer can be only “Yes.”

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator. I hope the roll-back will not go into effect immediately. Of course they have until May 30, when another roll-back will go into effect. What is going to happen is that there will be fewer cattle in the feed lots, the consumer will have to pay higher prices, and there will be a return to the black market.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? I should like to ask him a question.

Mr. THYE. Indeed I do yield. I was afraid the Senator was going to deny me further time. He has been very indulgent.

Mr. CHAVEZ. No; I wish to ask a question of the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. I am delighted to yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I should like to have the Senator discuss the subject for as long a time as he has anything to say about it.

Mr. THYE. I am delighted to yield to the Senator from New Mexico for a question.

Mr. CHAVEZ. We are discussing the matter of farm labor.

Mr. THYE. Yes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The question was never considered by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. THYE. In June, I believe. On June 30, as I recall, the subject will be examined as a study by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. It will undertake a serious study of the subject. It seems to me that if such things as roll-backs are to happen, the Senate and the House ought to have something to say, in the form of a recommendation of the directive. The law will terminate in June, and the directive certainly was issued upon the assumption that the law would be extended.

Mr. THYE. The subject would fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Banking and Currency, I believe.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I believe that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, would have jurisdiction, but I think the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry should take some positive action with respect to the roll-back on cattle. It was issued without any notice to the feeders.

Mr. THYE. Indeed I do yield. I am willing to let the American labor. I shall do all in my power to guard against the importation of labor so long as domestic labor is available.

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

Mr. THYE. I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

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

Mr. THYE. I yield to the Senator from Iowa.
Iowa said that some were bought for 40 cents a pound, which would be choice feeds for feeders. Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I have a record of feeder cattle being purchased by people in my State for 40 cents a pound. Of course, fairly well taken care of, but they are still 40-cents-a-pound feeders which have been purchased in recent months.

Mr. THYE. I concur with the Senator from Iowa. I stated the price range for feeder calves last fall. The choice feeders are the ones which cost the feeders which have been purchased in recent months for feeder calves last fall. The choice feeders are those which cost $1 up and $2 a hundred. Yesterday it broke $1 up to $2.50 a hundred. That means that the price of those cattle has gone from $1 to $2 a hundred. I am now speaking of the choice grade. In the case of the poorer quality unfinished cattle, which ought to go into the yards.

Mr. WHERRY. The feeders are $5 a hundred, and no one was bidding to carry them over as feeders, so that they prices which are not only going to hurt, but in some cases break the men who are in the market today to try to fill up feed lots which were emptied yesterday because of the OPS order.

I should like to read further information as to what the producer is faced with in the cost of his operations. A three-plow tractor on rubber tires sold in March of 1946 for $1,970. The same identical tractor sold in March, 1951, 3 years later, for $2,580. Some manufacturers can make the increased cost with which the producer is faced.

On top of that, the producer is now being told to get more meat for less money. The fact of the matter is that these are the replacement cattle. Mr. THYE. The reason for that is that those are the replacement cattle. Mr. THYE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. A feeder who finishes and sells his cattle ordinarily buys replacement cattle. The feeders are scared. They do not know what is going to happen. There is no hope of the replacement cattle, which ought to go back into the feed lot, as the distinguished Senator from Minnesota has already said, are a drug on the market.

Mr. THYE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. They are selling at prices which are not only going to hurt, but in some cases break the men who have put that money into such cattle to carry them over as feeders, so that they may sell them to the farmers of Minnesota and Iowa for the purpose of preparing a protein-rich food for the Nation.

Mr. THYE. An animal will ordinarily gain 2½ pounds a day. Today such animals are coming to market when normally they would not have come to market if it had not been for this unwarranted OPS order. They would not have come to market for at least 60 or 90 days. That means that if the animal had been kept on the feed lot for that additional time, it would weigh 200 or 300 pounds more. The bone structure of the carcass of the animal would carry that additional weight, and the buyer would not be able to do so at a percentage of error. I am getting down to the facts. The result is that steaks, roasts, short ribs, and all the other cuts of beef are less because of the 200 or 300 pounds shortage in the weight of the animal.

The simple fact is that within 60 days the housewife will not find in the market the beef which she would have found if the cattle had been finished to their normal condition and normal quality, as would have been the case if it had not been for the unwise order.

Mr. THYE. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator know how much the rollback is supposed to be when it is completed? Mr. THYE. The rollback cannot be figured in dollars and cents.

Mr. WHERRY. How much is it per hundred pounds?

Mr. THYE. The fact of the matter is that the rollback is figured in the light of what has happened in South St. Paul and in the Omaha yards within the past 2 days.

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

Mr. THYE. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I may say that the rollback could not be more than $6.96 a hundred, because that would roll the prices back to June 15 prices. I understand that it is planned to roll back prices 6 cents a pound to the farmer. At last they have found a short-cut to rationing, because they are going to reduce the supply severely, and possibly necessitate the rationing of beef by next winter if the roll-back is permitted to stand.

Mr. THYE. A reading of the order of Mr. DiSalle, which I hold in my hand, discloses that it shows specifically and in detail the effects of the roll-back on the cattle producer. It shows that the cattle in the suggested yard and a heavy run, prices go back far beyond what the official roll-back actually requires. That is what is happening, not only in South St. Paul, but in St. Cloud and in other yards. It will continue to happen, because who can feed livestock in the face of a daily loss on the feed which is placed in the feed lots to feed those animals? The owners must sell them, because every day they feed they are taking a loss. Therefore, cattle are coming to market unfinished.

Mr. THYE. The ceiling and the official roll-back are not the only factors that are rolling back the prices of beef animals in the markets as of today. A reflex action is being felt on the pork market. The producer is now being told to get more meat for less money. That is the same quality milk which is consumed in the Washington milk market.

Mr. AIKEN. A moment ago I stated that prices could not be rolled back more than $6.96 a hundred. I was in error. They cannot roll the ceiling back more than that amount. If they roll the ceiling back, they are taking a loss. The owners must sell them, because every day they feed they are taking a loss. Therefore, cattle are coming to market unfinished.

Mr. THYE. The ceiling and the official roll-back are not the only factors that are rolling back the prices of beef animals in the markets as of today. A reflex action is being felt on the pork market.

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

Mr. THYE. I yield.

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

Mr. THYE. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator know how much the rollback is supposed to be when it is completed? Mr. THYE. The rollback cannot be figured in dollars and cents.

Mr. WHERRY. How much is it per hundred pounds?

Mr. THYE. The fact of the matter is that the rollback is figured in the light of what has happened in South St. Paul and in the Omaha yards within the past 2 days.

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

Mr. THYE. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I may say that the rollback could not be more than $6.96 a hundred, because that would roll the prices back to June 15 prices. I understand that it is planned to roll back prices 6 cents a pound to the farmer. At last they have found a short-cut to rationing, because they are going to reduce the supply severely, and possibly necessitate the rationing of beef by next winter if the roll-back is permitted to stand.

Mr. THYE. A reading of the order of Mr. DiSalle, which I hold in my hand, discloses that it shows specifically and in detail the effects of the roll-back on the cattle producer. It shows that the cattle in the suggested yard and a heavy run, prices go back far beyond what the official roll-back actually requires. That is what is happening, not only in South St. Paul, but in St. Cloud and in other yards. It will continue to happen, because who can feed livestock in the face of a daily loss on the feed which is placed in the feed lots to feed those animals? The owners must sell them, because every day they feed they are taking a loss. Therefore, cattle are coming to market unfinished.

Mr. THYE. The ceiling and the official roll-back are not the only factors that are rolling back the prices of beef animals in the markets as of today. A reflex action is being felt on the pork market.

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

Mr. THYE. I yield.

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

Mr. THYE. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator know how much the rollback is supposed to be when it is completed? Mr. THYE. The rollback cannot be figured in dollars and cents.

Mr. WHERRY. How much is it per hundred pounds?

Mr. THYE. The fact of the matter is that the rollback is figured in the light of what has happened in South St. Paul and in the Omaha yards within the past 2 days.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?
age of beef will not be felt, however, until a few months later?

Mr. THYE. I would say that a man could sharpen his pencil and carry a pack of cattle before he mark down what is happening in the retail market very closely, wherever he likes to do so, and I think Senators will agree with me that within 60 days he will have great difficulty in understanding where much savings to the consumer will have been brought about as a result of the order.

Mr. AIKEN. There may be abnormal market conditions before August 1 in order to avoid reduction of prices at that time, but the real shortage in beef is likely to come after that, when there is a smaller number of finished animals to be put on the market, when they will be going direct from the range to the market at 600 or 700 pounds instead of from the feed lot at 1,000,1,100 pounds. If such a movement does not happen long the consumer can look forward to meat rationing, or obtaining no meat at all except through undesirable channels.

Mr. THYE. That is correct.

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

Mr. THYE. I am happy to yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I should like to ask the Senator from Minnesota if it is not true that the shortage will come about as the result of two things. The actual shortage to which the Senator from Vermont is referring may not come until 6 months from now, but the shortage will come for two reasons. First, because of the fact that the present animals on feed are going to be sold light. They are going to be dumped on the market. That will contribute to the shortage 6 months from now. Secondly, the feeders are not going into the market to buy feeder cattle to put on feed under the present chaotic conditions resulting from the actions of the Price Administration in Washington. Both factors will result in a shortage of meat.

By reason of the sale of light animals there will be depletion of the amount of meat which will be available in the future. The farmer who would be a feeder of cattle nothing scared to death of bankrupcy if he should undertake to do that in the present chaotic condition; therefore he is not going to put the same number of cattle into the feed lot that he ordinarily would today, or in the next 3 or 4 months, and that will contribute to the shortage of animals.

Mr. THYE. As the Senator knows so well, one can cross the good State of Iowa and find a tremendous number of beef calves going into the feed lots in the fall of the year. If one drives through there in the winter or spring one will find the feed lots full of unfinished cattle, that normally remain on feed in July and August and then are marketed. Such cattle are now going to be rushed into the market, because how can a feeder continue to feed the cattle when the cost of his feed is in excess of what he will receive for the cattle? Therefore, there is both a desire to move the cattle or take a terrific loss.

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

Mr. THYE. I yield.
this body prefers foreign labor to American labor it is undermining the things fought for in 1776. I know as well as does any Anglo-Saxon the history of this country. Under the laws of Sam Adams and John Adams stood for. I know what Washington, Jefferson, Madison, and other Virginians stood for. They worked to give us a Constitution and a Constitution, and when they opened the door to immigration, they did not say that citizens of the United States had to come from Sweden, England, and a basic idea in their minds was their great concept of living standards. Many races and religions have been the beneficiaries of that concept which has been knocked down today.

Any time we prefer foreign labor to our own American labor we are interfering with the basic ideas of our Government. Such foreign labor is so desperately in need of work, and that, of necessity, it will work for a miserable wage. Remember that none of us has a particular group alone that was intended to be protected by the Constitution. Our ancestors suffered throughout the ages, and the reason why they came to this country was to improve their condition, and try to obtain liberty.

I invite the attention of my good friend the junior Senator from Texas to the amendment which I submitted to the Senate. The Senate has taken definite action to the position which I have taken. The amendment against which the Senate has just voted so overwhelmingly would have protected American labor in foreign labor labor was the fact understood. But the Senate in its wisdom has the right to determine even that question, and I have no complaint whatever.

Mr. MCCARRAN. Mr. President, as I understand the amendment, it is with reference to a subject which is covered in an omnibus immigration bill which will be before the Senate within a very short time. It is a subject which is within the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary. It seems to me that the amendment should not at this time be adopted as a part of this bill.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I offered the amendment in order to be able to make a statement at this time with reference to the pending bill. The Senate has taken definite action on my first amendment. When I say "definite," I mean overwhelming action as to the position which I have taken. The amendment against which the Senate has just voted so overwhelmingly would have protected American labor in foreign labor was the fact understood. But the Senate in its wisdom has the right to determine even that question, and I have no complaint whatever.

My Republican friends love to attend Lincoln Day dinners and remember what he stood for. They have knocked down everything those men stood for. I am not criticizing Senators. This body has the right to make a mistake if it wants to. It is one of the basic rights of an American to make a mistake if he wants to. But the Senate has gone on record for cheap labor. There is not one of us who believes an immigrant, who tried to get away from a foreign country to escape economic disadvantages or political or religious difficulties. I know the history of the United States. The Senate has made a mistake. Any time this amendment gets only seven votes. The Senate has exercised its judgment. Thousands of children—

Children—

Thousands of children of veterans are not able to make a decent living because of low-wage competition by the wobblies and imported labor.

Some of us may have come from Norway; others may have come from Ireland, from Canada, from Scotland, from Wales, or some other country. We may have different ideas, but we carry out the ideal of America. The 50,000 referred to in the telegram are Americans of Mexican origin.

Thousands of veterans are not able to make a decent living because of low-wage competition by the wobblies and imported labor.

The amendment which I submitted would take care of the wetback situation, which even my friend from Louisiana believes should be taken care of.

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

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that an amendment such as I proposed by the senior Senator from New Mexico is needed in order to prevent the illegal entry of wobblies?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes: the wetbacks and those who come in illegally ought to be considered together. If we admit 500,000 legally, and a million of them come across the border illegally, we will not solve the problem.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator's amendment would put teeth into the bill; would it not?

Mr. CHAVEZ. It would do more than that. What about the veterans who did not receive their pension? Do we want veterans protected by us? Should we not do something at least to prevent wetbacks from coming in and keeping a veteran from making a living? It is not a question of giving citizenship to our own people. I do not care if my amendment gets only seven votes. I still prefer American labor to foreign labor. I prefer American labor to foreign labor irrespective of the fact that we can't get foreign labor for 70 cents or 80 cents a day.

Thousands of children—

They are even begging—

They must have opportunity to live like human beings and first-class citizens. The best way to do it is to stop all imported labor.

Is that asking too much? The greatest characteristic of an American is not the tendency to brag about this and brag about that, or brag about patriotism and loyalty. The greatest characteristic of an American is fair play. Why can't we be fair with our own? All they want is an opportunity to live like human beings and first-class citizens.

The Senate has exercised its judgment. This amendment of the Senate will not be questioned by me. I think it was wrong, but it was in accordance with our system. The Senate has overwhelmingly voted against my amendment. In my opinion, it would have protected Americans. I simply wish to make the statement for the record so that my position may be clear, and Senators may realize what they have done. I am disappointed, of course, because I think the Senate took a wrong stand, but the Senate had the right to take the stand, Senators have a right to exercise their own judgment. The Senate has spoken overwhelmingly on a very important amendment.

I now wish to ask that the remainder of the amendments which I had intended to propose be printed in the 

Rexxon, together with my argument on each of them. Then I wish to withdraw the pending amendment and the other amendments. The President pro tempore. The amendments are withdrawn. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I understand that the amendments to which I have re-
ferred are to be printed in the Recos at this point together with the accom­panying arguments, and that then they are to be withdrawn?

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

The amendments intended to be pro­posed by Mr. Chavez and accompanying arguments are as follows:

AMENDMENT 2
On page 2, beginning in line 4 with the word "including," it is proposed to strike out therein, then insert in lieu thereof "not including any workers illegally in the United States."

In addition to excluding any such workers under legal entry" leaves the door open for the protection of illegals by large­scale growers who want to exploit them. I believe that the Immigration and Naturaliza­tion Service has been doing an excellent job in the enforcement of the Immigration laws of the United States, and I have full confidence that they are following the letter of the law. Therefore, instead of under­taking this amendment, I would substitute "including any such workers illegally in the United States." There have been several attempts to bring to the attention of the few sessions before this pro­gress to legalize the so-called wetbacks. I think that my language in this instance is clear and without question as to its proper meaning.

AMENDMENT 3 (a)
On page 2, line 8, after the word into it, is proposed to insert a comma and the follow­ing: "and of their anticipated employ­ment in.

AMENDMENT 3 (b)
On page 2, it is proposed to strike out lines 13 through 17 and insert the following:

(3) To provide transportation for such workers from recruitment centers inside or outside the continental United States to such reception centers (or to places of em­ployment in the case of domestic agricultural workers, including those of the continental United States, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands) and transportation from such reception centers (or places of em­ployment in the case of such domestic work­ers) to such recruitment centers after termi­nation of their anticipated employ­ment, and return.

Transportation costs are one of the prime considerations in recruiting an adequate farm labor supply. Our domestic farm labor force could be better distributed if the farm labor could be transported from one area to another without the burden of transportation with mo­bility. Air transportation costs from Puerto Rico to the mainland and return are in the neighborhood of $120. Farm labor cannot adequately meet this expense if he is to return to Puerto Rico with savings at the end of his period of employment in the United States. Then, too, we cannot expect the employer to bear all of this expense since those in the Northwest or Northeast would undoubtedly at several times the expense that the employer in other parts of the coun­try would have to pay. I have a subsequent amendment which will enable the Secretary of Labor to implement this program.

AMENDMENT 4
On page 2, line 10, after the word "under" it is proposed to strike out section 501 of the same act.

"SEC. 503. No workers recruited under sec­tion 501 of this title shall be available for employment in an area unless the Secretary of Labor has determined that (1) sufficient domestic, Hawaiian, Puerto Rican, or Virgin Islands workers who are able, willing, and qualified are not available and cannot be made available under the provi­sions of subsection (b) of this section."

On page 4, between lines 18 and 19, insert the following:

"(b) The Secretary of Labor shall take whatever steps may be necessary and proper to provide an adequate supply of domestic, Hawaiian, Puerto Rican, or the Virgin Islands farm labor for the transportation of American farmers, including any such workers illegally in the United States, to such recruitment centers after termi­nation of their anticipated employ­ment in the case of such domestic work­ers, including any such workers illegally in the United States, and (4) the construction, lease, repair, alter­ation, relocation, expansion, and opera­tion of labor-supply centers, labor camps and homes, child­care centers, and other necessary facilities and services.

There is no doubt in my mind that the Secretary of Labor could do a more efficient job of recruiting and supplying farm labor if he were directed by statute to do so. Only when a person has a definite outline of his duties and responsibilities can he be pro­ected from unjust criticism that he is not properly executing the duties of his office. If the Secretary of Labor is to be properly executing the duties of his office, he would have clear and without question as to its proper meaning.

AMENDMENT 5
After section 500 it is proposed to insert the follow­ing:

"SEC. 510. Notwithstanding any provisions of law conferring similar benefits upon them, American Indians who are recruited for em­ployment as farm workers shall be entitled to the protection and benefits of this act to the same extent and effect as other farm workers.

The protection of the social and economic welfare of the American Indians should be our paramount consideration in any legisla­tive action, before such a bill is presented to the Congress. The United States Employment Service that throughout the United States thousands upon thousands of American Indians would be available at a given decimal wages and living conditions. The American Indian dislikes charity as much as any of us. The American Indian is a proud person. He feels that he survived without governmen­tal relief for centuries. Today he is asking an opportunity to regain that self-reliance and economic freedom which he enjoyed for so many centuries. Many of our Indian farm laborers have been in such un­American ways by certain employers that I feel we should take special pains to afford them protection.

AMENDMENT 6
At the end of the bill it is proposed to add the following new sections:

"SEC. — The Secretary of Labor shall au­thorize placement of workers recruited or transported under this act, whether United States citizens or otherwise, after the employer agrees with respect to such workers (1) to pay not less than prevailing wage rates set for the crop and area by the Na­tional Farm Labor Board as provided in this act; (2) to pay such workers their wages in legal tender at the end of each week, or at the end of a customary payroll period not exceeding a semimonthly interval; (3) to provide unemployment compensation for not less than 75 percent of workdays (as defined by the Secretary and the employer in conformity with industry practices) fall­ing between the beginning and end of each such worker's employment by such employ­er; (4) to cause any housing, subsistence, medical, hospital, or other services furnished such workers by the employer to conform to such standards as the Secretary determines to be necessary in all applicable Federal, State, and local laws re­lating to employment, to elect to cover such workers under legal insurance programs, or other types of compensating laws if such laws permit such electro­n, to obtain insurance to protect such workers from occupational accidents or diseases if coverage be so provided for occupational accidents and diseases. Insurance required pursuant to this section shall provide benefits no less than those set out in the following schedule:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Benefit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accidental death</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total loss of a digit</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partial loss of a digit</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"Sec. — The Secretary of Labor shall take such action as may be necessary to insure himself that employers perform agreements entered into by them under the act; that workers receive the wages due them without any unwarranted deduction therefrom, or upon any unwarranted deduction therefrom, and that any housing, subsistence, transportation, or other goods or services furnished by employers shall conform to the standards established by the Secretary.

"Sec. — A National Farm Labor Board, consisting of three representatives of agricul­tural employers, three representatives of ag­ricultural workers, and three representatives of the general public, shall be appointed by and of such other individuals as the Secretary of Labor may designate. The Board shall, after public hear­ings in particular areas with respect to par­ticular crops and area, determine the effec­tive demand for labor in such crops in such area for the production of such crops, and the prevailing hourly, piecework, and other wage rates and other conditions of employment applicable to such crops in such areas. The Board may delegate any of its functions to any of the employees of the Department of Labor. Members of the Board shall be compensated in accordance with the Classi­fication Act of 1949.

"Sec. — An advisory committee shall be estab­lished, composed of representatives of the Interstate Commerce Commission, the De­partment of Agriculture, the Federal Security Administration, Department of the Interior, Selective Service, and of such other depart­ments, agencies, and organizations and such individuals as the Secretary of Labor may designate. The committee shall advise the Secretary, upon his request, on hous­ing, health, education, and vocational train­ing, and of such other matters as the committee shall receive no compensation for their services as committee members.

SECTION A
Strange as it may seem, my fellow Mem­bers of the Senate, Mexican nationals im­ported for farm labor under contract are too­often enjoying better working conditions and
benefits than our own domestic farm workers who are United States citizens. Realizing that every Senator present is ever conscious of his oath of office, I have every confidence to believe that in this hour of national emergency we are not going to forget the first responsibility imposed upon us lawmakers by our beloved Constitution, that the welfare of our own people, yes, the citizens, should be uppermost in all our actions.

Gentlemen, I say that we should never allow any legislation which would place the foreign worker imported for temporary farm labor on a higher standard than our own working citizens with Mexico. I have simply duplicated those conditions and benefits in this amendment. Let us not forget our duty to the United States citizen who is a farm laborer.

**SECTION B**

The creation of a National Farm Labor Board is consistent with the report of the President's Commission on Migratory Labor. This board is the practical approach to the many arguments on the part of the growers and those who are engaged in our governmental officials in the matter of regulations, wages, and standards. This Farm Labor Board would conduct hearings throughout the United States, and could render just and equitable decisions on matters involving supply of labor, prevailing wages, and working conditions. It would be composed of nine members, three representing the employer, three representing the agricultural worker and three representing the public interest. I believe that such a board would be the vehicle whereby we would have greater uninterrupted production of our agriculture production. The board would be appointed and serve at the pleasure of the Secretary of Agriculture. I wish you to understand that any of the functions now exercised by that department, but would add to and strengthen those functions.

**SECTION C**

For years various reports, including the report of the President's Commission on Migratory Labor, recently issued, have stressed the importance of a concentrated attack on the farm labor problem by the various governmental agencies who are directly engaged in improving its unfavorable aspects.

Private enterprise has found the technique of government regulatory committees profitable. Government agencies have on many occasions found interdepartmental boards to be effective, not only in rendering better service but in reducing administrative costs considerably.

I, therefore, propose with the following amendment the creation of an advisory committee that will advise the Secretary of the Department of Agriculture periodically on the best procedures to follow in the solution of this complex problem.

**AMENDMENT 7**

At the end of the bill it is proposed to add the following section:

"Section 11. Section 2 (3) of the National Labor Relations-Management Act of 1947 is amended by striking out the following: "as an agricultural laborer, or.""

The position of agricultural labor today is approximately the same as that of industrial laborers. Wages were low; working conditions were worse; and the owners of industry were importing thousands of workers from Mexico. In the mines, mills, and factories. At that time there was no protection for the right of industrial workers to organize and bargain collectively. The National Labor Relations Act makes possible for industrial workers to bargain with their employers, and today unions perform a great service to both employers and employees.

However, the authors of the original national labor relations law, the Wagner Act, saw fit to exclude employees in large scale commercialized agriculture. This exclusion was added over the present Labor Management-Relation Act.

In presenting this amendment I wish to correct an injustice of long standing and to bring to employees of the 150,000 large scale farms which are in reality "factories in the fields" the benefits of a law which is applied to the millions of workers all over America. There are 1,000,000 workers employed on these large-scale farm operations. The large scale farm operators are in competition with our small family size farmers who are the backbone of American agriculture.

**AMENDMENT 8**

On page 3, line 23, it is proposed to strike out "$30" and insert "$200.

In supplying farm labor necessary for the production of food crops in defense emergency any of the prime considerations is the cost of recruitment and transportation. Our domestic labor supply could be better distributed if workers could be transported from one area to another under a cooperative arrangement between the Government and employers of such workers. Section 984 provides that employers shall pay the Government $20 for each laborer transported. That figure is based on the actual cost of transportation from recruitment centers in Mexico to the Mexican border. What about the employers of such labor in the Pacific Northwest or the sugar beet fields of Montana? What about the 150,000 Puerto Rican workers who are available for employment in the continental United States? The cost of transportation of Puerto Ricans to New Jersey is about $120 round trip. This provision either means that employers will be subsidized from the Public Treasury or there will be no labor sent to points within a few hundred miles of our southern border. I, therefore, propose an amendment which would require employers to reimburse the Government the actual costs of such transportation and subsidies not to exceed $200.

**AMENDMENT 9**

On page 7, line 16, it is proposed to strike out "1952" and insert in lieu thereof "1951."

Proponents of this legislation have repeatedly stated that this is primarily an emergency or stop-gap measure to enable our Government to renew its agreements with the Republic of Mexico for the importation of Mexican nationals for farm labor. While this particular measure was being considered by various members of both houses of Congress, the report of the President's Commission on Migratory Labor was issued. This long overdue study, thorough and practical in its approach, points very clearly to the need for extensive revision of present policies and administrative procedures to effectively solve this blight of our labor problem. In order to arrive at a long range solution of the problem, the processes now in existence would require reworking of the Administration so that the actual costs of such transportation and subsidies not to exceed $200.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Record several telegrams I have received indicating opposition to the pending bill.

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

_SANTA FE, N. MEX., May 1, 1951._

United States Senator CHAVEZ, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.: Would appreciate your amending Ellender bill. We favor establishment better working conditions for all agricultural workers and better organization.

Archbishop Edwin V. Byrne.

_CORPUS CHRISTI, TEX., May 1, 1951._


_D. J. A. GARCIA._

SAN ANTONIO, TEX., April 30, 1951._

Senator CHAVEZ, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.: Lulacs of San Antonio endorse your stand opposing authorization of imported Mexican labor. Texas labor cheaper by importing aliens.

LULAC COUNCIL OF SAN ANTONIO._

_TUCSON, N. MEX., April 30, 1951._

Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.: We are not in favor of Senate bill 984 as originally Introduced. Please endeavor to amend same.

CORONADO PHARMACY._

EXTENSA, N. MEX._

_SANTA FE, N. MEX., April 30, 1951._

Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.: Dear Senator: We are opposed to the Ellender bill. Thank you for your stand on this bill.

J. C. SANCHEZ._

_TUCSON, N. MEX., April 30, 1951._

Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.: Please endeavor to amend Senatorial bill 984. Present bill is detrimental to our laboring people in New Mexico.

MARKELINO MARTINEZ, J. P. REAL, QUESTA.

MR. CORDON. Mr. President, I call up my amendment designated "M," and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerks will state the same.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, it is proposed to strike out lines 7 to 12, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

(6) to establish and operate reception centers in the continental United States for the purpose of receiving and housing such workers while arrangements are being made for their employment in, or departure from, the continental United States; Provided, That such reception centers shall be distributed geographically so as to provide, as far as practicable, equality of costs and opportunity of recruitment of workers in the areas where the Secretary finds it necessary to establish them.

MR. CORDON. Mr. President, first I wish the Record to show that my col-
If I had before it, from the Pacific insufficient to meet the needs of culture even were there no increase in agricultural labor, which would be higher than agricultural wages. It United States from the circumstance need for the proposed legislation arises through the 48 to equalize the costs of the labor and its of the Secretary of Labor would serve the number of reception centers is a matter for the sound discretion of the Secretary of Labor. Their location rests within the discretion of the Secretary of Labor. The reason for the amendment rests in the vast distances within continental United States from any point along the border Mexico. It rests in the fact that the need for the proposed legislation arises from the current emergency, labor ordinarily available to agriculture in various sections of the United States is not available because it has been drained off by war enterprises. It rests in the fact that industrial wages are higher than agricultural wages. It rests in the fact that the Department of Agriculture, which was created as the representative of agriculture in the United States, which speaks with authority to agriculture, has called upon agriculture in this year for extraordinary agricultural production. That extraordinary production is an additional call on agricultural labor, which would be insufficient to meet the needs of agriculture even were there no increase in production.

This subject was before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I call attention to the fact that the committee had before it, from the Pacific Northwest, Mr. Ernest Falk, manager of the Northwest Natural Council, discussed this very question in detail. In his testimony he indicated that the cost of Mexican labor in the Pacific Northwest to the farmer would be $2 per man per day in excess of the cost of local agricultural labor in the area. Undoubtedly the same ratio would prevail in other sections of the United States. That added cost must be borne by agriculture. Agriculture cannot afford that type of discrimination and continue to produce.

In addition to the statement of Mr. Falk before the committee, Mr. Fred Bailey, legislative consultant of the National Grange, appeared before the committee and also went into the iniquities of the situation which would prevail if under the terms of the bill foreign labor were brought only and then had to be taken over by the prospective employers. The total transportation costs to and from the border reception center would borne by agriculture.

Mr. Bailey advised the committee that it was the policy and position of the Grange that equity should be done in this matter. He suggested the type of thing which is embodied in the amendment which we of the Pacific Northwest present today.

Among other things, Mr. Bailey said to the committee—and I quote from page 53 of the hearings:

We hope that the committee will weigh carefully our suggestion for the establishment of recruiting centers for foreign workers at a limited number of interior points, with an equitable apportionment of costs.

That statement was made again and again, and I shall not burden the Senate by repeating it.

Mr. Clarence J. McCormick, Under Secretary of Agriculture, appeared before the committee and also went into this subject in detail. He called attention to the increased production requested of the farmers by their Government through the Department of Agriculture.

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

Mr. CORDON. I am happy to yield to the Senator.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Oregon has been presenting the case very well. I wonder if he knows that the Labor Department indicated a desire to establish a great many roadside camps for migratory farm labor throughout the country. This led to considerable apprehension on the part of the committee that we would have such a series of tourist camps for migratory farm labor that they might spend a good deal of the time traveling, if they could be accommodated at cost every 200 or 300 miles. I wonder if the Senator would not consider limiting the number of reception centers so that there would be no danger of the Labor Department undertaking to establish an elaborate system of tourist camps for migratory farm labor throughout the United States. I do not think we need more than three or four reception centers. But if we were to provide from six to ten, I think that would safeguard the situation.

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

Mr. CORDON. I am happy to yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. I understand that it will require some time to complete consideration of the distinguished Senator's amendment. The Senator from Louisiana, Mr. CORDON, he wishes to speak at some length on the amendment. Does the Senator wish to proceed, or would he rather suspend until tomorrow?

Mr. CORDON. I am happy to yield to the desire of the majority leader. I ask unanimous consent, if we do suspend now, that I may have the floor when the Senate reconvenes tomorrow, as I have begun my discussion. I assure the Senator that I shall not take very long.

Mr. McFARLAND. I have no objection to that.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the Senator from Oregon retaining the floor tomorrow?
Mr. CHAVEZ. Suppose the majority leader tells us about it.

Mr. McFARLAND. It is a resolution providing for the appointment of a joint committee to investigate United States policies in the Far East.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I would like to comply with that suggestion, but I remind the Senate that the unfinished business, which is a bill affecting American labor, is important. So I shall object.

Mr. McFARLAND. Then I see no purpose in adjourning, I may say to the distinguished Senator from Michigan, because without a unanimous-consent agreement I am sure we could not finish consideration of the concurrent resolution in the 2 hours time, and we would only waste the 2 hours. So it will be my purpose to move that the Senate take a recess.

Mr. ERASMUS. I will press for an adjournment at a later time. If there is objection, of course, we cannot proceed.

Mr. McFARLAND. I will say to the distinguished Senator that I had thought we would finish action on the unfinished business on yesterday, or by today, and that we could then take up the concurrent resolution submitted by the Senator from Michigan. I was trying to keep him from having it taken up for consideration. I want the Senator to understand that.

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

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I wonder if the distinguished Senator from New Mexico would withdraw his objection. I think the majority leader made the situation plain, and I have no doubt the Senator from New Mexico understood him. Unless the concurrent resolution is brought up by tomorrow and voted upon time will run against it. It was the desire of the distinguished Senator from Michigan that the committees that were to hear this in question of our national-defense policy and our policies in the Far East, should be of a bipartisan nature, composed of an equal number of Democrats and Republicans, namely, from the Armed Services Committee, the Foreign Relations Committee, and the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I should like to suggest that I believe we can complete action on the pending bill as well as the concurrent resolution submitted by the Senator from Michigan if we continue in session tonight.

Mr. McFARLAND. We can pursue that tomorrow.

Mr. McFARLAND. Why pursue it tomorrow?

Mr. McFARLAND. Unanimous consent has already been obtained for two committees to proceed. We will see what can be done by tomorrow.

SUPPLYING OF AGRICULTURAL WORKERS FROM MEXICO

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2984) to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, it appears to me that my good friend the majority leader wants to expedite business. We all want to expedite business. There is only one controversial amendment pending in connection with the bill, and that is the amendment of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. DOUGLAS).

Why can we not conclude this bill tonight? I am quite sure that the Senator from Louisiana will agree that we should endeavor to complete action on the bill tonight, and then proceed with the other business.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I understand that 30 amendments have been offered to the bill. Only two amendments have been disposed of, and the only amendments which have been withdrawn are those which were submitted by the distinguished Senator from New Mexico. If the only amendment to be considered tonight is that of the distinguished Senator from Oregon, of course, we could get through with this bill this evening. But let us not forget that there are 17 more amendments at the desk. I believe the distinguished Senator from New Mexico had 10 of the 35 amendments that were submitted.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes, I had 10.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I recall, 30 were submitted. If the Senator from New Mexico has withdrawn his 10, and two have been acted upon, that would leave 18 to be considered, including the one which is now under discussion.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I will tell my good friend that the only controversial amendment is that of the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I appreciate the cooperation of the Senator from New Mexico. He could have taken time to present each and every one of his amendments. He has cooperated in expediting action upon the bill.

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

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I am sure that the majority leader made the situation plain, and I have no doubt the Senator from Oregon would provide for those concentration centers to be only on the Mexican border. The amendment of the Senator from Oregon would provide for such centers elsewhere in addition to those on the Mexican border. So the question is a simple one. If Senators want them to be on the Mexican border only they will vote against the amendment of the Senator from Oregon. If Senators want them to be located throughout the country they might help, for example, the beet growers in Michigan, and the growers of string beans and tomatoes in the State of my good friend from Delaware. Then Senators will vote for the amendment of the Senator from Oregon. If Senators want the concentration centers to be only on the Mexican border, they can vote against the proposal of the Senator from Louisiana. If they want them to be located all over the United States, as they should be, they can vote for the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I am happy to have this informal discussion going on, without yielding to Senators. I ask unanimous consent that I may yield for further discussion, so we may reach a decision on this point.

Mr. McFARLAND. I thought the Senator was going to yield for the purpose of recessing. I do not think it is fair to Senators to keep them here after 6:30 or 7 o'clock unless I have given notice in advance. I have given notice here that there will be a night session. I have not held Senators here until a later hour without giving notice. I sometimes remain myself in order to accommodate Senators who want to make speeches some time as late as 7:30 or 8:30 o'clock. We remain in session as long as we have now remained more often than not. But unless notice has been given in advance I do not think it is fair to hold the Senate in session later than this.

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

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, first I want to pay tribute to the senior Senator from New Mexico for the fine fight he has made on the bill. I know he perhaps feels discouraged at the reception which his initial amendment received, but I think the vote on that amendment does not measure the true opinion of the Senators on the other which he offered. In particular I regret that he withdrew the amendment providing penalties for violation of the immigration law in bringing to the United States. I think perhaps the penalties which he proposed may have been too severe, since there was provision both for a maximum fine of $2,500 and
for imprisonment for a term not to exceed 5 years. But in the form of alternative penalties of somewhat lesser amount it would seem to me that the amendment would commend itself to the Senate. So, I hope very much that the Senator from New Mexico will reconsider his determination to withdraw the amendment, and will now be willing to offer it so that we may debate and vote upon it tomorrow.

I wish to say that I think the Senator from New Mexico has rendered a public service of the first magnitude, and all of us honor him for the very brave fight he has made.

Senator Pearsall asks what I wish to do about it can be done tomorrow, but it is useless for me to give notice that we are about to end the session today, if some Senators then attempt to have us remain here.

Mr. McFARLAND. Then let me ask unanimous consent to present the amendment in the morning.

The motion was agreed to; and the amendment and that it lie on the table.

Then let me ask unanimous consent that the President pro tempore. With respect to the membrane of the deceased, the Senate do now take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

KOREAN CASUALTIES

The motion was agreed to; and at 6 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m. the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 2, 1951, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 1 (legislative day of April 17), 1951:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Daniel K. Edwards, of North Carolina, to be Assistant Secretary of Defense.

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

Richard T. Rives, of Alabama, to be United States circuit judge, fifth circuit.

HOUS OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, MAY 1, 1951

The President pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

That completes the Executive Calendar.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of these confirmations.

The President pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

RECESS

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

The motion was agreed to; and at 6 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m. the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 2, 1951, at 12 o'clock meridian.

The President pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

The President pro tempore.

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

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. O'MAHONY, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

Oren E. Long, of Hawaii, to be Governor of the Territory, of Hawaii, vice Ingram M. Steinback, resigned.

The President pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the calendar.

NEW REPORTS

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Daniel K. Edwards, of North Carolina, to be Assistant Secretary of Defense.

The President pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Richard T. Rives, of Alabama, to be United States circuit judge for the fifth circuit.

The President pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

That completes the Executive Calendar.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of these confirmations.

The President pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

RECESS

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

The motion was agreed to; and at 6 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m. the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 2, 1951, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 1 (legislative day of April 17), 1951:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Daniel K. Edwards, of North Carolina, to be Assistant Secretary of Defense.

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
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The President pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

The President pro tempore.

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

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. O'MAHONY, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

Oren E. Long, of Hawaii, to be Governor of the Territory, of Hawaii, vice Ingram M. Steinback, resigned.

The President pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the calendar.

NEW REPORTS

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Daniel K. Edwards, of North Carolina, to be Assistant Secretary of Defense.
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The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Richard T. Rives, of Alabama, to be United States circuit judge for the fifth circuit.