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

Maj. Gen. Charles Bertoddy Stone, United States Air Force, to be Deputy Chief of Staff, Air Defense Command, with rank of lieutenant general, with date of rank from October 1, 1947.

Maj. Gen. Charles Dresser White, United States Air Force, to be Deputy Chief of Staff, Air Force, to be Deputy Chief of Staff, United States Air Force, with rank of lieutenant general, with date of rank from date of appointment.

Maj. Gen. Henry Keppler Mooney, United States Air Force, to be Deputy Chief of Staff, Materiel, United States Air Force, with rank of lieutenant general, with date of rank from date of appointment.

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

Maj. Gen. John T. Schiffer, United States Air Force, to be Deputy Chief of Staff, Materiel, United States Air Force, with rank of lieutenant general, with date of rank from date of appointment.

Maj. Gen. Kenneth Bonner Wolfe, United States Air Force, to be Deputy Chief of Staff, Materiel, United States Air Force, with rank of lieutenant general, with date of rank from date of appointment.

Maj. Gen. Robert J. McNair, United States Air Force, to be Deputy Chief of Staff, Materiel, United States Air Force, with rank of lieutenant general, with date of rank from date of appointment.


The following-named persons for appointment in the United States Air Force, in the grades indicated, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force under the provisions of section 506, Public Law 331, Eightieth Congress (Officer Personnel Act of 1947), and title II, Public Law 365, Eightieth Congress (Army-Navy-Public Health Service Medical Officer Procurement Act of 1947):

To be captains, USAF (medical):


To be first lieutenants, USAF (medical):


To be first lieutenants, USAF (dental):

William E. Ayres, Edward E. Dickson, Barnes E. Kenedi, Ray E. Parsons, Hubert W. Woodward, Jr.

Subject to physical qualification and subject to designation as distinguished military graduates, the following-named distinguished military students of the Senior Division, Reserve Officers Training Corps, for appointment in the United States Air Force, in the grade of second lieutenant, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force under the provisions of section 506, Public Law 331, Eightieth Congress (Officer Personnel Act of 1947): Wilbur O. Aaltin, Jr., Fred B. Adler, Burt S. Bailey, James E. Banks, Arthur A. Fagen, Jr., Wendall C. Gann, Hammond, Cecil L. Brewer, Elmer H. Green, Jr., Murray L. Brockman, Charles R. Hoffman, Jr., John A. Brown, Jr., Jesse A. Key, George M. Browning, Robert H. Krumpe, Jr., William I. Lindsay, Richard P. Cline, John W. Lloyd, Jack P. Davey, Jr., Eugene L. Main.

CONFIRMATIONS

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

INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND AND INTER NATIONAL BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT

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

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

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

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

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JUNE 26, 1951

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

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

Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carroll, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 1726) entitled "An act to provide for the organization of the Air Force and the Department of the Air Force, and for other purposes' dis agreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses.
The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution. The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut? There was no objection. The Clerk read the statement. The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 683) The committee of conference on the disagreeing vote of the House on the amendment of the House to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 11) entitled "Concurrent resolution reaffirming the friendship of the American people for all the peoples of the world, including the peoples of the Soviet Union," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the House and agree to the same.


STATEMENT The managers of the House at the conference on the disagreeing vote of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 11) reaffirming the friendship of the American people for all the peoples of the world, including the peoples of the Soviet Union, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the committee of conference and recommended in the accompanying conference report. That the Senate recedes from its disagreement to the amendments of the House and agree to the same.

The Senate, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the House and agree to the same.

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

This resolution was introduced on February 8, 1951, simultaneously in the House and the other body. It was adopted unanimously in the other body. The resolution received most careful study by the Committee on Foreign Affairs and numerous changes were made at the suggestion of various members of that committee. It was reported unanimously from the Committee on Foreign Affairs and came to the floor on June 4, 1951.

Unfortunately, on that day, there was an agreement between the leadership that there would be no roll-call votes. When the resolution was before the House for passage, a division was asked for by a Member and the resolution was adopted on a 3 to 7 vote.

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

The damage to our good faith had to be restored. The Senate conference report is now before this House and the House resolutions differing were then sent to conference. The Senate conference adopted verbatim the House version.

A roll call will be asked so that this House can tell in overwhelming numbers what it, too, stands for a just and lasting peace and friendship for all the world's peoples and inviting the Russian people to work with the American people to advance the cause of peace. To be effective, this resolution should be passed as near to unanimity as possible.

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

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

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

Mr. RIBICOFF. That is correct.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. RIBICOFF. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. Judd).

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

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

This resolution is evidence that we have learned something from that experience. We do not want to make the same kind of mistake again. It is designed to begin the process of hammering away relentlessly in every possible way to pierce the iron curtain and get through to the people who are enslaved behind it that the American people do differentiate sharply between their tyrannical Communist governments and the people themselves. The governments are our enemy. They are the enemy of all free
peoples. The peoples of those countries are fighting for their freedom. In my judgment, why should we make the maximum effort to make clear to those peoples that we have no attitude toward them whatsoever except one of complete good will and a desire to encourage them in their efforts to regain their freedom.

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

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

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

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

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

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

The authors of the resolution seek to contradict the Soviet Government with the Soviet people. The falsehood and duplicity of such an assertion is only too obvious. The Soviet Government is serving only the interests of the present regime. The Soviet Government seeks to undermine and destroy the present regime. The Soviet people, for their part, know that the resolution is not a reflection of the complete(reader's note: possibly a typographical error) and confidence of the people. The Soviet Government is firmly and persistently fighting for peace because it is thereby expressing the will of the people, defending the vital interests of the people.

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

Their squirming denial demonstrates the wisdom and good strategy of a policy of sound ideological warfare in this struggle with a relentless enemy. So if we want to win the over-all struggle with a minimum of cost in lives, we must do everything we can to weaken the enemy's home front as well as to strengthen ourselves and our allies.

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

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

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

Mr. JUDD. It does not mention them by name, but you will note it says it is the deepest wish of our Nation to join with all other nations in preserving the dignity of man. It reafirms the historic and abiding friendship of the American people for all other peoples. It begins with the major premise: The people of the United States are friendly toward all peoples. Among all peoples are the Russian peoples. Therefore we are friendly toward them.

Then we direct our attack at the Soviet Government because the real enemy is not the people of Russia or the people or the government of Czechoslovakia or of Poland or of North Korea; the real enemy is the political situation in the Kremlin. Why should we not pin the responsibility of putting up the iron curtain on the Soviet Government? That is the purpose of the resolution.

Mr. RANKIN. You cannot make clear the real enemy is not the people of Russia or the people of any nation, but that of all nations. Certainly it can do no harm. We are not suspect so far as the people are concerned, but there are certain governments that are making an effort to make us suspect and that is what we want to overcome. This expression should be helpful.

Mr. GROSS. Then why not brand this resolution at those particular headings of the statement.

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

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

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

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. I yield.

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. I yield.

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

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

Mr. RANKIN. You cannot make peace with people by carrying on a carpetbag administration, and by hanging German soldiers, doctors, and civilians 5 or 6 years after the close of the war. We know what happened after the War and the States in the South have never got over it. It has
The thing we need most today is for the evil blunders of reconstruction. Yet we have not the war, but it was over man people. We may need them. Mr. REECE of Tennessee. I hope that condition will be overcome. Mr. WOOD of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield? Mr. WOOD of Idaho. I yield. Mr. WOOD of Idaho. Do you not think we ought to find out the constitutional authority for this resolution, wherein the effort to settle with other countries is entirely 100 percent through the present State Department, which has been taken over from the American people and the American Congress? Mr. REECE of Tennessee. This resolution expresses the hope that the President will find some manner of sending an expression to the German people. The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired. Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON]. Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I believe at this time the Congress would like to have a statement on the floor as to the answer of the Secretary of State to my question this morning, on the Foreign Affairs Committee this morning. The Secretary of State has stated that he will not enter into negotiations with the North Koreans or with Communist China. The insurance that each of those nations will conform to the Geneva Convention on American and Allied Prisoners. That will mean good news to the relatives and the families of the soldiers of this country who have been taken prisoner. There will be no talk of peace unless these opponents tell us who the prisoners are, where they are located, their mailing addresses, and that we identify them, and show us that they took care of the wounded; and, in addition, let our packages and medical supplies through to them. The Secretary of State secondly, in answer to my question whether Formosa would be used as a bargaining element in making peace in Korea, has again assured the no administration, and Formosa will not be used as any bargaining element in any peace negotiations in Korea, and that the freedom of the free people of Formosa will be respected.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield? Mr. FULTON. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

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

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

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired. Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. DOYLE]. Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I vigorously support the conference report reaffirming the friendship of the American people for all peoples of the world, including the peoples of the Soviet Union, and urge every Member of this distinguished legislative body to approve the same by his or her vote on the roll call.

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

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

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

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

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

Previous speakers today have urged to your attention that the battle of ideas is not less important that the battle of bullets and that both are sometimes necessary. I state that the battle of ideas is perpetually necessary, and I pray God that the time may not be too far distant when it shall be unnecessary to have any battle of bullets. But, until that happy day arrives, we must be prepared, if needs be, to enforce peace by virtue of our military strength and resourcefulness.

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

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

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

In other words, the raising of the human being to the level of personal dignity with the freedoms which are ours, for an idea which will promulgate human liberty of our own national security and the security of the nations of the world. This is the way we live, and we must let the peoples of all other nations know this at the earliest possible moment. This resolution, given life, will help toward world peace, peace loving and abiding. This resolution, given life, will help toward world peace, peace loving and abiding. This resolution, given life, will help toward world peace, peace loving and abiding. This resolution, given life, will help toward world peace, peace loving and abiding. This resolution, given life, will help toward world peace, peace loving and abiding. This resolution, given life, will help toward world peace, peace loving and abiding. This resolution, given life, will help toward world peace, peace loving and abiding. This resolution, given life, will help toward world peace, peace loving and abiding. This resolution, given life, will help toward world peace, peace loving and abiding.

The people of the Soviet Union are the foremost victims of a satanic tyranny—their own Communist regime. Since it came into power in 1917, this regime has murdered over 49,000,000 of its own citi­zens. The body of the Soviet citizenry is presently being tortured on the rack of the police state.

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

But the greater part of the realities of the situation are left untouched.
There is a very large area in our relations with the peoples of the Soviet Union and with the regime that now enslaves them which has not been covered. I have attempted to cover that additional area by Resolution No. 89, introduced by me on April 3, 1951, to which I called the Foreign Affairs Committee’s attention and asked that the committee give it early consideration. I have also introduced Resolution No. 4, pertaining to the enslavement of non-Russian peoples within the Soviet Union; Resolution No. 112, pertaining to the enslavement of the Hungarian people; Resolution No. 120, pertaining to the enslavement of the Polish people; Resolution No. 121, pertaining to the enslavement of the Bulgarian people; and Resolution No. 123, pertaining to the enslavement of the Romanian people.

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

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

I was deeply impressed by the speech of the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. Juns). He referred to the necessity of assisting these unfortunate people in overthrowing their present Government and assisting these unfortunate people in fields untouched by the instant resolution we are now debating. They also go into fields untouched by the instant resolution: Namely, the specific relations between the Soviet Government and the various classes of Soviet society, the basic rights of the Soviet citizens as human beings, specific measures that might be taken to help the peoples of the Soviet Union toward their liberation.

I am sure the gentleman knows I cannot give him any assurance that we are going ahead and fulfill the desire of these peaceful peoples that they be punished.

Mr. RICHARDS. I am sure the gentleman knows I cannot give him any assurance that we are going ahead and fulfill the desire of these peaceful peoples that they be punished.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

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

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

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

Once upon a time not very long ago I had the rare and unusual experience of a private conversation outside the Great Russian Foreign Commissar. I said to him: “My country is strong, and proud, and great, and is prepared to defend itself against aggression. I know that your country is strong, and it wants war or its terrible consequences. We will defend ourselves if we are forced to, because freedom means much to us. But we welcome your help in preparing to resist victories in the field between your Government and ours.

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

Those are the ideas which we express when we vote for this resolution. But let us not underestimate its value because it is couched in such simple words and is so plain in its meaning. Great movements have always appeared over the horizon of history garbed so plainly. They may be the rearmament program which we deplore, or Government wants war or its terrible consequences.

People have resisted the invasion of marching armies but not the power of an idea whose time has arrived. The simple ideas expressed in this resolution when implanted in the minds of the Russian people may be more effective than all or any program of defense, or necessary measures for prompt action. They may be the rearmament program for which we strive.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution may have the unanimous vote of this House.
Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. Javits).

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, let us understand what this resolution is. The Russian people are not only kept enslaved by a dictatorship, but they are kept enslaved by fear constantly dinned into their ears over the radio and from various sources that somehow or other the "imperialists," and that is always pictured by the Communist propagandists to include the United States, will attack and destroy them. That is why we must keep them from learning of the desire of the American people to live in friendship with all other peoples, and to work with them in advancing the ideal of human brotherhood; and

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

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

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

That the Congress request the President of the United States and the Congress of the United States, and the Congress of the Soviet Socialist Republics to acquaint the peoples of the United States with the contents of this resolution.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GAVIN).

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

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

And so forth.

Mr. RICHARDS. That is correct.

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

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

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished majority leader from Massachusetts (Mr. McCormack).

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the reason that the conference report is before us is due to procedural condition. A few weeks ago this resolution came up under suspension of the rules, as I remember. On that day there was no controversial legislation and many Members were engaged in their office work or in conferences, or performing their duties with different agencies of Government in connection with their constituents, and the result was that there were very few Members on the floor at that time. You and I know that the vote on that occasion represented the will of the House as a whole. But, we found out, due to the fact that there were few Members present on that occasion, that the Communists abroad used that for propaganda purposes against us and against the very purposes of the resolution. Therefore a very practical situation presented itself to us as the result of which the resolution as it passed the House, in different form in detail than it passed the Senate, was sent to conference, to come back for a separate vote at a time when the full will of the House might be expressed on this particular resolution.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. GROSS. It has every relevance to it.

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

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

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

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

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

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

My artificial barriers, the conspirators have denied these great peoples all contact with the free world. They have
launched a "hate America" campaign of unexampled virulence. The Soviet peoples are told they have no friends, save their masters. They are told that the American people are their enemies, and that they must stand ready, at their masters' bidding, to destroy America. This monstrous lie is vital to the Communist bid for world domination. If it is not destroyed, the future of civilization is dark and forbidding. Destroy it—and mankind can resume the march toward peace, and freedom, and justice, and decency.

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

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

It reaffirms their friendship for their fellow men.

It expresses the conviction that the Soviet Government has done a disservice to peace by isolating the Soviet peoples from their friends. It states forcefully and directly that the American people abhor war and its terrible consequences.

It serves its purpose by inculcating our eagerness for just and honorable settlement of differences between nations; and invites the cooperation of the Soviet peoples toward this end.

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

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

We must acknowledge that they may reject the challenge. They may seek to keep the message from those for whom it is intended. If they do this—if they reject the challenge—they will have admitted their guilt, and their lies.

But we proclaim ourselves the champions of peace. Their deeds belie our words. Their deeds belie their professions. They are aggressors. They may at any moment launch a terrible attack on the United Nations; and get the weapons of destruction, even in the United States.

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

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

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

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

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

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

There was no objection.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Whereas the Congress reaffirms its policy as expressed in Law "to continue to exert maximum efforts to obtain agreements to provide the United Nations with armed forces as contemplated in the Charter and agreements to control the use of weapons of mass destruction and universal regulation and reduction of armaments, including armed forces in external security, guards to protect compling nations against violation and evasion."

In other words, this resolution undermines the United Nations, and would make of it an instrument for the perpetuation of the weapons of destruction, even in the United States.

This resolution is now a part of a plan of appeasing directly to the peoples themselves who live behind the iron curtain. If we are to keep the friendship of those peoples, it is necessary that our President be not only clearly understood, but also understood. By this resolution we are trying to get the thoughts of this body about peace to the ordinary man at the street level. If there is any vulnerable point in this world, I think it is that we are striking at it in this resolution. Our battle is the free exchange of ideas and I agree with the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Judd] when he states our position as fighting ideas with other better ideas."

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

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

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

The previous question was ordered.
The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken, and there were—yeas 351, nays 6, answered "present" 8, not voting 87, as follows:

[Roll No. 88]

YEAS—530

Adams
Baldwin
Baker
Barkan
Bauer
Beard
Beaudoin
Beattie
Beckwith
Bell
Belmont
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Blackshear
Boggess
Bond
Boone
Bowdoin
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Breeze
Brooks
Brooks
Brown
Brown
Brown
Brown
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Into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3263) to amend the Agriculture Act of 1949.

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. ELSWORTH), and pending that I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COOLEY).

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

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

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

In the past, Mexican farm workers, without regard for our immigration laws, have crossed the border and have performed farm work in many States. Our immigration authorities have been unable to cope with the situation. Many of these so-called wetbacks have been exploited by self-seeking landlords. Some of these are illegal immigrants in America, our immigration laws to the contrary notwithstanding. Some of them, knowing that they were illegal in this country, did not feel at all apologetic as fugitives, and they cannot, therefore, demand fair wages and decent living conditions. We seek by the pending bill not to legalize the entry or the status of Mexican workers under the terms of a contract which is negotiated and agreed upon by the officials of the American Government and officials of the Mexican Government, and it is clearly understood and agreed that Mexican laborers desiring to go into the farm work will be carefully screened before being admitted. Protection is afforded the workers and the landlords and both Governments are certainly brought about a great improvement in the deplorable situation which has existed in the past. This is not a local, district, or State matter. Mexican workers have been used in about 16 States of the Union in the harvesting of crops. Mexicans will not be permitted to enter as contract laborers for the purpose of accepting employment in our country except upon certification to the effect that no American is available to perform the services. How then can it possibly be contended that Mexican laborers will take over the jobs of American workers?

I would like to call your attention to the fact that our cotton farmers have been called upon to produce a 16,000,000-bale cotton crop. Almost all of the American cotton crop must be picked by human hands, and cotton pickers in sufficient numbers are not available in the American labor market. Unfortunately, there is no cotton to be grown in any other State. This situation is not only true in the cotton country; the same problem exists with fruits and vegetables and with crops. I shall not attempt to discuss the details of the pending measure but shall leave that assignment to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POAGE), the chairman of the subcommittee that conducted the hearings. He understands all of the problems here presented. If you will listen to him as he presents the bill, I think you can vote more intelligently.

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

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

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Traffic in these habit forming narcotic drugs has become a menace to thousands of young people in our schools and there is a determined effort being made throughout the Nation to stamp
cut this nefarious practice. I believe that the severe penalties provided in this legislation, which has also been introduced in the Senate, will be a deterrent to the peddlers and will help to destroy this inhuman practice.

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

[From the United States News and World Report]

TEEN-AGE DOPING ADDICTS: NEW PROBLEM?—NARCOTIC CHIEF SAYS ONLY BIG CITIES SUFFER

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

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

Commissioner ANSLINGER. Yes; it is.

Question. Can it spread generally throughout the country?

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

Question. Then is there actually an epidemic?

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

Question. No city on the west coast?

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

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

Answer. Yes; it has. It happened after the First World War, too, and the rate was much higher then. I hope it is a temporary phenomenon. It is happening in many other countries. Turkey is one. And you see parties and all that. In Japan, the first time they had an addiction was in 1910. That is a lot of it now.

Question. Do you trace it to the war?

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

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

Question. Is it correct that addiction among adults, among people, has doubled or tripled in 1800 and again this year?

Answer. Oh, it has. I think I made that statement. Cincinnati, Ky., for example, is a hospital for addicts we find that our average age has dropped 10 years, from 36 to 26, in just 2 years.

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

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

They live with them. But what education can you give children who are not in school? In a weak mind? Education on narcotics places ideas. I don't think it is a wise thing.

Question. Is there more addiction among boys than girls?

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

Question. Who use dope mostly from broken, unfortunate families?

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

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

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

Question. Is it illegal to smoke marijuana?

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

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

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

Question. What is heroin?

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

Question. Do young people get these drugs from peddlers or friends?

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

Question. Where do the narcotics come from?

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

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

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

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

You see, in the hospitals they use narcotics for preoperative care, to relieve tension and fear. If you get a bank-robbery job, or a house, and you get it all figured and cased, naturally you're on tension. A good shot of heroin will take all that tension and fear out of you.

That's why those fellows use it and why they are dangerous. Our agents are out there buying their drugs and we know that there is blood and danger. We have casualties. But usually when they play rough, we do, too—pretty roughly.

Question. How do narcotics affect a person physically?

Answer. You build up a tolerance, then a habit. You build up to a peak of 12 to 16 hours. That sets up a metabolism in your body, which you can't throw off. It throws you off. If the dose is 12 to 16 hours and you have 18 different withdrawal symptoms which hit your body. There is diarrhea, vomiting, perspiration, water running down your neck and mouth, cramps, you've got the jitters, and your skin is like a cold turkey. Nature does horrible things to him, to her.

You've had the pleasure, now pay me. And usually the drug addict lives about two-thirds as long as the average person. He's very susceptible to tuberculosis.

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

Answer. We like to have them 4 months. Question. Would the cure be effective and complete?

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

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

Answer. The record is entirely secret—the record of those who want to get over the drug habit be protected from humiliation and embarrassment. We would like to increase our force. And we like to have them come voluntarily to us or the Public Health Service. An addict anywhere in the country can walk into a police station and say, 'I want to be cured.' Unless he is a repeater, they will turn him over to us to be cured, secretly and without arrest.

Question. Does it pay parents generally to worry about this increasing use of drugs among young people?

Answer. Certainly it is a menace, as far as the situation goes. And we have to clean it up. We can't afford the danger. There is no question about that.

Question. Is it a menace that can be licked?

Answer. It can be stopped.

Question. How?

Answer. I think the situation in St. Louis probably is cured by the fact that Federal Judge Roy W. Harper gave a peddler there 18 years. There is a general exodus. We have 180 agents. It's like using blotting paper on the ocean. But we catch them—the smugglers, the syndicates, the pushers, the wholesalers, and the users. We can catch them. But we can't keep them in. They sell about 500,000 pounds a week. We put one man in jail, then start on another one. By the time we get the second one, the first is all red, and then the other is all red again. So it's just a merry-go-round.

Question. Does Congress help?

Answer. The merry-go-round probably will stop when the bills are passed to limit opium production in Turkey, Yugoslavia, India, and Iran to medical and scientific needs. The agreement was worked out by the United Nations Commission on Narcotic Drugs—the first agreement we've had on that since the United States enunciated a policy in 1909.

Question. Is there anything States and cities should do?

Answer. We are recommending that the States provide heavier penalties. Four States have done it—Tennessee, West Virginia, New Jersey, and Maryland.
We recommend that States and cities provide hospital facilities for drug addicts, instead of saying, "Send them to Lexington." We recommend that the United States Congress enact legislation to provide federal assistance to any state that establishes narcotic treatment programs.

Pennsylvania and California have the only adequate legislation in this respect. Los Angeles has the only adequate squad.

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

Answer. Yes, but the situation has been with us many years. It is not new. It has been pending in Congress 3 years, but only now are there signs of action. And, of course, there is a lag in action. If they all did like Judge Harper in St. Louis, we wouldn't need a new law.

A thought-provoking discussion of this nefarious practice appeared in the Path-finder in its issue of June 27, 1931, as follows:

**Drug Peddling, The Dirtiest Crime**

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

Their harrowing, first-hand essays—pre­scribed by the 6000 State-wide investigation of dope peddling—hammered home the uncomfortable truth: That all too many youngsters know too much about narcotics. The total number of addicts in the United States is not large—about 60,000. But two facts alarm us:

The total has grown by 10,000 in only 2 years; and the proportion of addicts under 21 has jumped from 3 percent in 1946 to 18 percent today.

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

**Lost Generation?**

It takes a lot to shock a New Yorker about New York. But the story back of these bald statistics, told in recorded interviews by the children themselves, had plenty of Gom­mittee in a mood for murder. They learned that boys and girls sneaking "roysters," "snorting" heroin, and "going on the needle" within the schools themselves—in the lunch­rooms, in the boiler room, or on the roof. Others were trailing their favorite habit bands to sleazy joints and mixing drugs with downheats. Still others indulged in all-night "fie-nications" in "hot palace" apartments.

For beginners, the children testified, the price is often cheap—at first. Initial doses of heroin are sometimes given free by ped­dlers; marijuana cigarettes can be had for 75 cents apiece. "Naturally," explained one boy bookie, "if they continued the habit, the price would go up to $8, $8.50." Addicts (it takes less than a month to clinch the chronic habit) soon find daily bills running up to $15.

**Solution**

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

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

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

**Importation of Foreign Agricultural Workers**

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. LYLE).

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Many of our fine citizens are of Latin descent. Their ancestors fought for the Independence of Mexico and for the freed­om of this country in three other wars. They have proven their loyalty and alle­giance to this country in a manner which makes their citizenship unchallengeable. Yet, they bear Mexican names. They have the characteristics of the people across the border. They speak Spanish fluently. Yet, the effective amendment would be to compel them to carry at all times, when they sought employ­ment, proof of their citizenship, in effect, a card saying, "I am an American citizen because I was born in this country and because I have fought for this country."

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

There is a shortage of farm labor in Texas, and in other parts of the country.

If the House of Representatives does not feel that it can pass the bill as recom­mended by the Committee on Agri­culture, which has thoroughly studied the problem and has debated it, then let it be defeated. Many farmers will find it difficult, if not impossible, to gather their crops, but I am certain that they would prefer that difficulty, that they would prefer to have their crops destroyed, rather than have this House pass ill-advised legislation which would be calc­ulated to cause much harm to fine Americans of Latin descent and would seriously the illusory hope of up­lift humanity. We do not want illegal forein labor. We want only a workable, practical, sound program by which the whole problem could be ad­dressed for seasonal employment under terms which are agreeable to both countries. If we cannot have that, we would prefer to have no legislation on the subject at all.

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

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

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

Mr. LYLE. Yes.

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

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

Mr. CELLER. I think the gentleman means he does not wish anybody to hire anybody who comes into this country il­legally. The so-called wetback is one who is in this country illegally, who does not satisfy the provisio­ns of the immigration acts, the public-health stat­utes, the narcotics statutes, the McCarran law with reference to internal security. You would not expect anybody to come in under those laws?

Mr. LYLE. Of course.

Mr. CELLER. All that the Senate bill does with reference to those illegal en­trants is to provide a penalty for anybody who conceals or hires or transports any
illegal entrant. He shall be guilty of an offense. As it is now, the law is inadequate, under the decision in United States v. Evans (33 U.S.). That decision provides that because of lack of proof the Department of Labor cannot apprehend those who were guilty of bringing in these illegals.

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

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

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

I would like to direct the attention of the House to the fact that this bill is not essentially a bill for farmers, or to help farm production. It has a deeper purpose and a deeper significance than that. It is the purpose of this measure to attempt to solve, in an orderly way, a problem which has been of great concern and of considerable trouble to the Governments of the United States and Mexico for many years. It is all known there are thousands and perhaps millions of Mexicans in the United States. They are here to work and help harvest the crops and plant them and so on. We also know, the report so reveals, that thousands upon thousands of those Mexicans are here illegally. It is a problem which has plagued our Immigration Service and which has plagued the Government of Mexico. Early this year a meeting was held in Mexico City between representatives of our Government and the Mexican Government for the purpose of working out some details and plans for alleviating this situation, to bring about some orderly way of having Mexican farm labor come into the United States and not be in violation of immigration laws, and not be the subject of controversy as between our two Governments.

The meeting in Mexico City resulted in a very short report, preparatory to a measure which is embodied in the bill reported by the House. The Government of Mexico now tells us, I think with good reason, that what is needed is legislation of this kind, which will make this problem of employing Mexican Nationals in the United States a matter of orderly procedure, by which Mexicans are coming into this country will be terminated as of the end of this month.

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

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

Mr. CELLER. I think it would be well for the House to know, and I wonder if the gentlema n from Iowa, with his great deal of information, as to what portions of the bill the Mexican Government has agreed to and what portions it has disagreed to?

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

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

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

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

Section 505 provides that workers recruited under this title who are not citizens of the United States shall be admitted to the United States subject to the immigration laws, and so on, under conditions to be specified by the Attorney General.

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

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

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

Mr. ELLSWORTH. That question will have to be answered by one of the officials of the Mexican Government. The answer was not in the report from the Department of Labor which is authorized to enter into arrangements with Federal and State agencies, and all the way through, the procedure under which Mexican laborers will be brought in is spelled out, and I assume and believe it is spelled out in accordance with, insofar as the provisions of the bill are concerned, the Republic of Mexico.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of this rule with the favorable consideration by the House, not as a hand-out to farmers, but against anyone who has knowledge of the presence of an alien in the country and who does not report that knowledge.

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

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

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

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

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

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

There was no objection.

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

The Department of Agriculture reports the average family of four persons will have 592 pounds of meat available in 1951, which is 81 pounds more than was available during the period 1935-40.

That there will be available to the average family in 1951, 166 pounds of eggs compared to 148 pounds in 1935-40. The average family has 126 dozen eggs in 1951, or one egg a day for every breakfast for each in a family of four.

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

Butter is reported to be the only staple food that will see a shorter supply during prewar years, and oleomargarine is expected to fill this gap.

Mr. Speaker, a check this morning with the Department of Agriculture gives the report of the abundant food supply for 1951 which, in fact, carries over into 1952.
Let us eradicate the cause of inflation rather than perpetuate it by treating only its symptoms.

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SADLAR).

Mr. SADLAR. Mr. Speaker, I am wholeheartedly in favor of this rule and shall support it. The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture has stressed the incisive work and effort put forth by the subcommittee headed by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Poage). I feel that an opportunity be afforded by passage of this rule to have the benefit of the explanation, the investigation, the negotiations with the officials of Mexico and the reasons why the bill, Senate Bill 2083 merits favorable consideration on the basis that the need of farm workers in this instance, is an emergency measure.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CRAWFORD).

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

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

session of the United States. Puerto Ricans are citizens, and therefore you have an entirely dissimilar relationship between the people of Puerto Rico and the people of the rest of the United States. I oppose the Puerto Rican government and the United States Government than you have between old Mexico and the United States. So, when my friend from West Virginia referred to this bill carrying an indirect and indirect, it might pay him to give some consideration to what a subsidy consists of. This bill is designed to provide a supply of labor from old Mexico. In reading the provisions of the bill I find that someone has given a lot of good thought to it because this language is more or less technical. For instance, suppose you as an individual farmer go into old Mexico and try to recruit labor to come into the United States to work on your land. Suppose five, ten, twenty-five, or a million other farmers go into old Mexico bring in workers. You can imagine what a perfect mess we would soon involve ourselves in under such a procedure.

Here the Government of the United States prepares to establish and operate reception centers at some places of actual entry of such workers into the continental United States. After those workers are here it is our responsibility to those people within the United States. American farmers can go to those centers and pick up their supply of labor, provided the farmers can qualify under this bill. I think that is the idea. The most constructive steps this country has ever made since the supply of raw labor disappeared here in the United States. Why did it disappear? Because of our disengagement from the war and the absence of migrants from the Old World, or Western Europe. For years we brought them in by the hundreds of thousands, and there was a constant supply of raw labor coming into this country and the United States, and from the Near East. In recent years that supply of labor has been discontinued.

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

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

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JENKINS).

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, in years gone by I have had great deal of interest in immigration matters, but of late I do not claim to be anything like an expert. However, I should like to call
the attention of those who are responsible for this legislation to section 509 on page 6 of the House bill.

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

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

We know that farmers generally would be apt to employ any Mexican who would appear to be physically able to do his work, and would not go into any details about how this laborer came into the country, but the Douglas amendment would make him liable for a severe penalty. But getting down now to my objection with reference to section 508 on page 6, it is this: I want to call your attention to it because if I am wrong of course I will be glad to be corrected. It says:

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

That means all the immigration laws—

The following resolution was introduced on behalf of our members and adopted unanimously by our members in the House.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

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

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

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

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

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

The following resolution was introduced and adopted unanimously by our members at our general assembly meeting April 29,
I have before me a communication from the Department of Labor in which the Secretary is stated to have said in late January, in early July in certain counties in Texas in the Rio Grande Valley, approximately 10,000 American agricultural workers, about 45,000, and 50,000 were on relief, and despite that fact between 1,200 and 2,000 Mexicans were working on farms.

Again, between March 13 and 25, 8,191 wetbacks were employed, while many American workers were on relief and out of work, seeking work. My complaint is not lodged so much against legal entrants as against the illegals, the wetbacks.

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

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

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

That must give us pause. It is dangerous for the narcotic carriers? The narcotic carriers can come in without hindrance. The illegal wetback is not examined for his identity, his citizenship.

I wish to call your attention to the provisions of this bill that exclude or that will put proper safeguards against those who would carry heroin, marijuana, and opium into the United States. Those who are doing that are I am addressing myself to.

At the proper time I shall offer amendments.

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

It now appears that the defense agricultural program will result in the American farmers cultivating approximately 28,000,000 acres for the production of 16,500,000 bales of cotton. The production of foods also is being tremendously increased. It is the duty of the Federal and State law enforcement experts in our Government that the complete utilization of all agricultural workers in this country will not be possible unless the additional 2,000,000 to 2,250,000 agricultural workers may be needed during 1951.

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

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

The Mexican border extends for approximately 2,000 miles, and the Immigration and Naturalization Service has a Border Patrol force on duty which consists of only 700 officers. Annual and sick leave, holidays, and the 5-day week reduce this force by approximately 39 percent leaving only 450 officers available for daily duty. When this group is divided by 3, to get a 24-hour daily coverage, and again by 2, because these officers invariably work in teams of at least 2 to 3, it means that Border Patrol teams are available at any one time to cover the entire Mexican border.

Despite its meager force, the Border Patrol is back on the 1940 level of apprehension and deported 7,000 wetbacks. Since that
time, however, the flow of wetbacks into this country has reached the proportions of a raging torrent. For 1950 the Border Patrol deported almost 600,000 Mexican illegals. This tremendous increase is the result of two serious blunders. First, certain groups of American farmers are granting employment to wetbacks as freely as they possibly can. They have been pressed for labor and the desire of Mexicans to enter this country illegally regardless of the consequences to our Nation that the Mexican Government complained very bitterly to our Government. American employers had come into Mexico and distributed leaflets inviting Mexicans to enter the United States illegally and accept work on American farms. Second, in 1949 representatives of our Government and the Government of Mexico entered into an international agreement which permitted the continued employment of wetbacks in this country. When it became known in Mexico that wetbacks were being given legal status and steady employment by American farmers, this created a vacuum which was promptly filled. The records show that in 1944, when employment of wetbacks was not "legal" fewer than 30,000 wetbacks were apprehended by the Patrol. In 1946, however, this figure jumped to more than 300,000; in 1950 it became almost 600,000; and if H. R. 3283, the Poage bill, is passed by the House we can expect the number of apprehensions to exceed 1,000,000.

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

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

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

An illustration of the danger to American health standards and the records of the Public Health Service. According to C. R. Kroeger, health officer of Imperial County, Calif., the more than 1,000,000 wetbacks now illegally entering this country affect more than 6,000 Americans with tuberculosis. Other surveys have revealed that these Mexicans have 12 times as much whooping cough as Americans, that the death rate among babies is 5 to 1 against the Mexicans, and that they have 4 to 6 times as much diphtheria and malaria as the average for the United States.

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

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

If the facts relating to labor standards and health conditions are startling, the truth about the dangers to our internal security are appalling. Because the border patrol is so busy apprehending, processing, and deporting wetbacks it is not able to man effectively an area originally designed; that is, to protect our borders from subversive elements.

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

The failure of Congress to treat effectively this wetback situation has made the American employer held responsible for the administration of this country by Mexican nationals only through the orderly processes established by law and by international agreement. I repeat, this country can be safe only through the adoption by Congress of legislation such as is proposed in S. 984 with the additional amendments which would strengthen the Immigration and Naturalization Service.

Finally, while I was temporarily absent from the Chamber, I regret to note that the gentleman from California (Mr. Walsh) injected some remarks of a "racist" character into the Record. He implied that I supported the so-called Douglas amendment. He wondered what I would say if the punishment involved the passage of this bill. In his statement, he made an unfair and unjust remark that the amendment would be directed against an Irishman or a Jew in New York. That is how colleagues reported to me his remarks which I did not hear. If he made that statement, it has rather unfair underpinning. I shall not attempt to extend answer. It speaks volumes concerning the thinking of the gentleman, volumes that are not very edifying in my opinion.

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

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

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. Anderson). Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York seems to think it is necessary to deal with illegal aliens coming into this country in the present bill. Why, we already have laws on our statute books and if properly enforced we will take care of all the illegal aliens who come into this country. There is no place for such provision in this act.

The gentleman from Ohio referred to the fact that this bill might make possible the coming into the United States of thousands of illegal aliens. I am afraid that might be a few come in. But if you will look
at the records submitted by the FBI, you will find Mr. Hoover states that we now have 50,000 to 100,000 Communists running loose in the United States, in all parts of the country, in every community, who are operating under orders from Russia, ready to sabotage anything our economy is to produce, as I have just pointed out.

For the 163 years that the United States has had a common border with the Republic of Mexico there have been individuals who have crossed that border in both directions without the permission of the governmental authorities. Frequently such crossings have been made by individuals. Certainly this bill in no wise adds to the ability of anybody to cross the border. The bill in no wise makes it more likely that there will be illegal entrants in the United States. On the contrary, this bill goes a long way toward correcting it. It is probable that there will have the substantial number of illegal entrants we have had in the past.

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

If perchance additional legislation in regard to purely immigration matters is needed, the gentleman who so recently addressed you, the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, is desirous of bringing in such legislation, but to condemn the Committee on Agriculture because that committee properly exercised a function which is within its jurisdiction, seems to me to be a little unfair and uncharitable on the part of the chairman of that committee. Why blame us if the chairman of that committee does not bring in the type of immigration legislation that he wants?

We are amending the Agricultural Labor Act. We are not trying to change or add to or diminish existing immigration laws.

In our strict endeavor to try to leave the jurisdiction of other committees to those committees, we wrote a provision in this bill which was questioned here on the floor, which provision simply says that nothing in this bill shall be construed to interfere with the powers that the Attorney General now has. The gentleman from Ohio questioned the propriety of that. We are simply saying all the way through that we are trying to provide adequate agricultural labor for this country. When we have done that the Committee on Agriculture is not concerned with social reform or immigration laws or with the jurisdiction of the Attorney General of the United States. We have sought here to bring to the House legislation which would correct an obvious evil. If members of other committees feel that reforms within the jurisdiction of their respective committees are needed, let those members bring legislation out of their own committees.
Let me review the circumstances that make this legislation necessary: Throughout all these years, as has already been noted, many of our farmers have used Mexican labor. Sometimes it has come into the country legally, and other times it has come in without benefit of law. But it has come into this country, and that is the issue. Right now the wages on the Mexican side of the river are possibly 2 pesos a day. A peso is worth less than 20 cents—that is less than the cost of the day’s work on the south side of the river. If the lowest wage areas on the United States side that same worker can make more than that amount by 1 hour’s time.

On the Mexican side of the river the population is pressing against the means of subsistence with such tremendous force that the Mexican worker who wants to provide for his home and family—and my experience in those places is that they have the same love of family and home that you have for your family and home—that man sees the opportunity to cross the Rio Grande and goes to work for somebody. There is a believed that the dignity of their citizens required that we reject that proposal of governmental contracting.

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

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

But the American employer who goes and gets those men must then and there pay the United States Government for the service he has had done for him. We did not propose to have the United States Government subsidize the transportation of workers either within the United States or from Mexico. On the contrary, we said in this bill that the employer must reimburse the Government for all of the expenses incident to bringing those individuals in except the ordinary expenses of maintaining the immigration service and other services which would go on whether they brought these contract laborers in or not. We put a limit of $10 upon these expenses in this bill. This limit is intended to restrain the Government, not to relieve the employer. This action has been criticized. It is claimed that it would constitute a subsidy because it has been charged that the Government would spend more than $10. Maybe the Government will spend more than $10, but this limitation will certainly tend to restrain it. The Government need not and should not spend more than $10.

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

Mr. Chairman, there is no subsidy in this bill. This bill provides that the man who employs the Mexican will pay all the costs; then it provides that he will pay the current wages in the community, and it provides that he will have the opportunity to recruit any Mexican until the Department of Labor—not the State Department as some have suggested—not the Department of Agriculture which might be accused of being biased toward the farmer, not somebody else—but until the United States Department of Labor finds: First, that there are not enough American workers in the community to do the work; and, second, that the importation of Mexican nationals would not impair the wage standard or living conditions of Americans if those Mexican nationals were brought in.
Those things have to be affirmatively found by the United States Department of Labor before any man can get a certificate to bring in a Mexican national. After that has been found and after the American employer has brought the Mexican national in, the American employer has got to pay his transportation, his subsistence while he is bringing him in, provide him with a place to live when he gets there, and then he has to pay him current wages.

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. FOAGE. That is right.

Mr. FOAGE. We are trying to improve the wetback situation.

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

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman was in Mexico during the period of negotiation between our Government and the Mexican Government?

Mr. FOAGE. Yes, I was.

Mr. COOLEY. This contract was worked out at that level. That is right.

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

Mr. FOAGE. There is no question about that. If you do not pass this bill, if you leave us with no contract with Mexico, then you are going to make matters worse than they are now. The people of the country, the people of this country, are not going to put up with more wetbacks. If you do not provide a legal method of entrance, the Mexican workers will come in anyway.

Again, let me ask you to search your own conscience. Under this bill these Mexican workers have an opportunity to make a choice between entering the United States under a legal contract, whereas at the present time, if they are going to be forced down those lines back to the proposition of wetbacks in the United States who are working illegally. If you do not provide a legal method of entrance, the Mexican workers will come in anyway.

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

Mr. FOAGE. Exactly.

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

Mr. FOAGE. This is exactly the protection that is provided. We have made provision whereby a Mexican can stand up and make a contract of employment with the assurance that he is dealing within the law and with the protection of the law. This bill attempts to give protection where protection is needed. This bill attempts to provide a workable piece of legislation that will allow us to save our farm crops.

This bill has been discussed with the Mexican officials. If it is passed, I am sure that we can extend the agreement with Mexico. If it is not passed or if it is materially amended I fear that we will have no agreement with Mexico and that this year's crop will be lost.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. HILL).

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I want to discuss first the bill itself, but prior to that I will say a word about the reasons before I discuss what is in the bill. There are a number of reasons that I know something first hand about migrant labor. For more than 30 years I have lived in a beet sugar producing area. For several of those years I was teaching in the communities where we used Mexican labor. I have had Mexican students under me while I was in school. We like to call them Spanish-Americans or Americans of Spanish descent. They are very good students, always willing to cooperate with the school authorities, and their parents likewise. So, I do not believe in this bill. In the beginning this afternoon and speak without any personal experience.

Mr. Chairman, I know that we should understand exactly what we are trying to do. The thing that we are trying to do, that this Nation of ours should have done, is the thing that is contained in this bill. Why do we need any outsiders at all? The answer is evident; the answer is obvious. The farmer is in a different position than any other type of employer. We need this special labor at a certain specific time. If there is no harvest of the crop you may need it in the planting season. That may be the time of the shortest and sharpest need of outside or migrant labor. It may not be there. It may be in the bean-picking season. Again, it may not be in the middle of the summer; it may be in the fall during the harvest. Now, we must have this labor during a short period of time and during that particular Mexican season. We need our crop without that help. If it is the planting, we cannot plant the crop without the help.

Mr. POAGE. Exactly.

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

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

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

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

Mr. HILL. Exactly.

Mr. JOHNSON. And while the farmer and his wife and children
Mr. HILL. And that very thing is not understood by a good many of the gentlemen that are opposing this bill. In the harvesting of potatoes 10 days may mean the entire loss of the potato crop, yet Members will stand on the floor and say they can harvest those potatoes over a period of 3 months.

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

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

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

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

I want to mention what the bill provides. First, it provides a way to recruit these Spanish-Americans in Mexico to come here, if they want to come here, and not under any organized legislation. It provides the establishment of reception centers and gives a program to direct them in a way that you have not had before. It also provides more in the way of medical care and subsistence than the Spanish-American people have ever had.

There are several other provisions that are just as important as the one I mentioned, but the bill also provides that you may go to this reception center and secure your own employees. It gives the Spanish-American the right to turn down a particular job if he wishes.

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

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

Mr. HILL. Now I would like to discuss how you get these Spanish-Americans over here. First of all, you must enter into a contract with the Federal Government of the United States. You just do not go down to Mexico and get your help. You make an agreement with the United States Government that you will do certain things, and they are spelled out as plain as they can be in any organized legislation. It provides the establishment of reception centers and gives a program to direct them in a way that you have not had before. It also provides more in the way of medical care and subsistence than the Spanish-American people have ever had.

There are several other provisions that are just as important as the one I mentioned, but the bill also provides that you may go to this reception center and secure your own employees. It gives the Spanish-American the right to turn down a particular job if he wishes.

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

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

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

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

There is no use of anyone's getting up on this floor and crying about us in the fruit areas working children. That is out of the picture. I am surprised they have not already mentioned that. Now they have brought it up, let us get the statement about child labor to wetbacks. So this afternoon you have had a demonstration of those ready to shed tears about bringing in wetbacks. I do not qualify my statement, but the evidence is there. I never saw a wetback, to my knowledge. I will have a little bit more to say about that later. I would not know one if I met him in the beet field. I dare say that probably not a gentleman on this floor can identify one to save his neck in the beet field.

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

These very men they were talking about went out all over the country to find out how badly we were treating these wetbacks. He did not know a thing about them. He came into my territory and called me up, and told me where he had been. What did he do? He brought a photographer with him to take a picture. He waited until we had a flood down there in that dry area where it only rains now and then, and then he refused to call the 100 people folks kept?" And he sent the picture all over the country, back here to the East, so that you could see all these poor Spanish-Americans wading around in the mud and bleeding their silly hearts, we were so glad when we got that rain. We were praying for it.

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

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

Mr. HILL. I yield.

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

Mr. HILL. That is right.

Mr. FISHER. That is done by the officials of the Department of Justice and the Public Health Service officials and it is passed to the Mexican Government. There, if they wish, every thing they can get can be found out.

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

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

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

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

Mr. HILL. I yield.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Any person who shall employ any Mexican alien not duly admitted by an immigration officer or not lawfully entitled to enter or to reside within the United States under the terms of this act or any other law relating to the immigration or expulsion of aliens, who such person knows or has reasonable grounds to believe or suspect by reason of the information obtained by him or the information obtained by any other person, shall be punished by a fine not exceeding $2,000, or by imprisonment for a term not exceeding 1 year, or both, for each alien in respect to whom any violation of this section occurs.
Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill introduced by my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Fong]. I earnestly urge the House to adopt this bill. It has the support of the American Farm Bureau Federation also the National Grange.

I should like to point out just a few facts about California, particularly the district I represent. In the Ninth Congressional District located in the San Joaquin Valley in California. There will be a record crop this year of cotton and canning vegetables. I am here to present a report which I received, dated June 22, from the California State Board of Agriculture. The production of cotton this year will be up 60 percent and the production of canning vegetables will be up 55 percent. Last year we had in cultivation in California about 600,000 acres in cotton. I have been informed that this year there will be about 1,200,000 acres of cotton. Other crops, including crops of tree fruits will be of above-average yields.

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

The conclusion is obvious that unless we have a supplemental supply of labor and other inducements into the military service, the demand for farm labor will reach its peak in October, during which an estimated 127,075 agricultural laborers will be needed. This compares with a peak of 78,970 in October 1950. This figure represents total hired labor force in agriculture and excludes farmers and unpaid family workers.

It has been said by those who oppose this bill that this is nothing more than a scheme to get cheap labor for the big farmers. Such a contention is not in line with the facts. It is true that the Department of Labor testifies that, first, sufficient domestic workers are not available; and, second, employment of such workers will not adversely affect domestic agricultural workers.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. KEATING. Presumably, under a normal economy, what the gentleman says is true, that the more food you produce the cheaper it will be, but some of the consumers in my area seem to doubt whether those laws are now operative.

Mr. Hunter. If the charge is that these Mexican nationals are exploited, mistreated, and underpaid, allow me to point out these facts: In my district, these people are protected in their working conditions and wages by State and local regulations, which the farmers must meet. Not only must the farmers go to the added expense of paying the Mexican nationals from points within Mexico, but they are also obligated to pay the going rate for farm labor generally in the area. Today in my district the lowest rate being paid for farm labor is $3.25 an hour. The average rate for cotton picking last year was $3.50 per hundred pounds. That rate, or an even higher one, will prevail this cotton-picking season. That means that the average cotton picker working more than 8 hours a day will make a minimum of from $12 to $16 per day.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Hon. T. M. HUNT, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Hunt: The labor situation on farms in our State and, I believe, in most of the States, continues to be very critical. In view of the terrific demands for food at this time, it is imperative that appropriate action be taken by the Congress to insure labor requirements and no action be taken that will in any way impair the future supply. Many of our Central and Western States rely upon Mexican labor and this labor has made possible food production which continues to meet the consuming demands of the people of our country.

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

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

We do not concur in the Douglas amendment because we cannot support the idea that farmers should become policemen to ascertain if the labor whom they hire is a United States citizen of Latin American ancestry or a Mexican national. It seems to us that the only constructive approach to this problem is to work out an orderly and legal means for meeting the economic needs of both sides of the border. It is only after such a method to the problem has been demonstrated that any rational program can be undertaken.

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

Sincerely yours,

HERBERT W. VOORHEES, President.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Polk).

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

The problem of migratory labor in the United States has become so serious that several months ago the President of the United States appointed a Commission on Migratory Labor. I hold in my hand a copy of that report. It contains about 185 pages of very enlightening information concerning this very, very serious problem. I regret very much that our Committee on Agriculture did not have before us during the time of this farm labor bill the information that is contained in the President's Migratory Labor Commission.

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

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

Mr. GATHINGS. The President named that Commission on the 3d day of June 1950, before the outbreak in Korea. I do not believe the President of the United States has asked this Commission to go into this problem of labor in Korea. I do not believe this Commission will be able to report on this problem because the President has not asked them to do so.
Mr. POLK. Nevertheless the problem exists. Every problem which affects all Members of the Committee might have the benefits of this very informative report, because it points out many, many problems and recommends numerous solutions. And should he also point the way with reference to this entire problem.

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

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

The report says:

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

Wage rates reflect graphically and dramatically the impact and consequences of the wetback traffic. In 1947, when daily wages for cotton (thinning the rows of cotton plants) in the Lower Rio Grande Valley were $2.25 (10 hours), wages were 75 cents at points farther from the border: in the Sandoz Lands of Texas, $3; in the Corpus Christi and Coast Prairie areas, $4; in the Boling Plains, $5; in the High Plains, $5.25.

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

Wages for common hand labor in the Lower Rio Grande Valley, according to the testimony, were as low as 15 to 25 cents per hour. To the north and west through El Paso Valley, we found a marked tendency for wage rates to be higher. Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. POLK. I would say to the gentleman that he has touched on what I believe is the crux of the whole matter. The recruitment of wetbacks is the main source of Mexican labor. Figures show that at one time in a study which was made in 1947, about 85 out of every 100 farm workers in the area close to the Rio Grande River were illegal wetbacks.

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

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

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. FERNANDEZ). Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I am going to address myself to only one point which will be in controversy and which constitutes the chief difference between the Senate bill and the House bill.

It is my understanding that when this bill is read under the 5-minute rule, an amendment will be offered to substitute the Senate bill for the House bill. The main distinguishing feature of the Senate bill from the House bill is that the Senate bill provides that any person who employs a Mexican alien not legally admitted to this country shall be guilty of a felony and shall be punished by a fine not exceeding $2,000, or be imprisoned for a term not exceeding 2 years, or both.

I do not question the sincerity and good intentions of those who sponsor that amendment, and I do not minimize in the least the situation which confronts us, but I am taking the floor in the hopes that I may dissuade the proponents of that amendment from offering it in connection with this bill.

In the first place, the result of that amendment if it should become law would be to punish the innocent as well as the guilty. It would deny employment not only to the illegal Mexican alien or wetback but it would result in denying employment also to thousands of native Americans who like myself are of Mexican or Spanish descent, and who like myself have Mexican or Spanish names. It is mainly for this reason that I could not support such an amendment. The farmer would be running too great a risk in employing those native Americans, unless he happens to know them personally, and the result would be that preference, particularly in the rush of getting workers quickly, would be given to Negroes and Mexican aliens with an immigration card, to the exclusion of the native Americans with Spanish or Mexican names.

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

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I yield.

Mr. FISHER. Does the gentleman believe that if he were called upon today to prove that he was an American citizen that he could prove it?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. And I may say to the gentleman that if I were to go away from my home community and decide to seek employment I doubt if I could even get a birth certificate, and there are thousands of native Americans in the same shape. That is one of the points I am coming to.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield on that point of the Senate amendment?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. The gentleman has touched an important element in the Senate bill. In order to convict under the Senate bill it is necessary for the farmer or employer to have knowledge that the person is here illegally.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. The trouble is that he would always be subject to being accused and arrested for self-defense he would have to show that he did not know all these things. Farmers have enough to do beside running to court to establish the fact that they are not felons. Consequently, to be safe, they would decline to employ Americans of Mexican or Spanish descent whom they did not know personally.

There are thousands of these in every community in New Mexico, and no doubt in Texas, Colorado, Arizona, and California. Those native Americans are well known in their communities where they and their forefathers have lived for generations, but when they leave their communities or their States to seek employment elsewhere it would be hard for the employer to distinguish them from Mexican aliens. Many of them, if not most of them, would like myself be unable to furnish a birth certificate. Like myself all they could furnish, if that, would be a baptism. The work season would be over before they could obtain such a record, if they could obtain it at all. It is a well-established principle that it is better for nine guilty persons to go free than for one innocent person to be punished. Under this law you would be punishing many native
Americans by depriving them of employment merely because they could not promptly and adequately prove that they were American-born.

Furthermore, it would be unfair to the employer. Immigration Service and our Government so inept and so impotent that it is necessary to make farmers act as immigration policemen or risk becoming felons. The present amendment as offered in the Senate applied equally to the employment of all aliens illegally in this country. Senator Brewster, of Maine, inquiring as to why they should be treated differently, they would have in distinguishing Canadian aliens from native American citizens, and so he wanted to know what was meant by the words "reasonable inquiry" in connection with the investigation of prospective laborers on the part of employers. I read from the Record:

Mr. BREWSTER. How is he to know that a certain man is not a native? Has he to ask for a birth certificate be required? I suppose conditions are different in the South, but up in Maine a great many of us speak Spanish and not too well. What is the employer supposed to do?

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Immigration and Naturalization Service would be expected to issue cards to those who are legal entrants, and the employer could at least ask to see a man's card. If he did not see to the card, this would be one circumstance in which he would fail to make reasonable inquiry.

Mr. BREWSTER. If he is a native, of course, he will not have a card.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I understand that.

Mr. BREWSTER. When a native of Maine goes to Illinois, he has no card to show that he is a native of Maine.

Mr. DOUGLAS. There is supposed to be freedom of migration within the country—and fortunately there is. The provision, of course, applies only to aliens. It is not intended to establish a registration system for persons who are citizens of the United States. However, those who are legal entrants are supposed to carry a card. If so, he could be asked to show his card.

Mr. BREWSTER. If he says that he is not an immigrant, what is the employer supposed to do? Is he supposed to investigate his ancestry?

Mr. DOUGLAS. There is certainly no obligation to investigate his birth certificate or to ascertain whether he has paid a poll tax or property tax or whether he is upon any voting roll or not. There is certainly no such obligation. But if all the circumstances of appearance and language and lack of identification care and failure to furnish any evidence of birth would give rise to a ground of legality of entry, the employer should make some further inquiry.

The amendment was modified and in its present form applies only to Mexican aliens.

The fact that it does apply only to Mexican aliens makes it all the more objectionable because it is discriminatory. Why punish the man who employs a Mexican alien? His implication does not implicate the employment of a Cuban alien, a Chinese alien, or any other alien.

It may be that we are in such a terrible shape with respect to wheat and other products that we dare employ a Cuban alien, and it is discriminatory, I believe, to deprive him of employment because he is a Cuban alien.

This provision is without precedent. If we are to depart from the well established procedures in the matter of immigration, I repeat that careful consideration by the appropriate committees should be given to the bill and provisions worked out to provide for Americans and employers alike from the hazards and injustices of such a policy.

Notwithstanding the recommendation of the Migratory Labor Commission, it is questionable that we should ever adopt such a drastic and devious policy. It seems to me to be immoral to make a felon out of a Christian nation to make a felon out of a person who, in Christian charity to say the least, gives a needy human being the opportunity to earn bread and shelter for his children. This country is too great to resort to the necessity of starving good people into submission to get rid of them.

I have in mind the case of a Mexican woman, Maria Paez, who came to a community in New Mexico some 25 or 30 years ago without immigration papers; as did many, many others for years, most of them ignorant of the fact that immigration papers were required. She remained in that community without being disturbed until 3 or 4 years ago, when proceedings were undertaken to deport her to Mexico. The only relatives she has and the only people she knows are in this country. It is her appeal that the request of the pastor in the parish where she lives and at the request of the people who have cared for her when she is sick and given her employment as a domestic when she is well, if a few days ago I was notified that proceedings to deport her would be dropped. The immigration officials realized that to uproot this old woman, who has lived for 30 years, and to prove her she be starved to death or live on charity. And there are many such Marias in New Mexico, and to them their neighbors and relatives will have to say, it is unlawful for you to earn your bread and butter.

For these reasons I plead with you not to go off the deep end by adopting this drastic measure in this bill. There are other provisions in the Senate bill which would seem adequate to accomplish the purpose, and to which I have no objection if they are added to the House bill, but which would be criminally inadmissible to adopt this particular provision.

This provision is objectionable on many grounds: First it forces the employer into becoming a "gestapo" for the Immigration Service or risk becoming a felon; second, it will result in denying opportunity for employment to thousands of native Americans of Mexican or Mexican descent; third, it is discriminatory that it singles out the Mexican alien; fourth, it is immoral and unChristian to starve people into submission; fifth, it has not received adequate consideration from the two judiciary committees which have jurisdiction, and it was not presented to the Agriculture committees of either the House or Senate. It is unfair to require us to vote on this far reaching provision.

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

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I yield.

Mr. FISHER. The gentleman has made a commendable and an unanswerable argument against the so-called Douglas amendment which would be vicious and would work untold hardship. In the first place, the gentleman pointed out that thousands of worthy, loyal American citizens of Mexican descent would be deprived of employment because employers would not dare employ them, and the government would insist on proof of their citizenship, which would be very difficult in most instances.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. There is no question about that. Even Senator Humphrey, when he was on the floor of the Senate, referred to the amendment which I have referred to, and by the way he supported it, but he pointed out in the Senate that this great Commission that the President appointed and which recommended this bill be done, considered it pretty far reaching, Senator Humphrey said:

"The President's Commission on Migratory Labor in American Agriculture, which spent a great deal of time investigating this problem—much more time, I may say, than any Member of the Senate has, and I think I am not in any making that statement—feels that my amendment is a rather modest, meek, mild proposal. On page 97 of the report of the President's Commission, the President has recommended the adoption in the amendment which has just been adopted—that of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Douglas]—I refer to him as one who goes so far as to say that the Commission is not sure that it should be adopted.

That Commission has done a very fine job. There is no question about it. I think that the two great committees of Conference before having to do any business with the Judiciary Committees of the Senate and of the House ought to take the work of that Commission and work out some system whereby if it is necessary to make cuts in employment, it will not hurt the Mexican or of what other aliens we wish to call them, at least some other provisions ought to be put in along with that to
protect people who are not Mexican nationals but who have Spanish names but who cannot readily prove, as the gentleman so well said, that they are American-born.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. The gentleman has also pointed out another flaw which would make the Douglas amendment contrary to every concept of legislating that we have ever undertaken in this country in this very discriminatory way that it makes it a penitentiary offense for an American citizen to employ an illegal alien who happened to employ illegal aliens who happened to be Mexicans that have been eliminated by the last paragraph in the very able statements made by the gentleman from California. Mr. McCARTHY, who has preceeded me. I do not think I will take all of my time, but there are one or two points I desire to mention.

Originally I was opposed somewhat to this bill, even though I represent an agricultural area that does need assistance, I thought that the defeat of this bill will mean the failure to pass this bill, not rise in opposition to an amendment that would encourage them. I do not think I will take all of my time, but there are one or two points I desire to mention. The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Mexico has expired.

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

Mr. WERDEL. Mr. Chairman, I concur in the very able statements made by the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. FERNANDEZ] and by the gentleman from California [Mr. McCARTHY], who have preceded me. I do not think I will take all of my time, but there are one or two points I desire to mention.

Originally I was opposed somewhat to this bill, but it was not as to whether the terms of this bill would be spent to support the community and to protect the community. Those agencies should have an opportunity to protect local workers. However, that has been eliminated by the last paragraph of the bill which was in the Senate bill. May I say that the area that the gentleman from New Mexico and some of the rest of us have been at one time under Spanish rule. That rule was carried on by very honorable families. There is a carry-over of much Spanish blood. Some of these peoples are the people that have preceeded me. I do not think I will take all of my time, but there are one or two points I desire to mention.
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solving a really pressing social and economic problem in the Southwest and in the far West, one which affects every American and which reaches out and affects everyone in this country.

We, too, are concerned with providing labor to harvest the crops, but we do not think we need to accept the provisions of this bill to accomplish that purpose. If we make the provisions of this migratory labor problem really a most serious problem. The number of migratory laborers in this country is something over 2,000,000. Of the other 500,000, about 400,000 are Mexican wetbacks, and about 100,000 on the average are people who are admitted legally from Mexico and a few from other countries. So approximately 1,000,000 people are affected.

The President's Commission makes this report, that the average annual wage provided in this report for the housing that they get and all of the other special advantages, amounts to about $550 a year. That is not all income from agriculture, that is not all the income. Their agricultural wage is enhanced by what they can pick up in odd jobs and part-time employment in industry and in the cities, either between crops or during the winter season.

You have heard statements in regard to health conditions among these people. You have been given description of the kind of shelter which they are forced to use.

There is one other important point I think we should not overlook, and that is the abuse of the child-labor law. One Congressman presented a statement before our committee which is indicative of the kind of thinking that is behind this bill. His general statement was to this effect, that the enforcement of the Wages and Hours Act in regard to child labor whereby certain growers were not permitted to use school children during school hours while school was in session, resulted in a great hardship. These children are the mainstay of the farm families. I am sure it does. The fact that any factory owner has to pay a minimum wage and cannot use child labor at depressed wages is a hardship upon him, if our only consideration is that of the profit he may make. Understand, that in these States they could suspend school, let everybody get out of school to work in the fields, or let those that did not want to work take a vacation. The objective is to keep these schools going so that some children, especially those from families which have sufficient income, can continue to go to school, but the children of the poorer parents can be taken out of school while school is in session and during school hours and be put to work at the stook labor that has been here described.

The purpose of the minority of the committee on Appropriations who said it should be a substitute is threefold: First, in the first place, we feel that something should be done about stopping the movement of the wetbacks. Second, in the second place, that the proper course should be given to Mexican laborers who come in under contract. Third, in the third place, we hope through these two steps to give some kind of protection to American domestic agricultural workers.

Under the terms of the bill we could not touch them directly. Actually what you have in this bill as presented by the author and in the bill that was passed by the Senate, and in the bill which we are advocating here with certain amendments, is that the Mexican Government is establishing standards for the employment of American agricultural workers. The terms of this bill is that the Mexican Government shall guarantee the wage and the transportation of the people who are brought in under contract which are not presently given to the domestic agricultural workers. For example, the only thing the government shall guarantee the wage and the transportation of the people who are brought in under contract from Mexico.

Of course, the argument has been made here that this would not very well go into court. What of the Americans? Take any American migrant who is making $550 a year, and he is not going to make a very strong case in any court that the Mexican workers do have that guaranty.

In addition the bill provides $150 for burial expenses for Mexican workers. It also provides that the medical expenses of these people shall be paid. For any such guaranty given to American migrants? Of course not. What is proposed is the establishment of standards for Mexican migrant workers in this country which would set the standard for domestic workers. We do not have any standards for American farm workers. As I say, we of the minority would like to get at that problem directly but we cannot do it because this bill is restricted to foreign workers, so the only thing for us to do is establish decent standards for these people so that there may be an economic motivation for the American growers to give fair or at least somewhat equitable terms to the Americans who might apply for these same jobs.

That is the problem in its simplest terms. That is the thing which we of the minority are attempting to do, not by defeating the legislation, but by improving it. We do feel that the terms of the bill as they have been presented do not go far enough, and that this is the time to make some real progress, first, toward discouraging the flow of wetbacks into this country; second, toward establishing decent standards for the contract labor, and so indirectly make some slight progress in the way of providing decent wages and decent living and working conditions for American migratory farm laborers, also.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Bentsen].

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Chairman, I do not question the intent of my friend from Ohio who says he will offer the Senate felony amendment to the migratory-labor bill, but I have this knowledge of the southern border of the United States and the effect this proposed amendment will have on its citizens.

There are many reasons why this amendment is completely impractical in its application, but since my time is so limited, I shall confine myself to a brief review of some of its gravest inequities.

First. First and foremost, it is completely discriminatory as it is aimed at a class of people. Many United States citizens of Latin ancestry will be denied employment. If this is accepted. Farmers will be afraid to hire them for fear they might be Mexican nationals posing as United States citizens. Combined with the draft, the farmers simply will not take a chance on hiring a man of Latin ancestry.

This amendment does not apply to those farmers along this country's northern border who hire Canadians or those on the east coast who hire Bahamas and Jamaicans. This amendment should not apply to those farmers any more than it should apply to the farmers of the South. When a supporter of this amendment in the other legislative body was asked why he did not apply it to Canadian aliens, he said, you cannot apply it to the United States citizens which is clear proof he does not understand the southern United States border.

Over 50 percent of my district is made up of United States citizens of Latin ancestry. Over 2,000,000 United States citizens claim and speak Spanish as their native tongue. As a practical matter, it is virtually impossible for the ordinary United States citizen, without the assistance of the FBI to distinguish a Mexican citizen illegally in this country from a United States citizen of Latin ancestry.

While I was a county judge in south Texas, I had men appear before my court to obtain delayed birth certificates. They would testify that they were born in this country and would have two witnesses to corroborate his testimony. In addition, they would offer in evidence a baptismal certificate from the Catholic Church to show they were baptized citizens of the Rio Grande. Being satisfied with the evidence, I would grant them their certificate. A month later the FBI would come in and state that the applicant and witness had perjured themselves before my court and that the baptismal certificate was a forgery. The farmer will find himself just as helpless if not more so in determining true citizens.

The Senator who offered a similar amendment stated there was no obligation to investigate the employee's birth certificate, nor to see that he had paid a poll tax or was on the voting rolls. Just what is intended by this dangerous amendment? Does it mean merely because a United States citizen happens to be of Latin ancestry that he has to wear a government dog tag or perhaps acquire a governmental tattoo before it is safe to hire him?

A man or woman of Latin ancestry who is a supporter of this amendment would be one of the major victims of the discrimination contemplated by this dog-tag amendment.

Second. This is a most serious and far-reaching amendment and yet it is offered here without previous study by the Agricultural Committee which has...
proposed the bill. It is logically a matter which requires the careful consideration of the Judiciary Committee with its jurisdiction over proposals relating to crime and immigration.

The dog-tag or similar offense must be defined in language understood by the common mind. The prohibited act must be described in explicit terms. This is required by the fifth and sixth amendments to the Constitution. But this dog-tag amendment, with its loose terms, is completely vague. It uses the words "reasonable grounds to suspect" but does not define such grounds. Thus constitutes such grounds for the farmer to determine that the employee is an alien who has illegally entered this country. What is the farmer to do? Does the farmer have to call the nearest Federal authority every time he hires a laborer? If so, who does he call? How does he prove the call? Must he report or inquire by registered mail?

This ill-considered amendment is an outstanding example of what can be offered from the floor without careful consideration. Congressional committees of all of the possible consequences of such severe and far-reaching legislation.

Fourth, this amendment attempts to shift the burden of enforcement from the Federal officers to the farmer. In all fairness, if it is enacted, we should put the farmers on the Government payroll as enforcement officers and turn our able immigration men out to grass.

Fifth. A further example of how little study and ill-considered is this amendment is the fact that it places a greater penalty on the farmer by making him guilty of a felony than it does on the smuggler who brought the alien in and is only guilty of a misdemeanor—United States Code, chapter 8, page 154. As a member who represents a district that would be most seriously affected by this amendment which has little or no bearing on the welfare of the district represented by a Congressional committee of all the possible consequences of such severe and far-reaching legislation.

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

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Burleson].

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Chairman, I subscribe to the able statement of my colleague from Texas who has just spoken, and I am supporting the measure offered by my colleague from Texas [Mr. Poage].

Mr. Chairman, this bill seeks to correct several situations which seriously affect the farmers of this country. In the first place, if the seasons remain favorable, the harvested cotton crop is between sixteen and seventeen million bales. This past year the farmers of my district in Texas had great difficulty picking cotton. They had difficulty in making legal arrangements to secure Mexican cotton pickers and then after pickers were secured, their children under 16 years of age were not permitted to work by reason of the so-called minimum-wage law.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have never voted for a minimum wage provision and am opposed to such a feature which contained this feature and which has worked such an injustice and hardship on the Texas farmers. Doubtless it has been most impractical of farmers in other parts of the country.

One of my colleagues from Texas, either Mr. Rogers or Mr. Mahon, expects to introduce an amendment to this bill, which will be the Fair Labor Standards Act and permit children under 16 years of age, when not legally required by State law to attend school, to engage in agricultural labor. I certainly expect to support the amendment and hope that no point of order is placed against it. If a point of order is made, I hope the Chair will overrule such an objection and support the amendment to be germane to the bill.

Mr. Chairman, there is such a thing as being practical, although it is not too much in evidence at the present time. For years Mexican labor has picked the cotton in Texas—to a very large extent. They live through the winter on what they are able to make in the crop-gathering season. Now if we want to prevent thousands of Mexicans from making a living, many of whom remain in this country the year around, by not correcting existing law is a good way to do it.

Mr. Chairman, farm labor is extremely short at this time. Cotton picking labor is always short at the time it is needed.

The Government is asking the farmer for greater production of most products, particularly food. Our boys are being drafted and reservists and National Guard men have been called to active duty, which further contributes to a serious situation. Now why should we not pass this bill with the amendment, allowing children under 16 years of age to assist in gathering crops in these critical times and provision in an orderly way for the farmer to utilize the services of Mexican labor imported from Mexico for that purpose?

Certainly, Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the Senate provision which places the burden on the farmer to determine that the alien laborer has entered this country legally. That is the business of the authorities whose duties are already prescribed by law for this purpose.

Mr. Chairman, I support the bill authored by my colleague from Texas [Mr. Poage]. I support the amendment to which I have referred, as a practical, workable, and just arrangement for the American farmer in the harvesting of crops so vitally necessary for the country's food supply.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 8 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. Mahon].

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I am interested in this bill from the standpoint of a consumer only. As far as I know there are no Mexican laborers in my district; that will be none if this bill becomes a law. I hold in my hand a monthly bulletin issued by the Bureau of Agricultural Econ-
Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Chairman, why is this legislation before this body at this time? If the contract with the Mexican Government will expire, so it is necessary that we bring in legislation prior to June 30 so that we can have the labor available when needed on the farms of America. In the mid-South area the workers have left our particular section and gone to the larger cities; they have gone into Memphis, to Detroit, to Chicago, and Los Angeles. They have gone where they can set employment in defense industries. Further, many of them have been called into the armed services. So now we do not have enough labor not only to harvest our crops down in the mid-South area, but we do not have enough labor to chop the cotton. At this particular time there are 5,900 Mexican nationals in the state of Arkansas chipping cotton. They are badly needed since our cotton acreage has increased greatly in the current year—the production of cotton up about a lot of labor to be here from the Department of Agriculture a report which says that the people who worked on the farms in May 1951, totaled half a million less than a year ago. So, you can see when we are asked to produce more food, when we are asked to produce more cotton, 60 percent more cotton in 1951 than in 1950—and we had an awfully hard time to get enough labor to harvest our crop in 1950—that it will be extremely important and necessary that we do have legislation to negotiate with Mexico so that we can recruit the necessary labor to be used in the harvesting of these food crops that are so highly essential in this emergency.

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

Mr. GATHINGS. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri. Even with your small crop last year you had to call upon Mexican help to harvest that crop, did you not?

Mr. GATHINGS. Oh, yes. Last year in the gentleman’s State of Missouri several thousand workers were imported. We had 21,000 in the State of Arkansas during the prior year.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. And you are going to have a bigger crop this year with less local labor.

Mr. GATHINGS. Yes. We increased the acreage this season this year.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman speaks of this as being a bill to help the farmers of the United States. There is not an ounce of help in this bill for the mid-west farmer.

Mr. GATHINGS. Whoever comes and applies for this labor and follows the provisions set out in this bill can go to Mexico and obtain that labor.

The gentleman from New York (Mr. Celler) is the chairman of one of the most important committees of this House, the Committee on the Judiciary. He came before this body today bitterly complaining about the Mexican labor. He urged that something ought to be done to cure the illegal entry into this country of Mexican farm workers. As chairman of the important Committee on the Judiciary, the gentleman has full and complete authority to present legislation to cure the illegal entry into this country of Mexicans. It is the gentleman’s job to do that.

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

Mr. GATHINGS. I yield to the gentleman, inasmuch as I have called his name.

Mr. CELLER. Does not the gentleman believe this bill should have been referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, since it is primarily an immigration statute? Further, does not the gentleman think that members of the Committee on the Judiciary should have an opportunity to pass on the provisions of this bill?

Mr. GATHINGS. I do not think so, because of the fact that it amends the Agricultural Act of 1949. It applies to agricultural labor. We are not coming in here trying to regulate the flow across the borders of our country or Mexico. We are not asking for immigration legislation in the least. We are asking this House to pass this legislation so that we can produce the food and fiber necessary for the support of our economy.

Mr. CELLER. I want to see that the crops are harvested; I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. GATHINGS. That is very fine. The cost is extremely high, in order to get the labor to the farms of America. It costs a lot of money to do that.

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

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

Mr. JOHNSON. It is not a fact that over 10 years ago the Tolan committee made a very exhaustive and constructive study of the migratory problem and it has been resting in the Committee on the Judiciary ever since, with not a thing being done about it?

Mr. GATHINGS. I recall the Tolan investigation. They could have something done about illegal entry of Mexicans or others if they desired to do so.

Mr. JOHNSON. They have taken 10 years to do something, based on a very thorough study.

Mr. GATHINGS. It has been said by the gentleman that there is enough labor available for use on the farms of America. That has been brought out repeatedly.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Does the gentleman remember who made that statement on the floor?

Mr. GATHINGS. The opposition has hinged on utilizing available domestic labor.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I did not say it, and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Poff) did not.

Mr. GATHINGS. It was said in the committee by the farm-labor groups. They came in and said, “Let us utilize the labor that is available in America first.”

The gentleman filed a minority report. If I remember rightly, in that minority report he has brought out the point that he wants to utilize the labor in this country. Does not the gentleman think that if there were a laborer available on his farm, if he could bring him to his farm he would not send all the way to the Mexican border, a distance of 1,200 miles from my district, to recruit labor? They go to the expense of sending a man down to the border on a truck and go to all the extra expense of paying the worker’s transportation by train or bus up to the border from Monterrey, Hermosillo, or Chihuahua. Hotel expenses and food are provided by the farmer, too.

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

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

Mr. PHILLIPS. The gentleman should point out that none of these laborers can be employed until the Department of Labor has certified that there is no other labor available.

Mr. GATHINGS. The gentleman is correct. Until the Secretary of Labor makes such a determination, he could not obtain Mexican national labor. What farmer in America would go to all the expense if he did not need that labor on his farm?
Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman made the statement that the opposition had contended that American labor was available in sufficient numbers. Then he was challenged on that and asked to say what he meant by that, and I am just wondering if those opposing this bill are frank enough to admit that we do not have sufficient labor. Is that the contention of the opposition, or the administration?

Mr. McCARTHY. I think I would concur in that statement. I do not wish to stop the bill or stop the bringing in of contract labor. What I am trying to do is stop the bringing in of wetback workers.

Mr. COOLEY. That is an entirely different proposition than the gentleman just mentioned. That is a matter for the Immigration Committee. We are not trying to enforce the immigration laws and we are not amending them. We hope to make easier to bring in wetbacks.

Mr. GATHINGS. That is right. The various departments charged with responsibility of this problem of recruitment of foreign labor came before our committee and every one of them recognized the need on the farms of America for this additional labor.

Mr. COOLEY. If there were any way to pass a law now to keep out all wetbacks, I am sure the House would do it, but that is not the proposition before us.

Mr. GATHINGS. We are faced with the proposition whether we are going to have anything to eat on our tables or anything on our backs to wear. I hope the House bill will be approved by this body.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired. All time has expired.

The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk reads as follows:

"Be it enacted, etc., That the Agricultural Act of 1946 is amended by adding at the end thereof a new title to read as follows:"

"Title: Agricultural Workers.

"Sec. 501. For the purpose of assisting in such production of agricultural commodities and products as the Secretary of Agriculture deems necessary, by supplying agricultural workers from the Republic of Mexico (pursuant to arrangements between the United States and the Republic of Mexico), the Secretary of Labor is authorized:

"(1) to recruit such workers (including any such workers temporarily in the United States);

"(2) to establish and operate reception centers at or near the places of actual entry of such workers into the continental United States for the purpose of receiving and housing such workers while arrangements are being made for their employment in, or departure from, the continental United States;

"(3) to provide transportation for such workers out of such reception centers and transportation from such reception centers to the continental United States to such reception centers and transportation from such reception centers to such reception centers after termination of employment;

"(4) to provide such workers with such subsistence, emergency medical care, and burial expenses (not exceeding $100 burial expenses in any one case) as may be or become necessary during transportation authorized by paragraph (2) and while such workers are at such reception centers; and

"(5) to assist such workers and employers in negotiating contracts for agricultural employment to include, among other considerations, freedom to accept or decline agricultural employment with any employer and to choose the type of agricultural employment they desire, and eligibility to leave agricultural employment to any workers of their choice not under contract to other employers; and

"(6) to guarantee the performance by employers of provisions of such contracts relating to wages or the furnishing of transportation.

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

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

"(2) to reimburse the United States for all reasonable expenses of regular or emergency personnel incurred by it for the transportation and subsistence of workers under this title in such amounts, not to exceed $10 per worker; and

"(3) to pay to the United States, in any case in which a worker is not returned to the reception center in accordance with the contract entered into under section 501 (5), in an amount determined by the Secretary of Labor to be equivalent to the normal cost to the employer of returning other workers from the place of employment to such reception center, less any portion thereof required to be paid by other employers.

"Sec. 503. No workers recruited under this title shall be admitted to the United States unless and until such employer shall have entered into an agreement with the United States—

"(1) to provide such workers with such subsistence, emergency medical care, and burial expenses (not exceeding $100 burial expenses in any one case) as may be or become necessary during transportation authorized by paragraph (2) and while such workers are at such reception centers; and

"(2) to assist such workers and employers in negotiating contracts for agricultural employment to include, among other considerations, freedom to accept or decline agricultural employment with any employer and to choose the type of agricultural employment they desire, and eligibility to leave agricultural employment to any workers of their choice not under contract to other employers; and

"(3) to provide transportation for such workers out of such reception centers and transportation from such reception centers to the continental United States to such reception centers and transportation from such reception centers to the continental United States to such reception centers after termination of employment;

"(4) to provide such workers with such subsistence, emergency medical care, and burial expenses (not exceeding $100 burial expenses in any one case) as may be or become necessary during transportation authorized by paragraph (2) and while such workers are at such reception centers; and

"(5) to assist such workers and employers in negotiating contracts for agricultural employment to include, among other considerations, freedom to accept or decline agricultural employment with any employer and to choose the type of agricultural employment they desire, and eligibility to leave agricultural employment to any workers of their choice not under contract to other employers; and

"(6) to guarantee the performance by employers of provisions of such contracts relating to wages or the furnishing of transportation.

"Sec. 504. Workers recruited under this title shall be available for employment in the United States—

"(1) to perform agricultural labor; and

"(2) to perform agricultural labor, provided that any such worker may, pursuant to arrangement between the United States and the Republic of Mexico, be permitted to remain therein for such time and under such conditions as may be specified by the Attorney General but, notwithstanding any other provision of law or regulation, no penalty bond shall be required which imposes liability upon any person for the failure of any such worker to depart from the United States upon termination of employment.

"Sec. 505. (a) (1) of the Social Security Act, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subparagraph as follows:

"(C) Service performed by foreign agricultural workers under contracts entered into in accordance with title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended; and

"(b) Section 1426 (b) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended, by adding at the end thereof a new subparagraph as follows:

"(C) Service performed by foreign agricultural workers under contracts entered into in accordance with title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended; and

"(c) Workers recruited under the provisions of this title shall not be subject to the head tax levied under section 2 of the Immigration Act of 1917 (8 U.S.C., sec. 132).

"Sec. 506. For the purposes of this title, the Secretary of Labor is authorized—

"(1) to enter into agreements with Federal and State agencies, to utilize (pursuant to such agreements) the facilities and services of such agencies, to allocate or transfer funds or otherwise to pay or reimburse such agencies for expenses in connection therewith;

"(2) to accept and utilize voluntary and uncompensated services; and

"(3) when necessary to supplement the domestic agricultural labor force, to negotiate with the Secretary of State in negotiating and carrying out agreements or arrangements relating to the employment in the United States, subject to the immigration laws, of agricultural workers from the Republic of Mexico.

"Sec. 507. For the purposes of this title—

"(1) the term 'agricultural employment' includes services or activities included within the provisions of section 3 (f) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, or section 1426 (h) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended, with respect to the ginning, compressing and storing, crushing of oil seeds, and the packing, canning, freezing, drying, or other processing of perishable or seasonable agricultural products.

"(2) The term 'employer' includes associations or other groups of employers.

"Sec. 508. Nothing in this act shall be construed as limiting the authority of the Attorney General, pursuant to the general immigration laws, to permit the importation of aliens of any nationality for agricultural employment as defined in section 508, or to permit any alien who entered the United States legally to remain for the purpose of engaging in such agricultural employment under such conditions and for such time as he, the Attorney General, shall specify.

"Sec. 510. No workers shall be made available under this title for employment after December 31, 1953.

"Mr. COOLEY (Interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the bill be dispensed with.

"Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, is my understanding correct that if the unanimous-consent request is granted, the bill will be open to amendment at any point?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not so understand.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk reads as follows:

Mr. GATHINGS. I ask unanimous consent to strike out all after the enacting clause.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman does not submit a preferential motion.

Mr. POLK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute.
The term "employer" shall include an association, or other group, of employers, but only if (A) those of its members for whom workers are being obtained are bound, in the event of its default, to carry out the obligations undertaken by it pursuant to the provisions of this title.

"SEC. 509. For the purposes of this title, the Secretary of Labor is authorized—

"(1) to enter into agreements with Federal and State agencies to utilize (pursuant to such agreements) the facilities and services of those agencies to allocate or otherwise to pay or reimburse such agencies for expenses in connection therewith;

"(2) to accept and utilize voluntary and uncompensated services; and

"(3) when necessary to supplement the domestic labor force to cooperate with the Secretary of State in negotiating and carrying out agreements or arrangements relating to the employment in the United States, subject to the immigration laws, of agricultural workers from the Republic of Mexico.

"SEC. 507. For the purposes of this title—

"(1) The term "agricultural employment" includes services or activities included within the meaning of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, or section 1626 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code.

"(2) The term "employer" shall include an association, or other group, of employers, but only if (A) those of its members for whom workers are being obtained are bound, in the event of its default, to carry out the obligations of this title; or (B) the Secretary determines that such individual liability is not necessary to assure performance of such obligations.

"ER. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, this section is read as follows: Amendment offered by Mr. Foy. In the nature of a substitute for H. R. 3333: "That the Agriculture Act of 1949 is amended by adding at the end thereof a new title to read as follows:

"TITLE V—AGRICULTURAL WORKERS

"SEC. 501. For the purpose of ascertaining in such other agricultural commodities and products as the Secretary of Agriculture deems necessary, by supplying agricultural workers from the Republic of Mexico (pursuant to arrangements between the United States and the Republic of Mexico), the Secretary of Labor is authorized—

"(1) to establish and operate reception centers at or near the places of actual entry of such workers into the continental United States for the purpose of receiving and housing such workers while arrangements are being made for their employment in, or departure from, the continental United States;

"(2) to reimburse the employer of returning other workers for the transportation expenses incurred by it for the transportation of such workers into the continental United States under legal entry;

"(3) to establish and operate reception centers at or near the places of actual entry of such workers into the continental United States for the purpose of receiving and housing such workers while arrangements are being made for their employment in, or departure from, the continental United States;

"(4) to reimburse the employer of returning other workers for the transportation expenses incurred by it for the transportation of such workers into the continental United States under legal entry;

"(5) to reimburse the employer of returning other workers for the transportation expenses incurred by it for the transportation of such workers into the continental United States under legal entry; and

"(6) to guarantee the performance of employers of provisions of such contracts relating to the payment of wages and the furnishing of transportation.

"ER. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment on the ground that it contains matter not germane to the House bill, and I should like to be heard on the point of order.

"Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I am glad to hear the gentleman and requests that the gentleman point out the specific language to which objection is made.
which is the bill we are considering at this time, is a specific bill having a specific purpose. The purpose is stated in the opening section of the bill, as follows:

For the purpose of assisting in such production of agricultural commodities and products as the Secretary of Agriculture deems necessary—

And so forth. Section 509 of the proposed substitute does not deal in any way with the pending House bill. Section 509 of the proposed substitute deals only with the matter of finding information as to the illegal entry of aliens from Mexico into the United States, and imposes a penalty for failure to supply information concerning such illegal entry. That is the sole purpose and the sole effect of this section 509. It does not refer to the employment of farm labor, and it does not go to the purpose of the bill.

I think it is a fact that one of the principals applying to germsenness is that an amendment should be in accordance with the fundamental purposes of the bill to which the amendment is proposed.

I make a second point of order against the substitute on the ground that it is not germane but is a general provision. Read the language of the bill, Mr. Chairman—section 509. Section 509 of the substitute speaks of any person who employs a Mexican alien not certified by the Secretary of Labor, any person, whether that person be the provider of a restaurant or the operator of a steamship company, railroad, bus line, and so forth, any person who shall employ any Mexican alien not duly admitted by an immigration officer or not lawfully entitled to enter or to reside within the United States.

A restaurant operator in the city of New York would be subject to a $2,000 fine and 1 year in prison or both if he employed a Mexican alien without taking the trouble to go to the FBI or some other source and find out if Mexican was in the country with proper credentials.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that that is strictly a general proposition and is offered to this bill which has specific reference to a program of orderly recruitment and dispersal of farm labor—farm labor only; whereas the amendment, Mr. Chairman, applies to any person who shall employ any Mexican alien wherever he may be and whatever he may be doing.

I submit, therefore, on those two counts, first, it is an amendment, a general provision, a general amendment, applied to a specific bill, which, according to the way I read the rules of the House, is not allowable as germane; and, secondly, that the amendment itself does not have anything to do in fact with the purpose and the fundamental intent of the bill.

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

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

Mr. COOLEY. I would like to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that the bill before us now amends the Agricultural Act of 1949. I agree with the gentleman's observations on the point of order. The section he referred to, 509, is general in its application and in effect revives the immigration laws of this county insofar as they affect Mexico.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I may say to the gentleman along that same line that there is now pending before this House a very large Omnibus immigration bill to which this particular section 509 should be added if it is the will of the House, but it has no place as a penalty provision in an amendment to the Agricultural Act.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard briefly?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be glad to hear the gentleman.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from North Carolina has just said that the bill did not intend to amend the immigration laws and the Raccoo will discuss this general debate on general immigration and said he said the same thing. If the Chair will refer to page 7 of the bill I hold, which is the Senate edition, lines 15 and 16, he will observe words "or other law relating to the immigration or expulsion of aliens"—not necessarily Mexican aliens.

This is a broad provision saying that everyone in the United States must know all the immigration laws if he is to operate under this amendment, therefore placing upon the shoulders of all citizens of the United States the responsibility we have assigned to the Immigration Service. It is manifestly legislation out of place in this bill.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be glad to hear the gentleman.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to call attention to the fact that if section 509 had been introduced as a separate bill, it would not even have been referred to the Committee on Agriculture. It would have gone to the Immigration Committee.

Now, I am faced with a situation of having to pass upon a question which our committee had no right under the rules of the House to even consider and because I am a member of the Senate, a member of the Senate, does the Senate bill certainly does not make it germane to the bill now before us.

We are attempting to amend an agricultural bill. If the pending amendment is approved, it will greatly enlarge the scope of the subject with which we are dealing. It should not be held to be germane because there is no provision in this bill to compel the House Committee on Agriculture dealing with the problem of immigration generally. It deals only with agricultural aid. The pending amendment seeks to make it apply to even the or to people in the United States to all other vocations and avocations of life in this country.

I submit the point of order should be sustained.

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

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

Mr. CRAWFORD. I would like to ask the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture this question: Should this substitute prevail, in his opinion, would it not completely kill this whole proposition?

Mr. COOLEY. There is no question about that. I think it would be the end of legislation of this bill if it were to prevail. I do not think we would have a bill.

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

Mr. FOLK. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be glad to hear the gentleman.

Mr. FOLK. Mr. Chairman, I call attention to the fact that this bill amends the Social Security Act, and I am speaking now on the bill before the House, H. R. 3283. It also amends the Immigration Act of 1917, and I refer to lines 7, 8, 9, and 10, on page 5. It amends the Internal Revenue Code, and I refer to lines 2, 3 and 4, at the top of page 5. In other words, in several instances the bill which is before the House amends other Federal statutes.

I therefore respectfully submit, Mr. Chairman, that the point of order against section 509 of this bill should not be sustained.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. The bill before the Committee is a bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949. The gentleman from Ohio offers an amendment in the nature of a substitute to which a point of order is made by the gentleman from Oregon, the particular objection being directed to the last section of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

The Chair feels that it is necessary to be fair and explicit in this matter to spell out in some detail the rule of germsenness and its application to this particular amendment. As the Chair understands the rule of germsenness, its purpose is to provide for and protect the orderly procedure in the Committee of the Whole and in the House. It is to protect the legislative process, to protect the membership from hasty, ill-considered, and extraneous subject matter being offered to the proposition under consideration. An amendment, to be germane to a bill under consideration, must be akin to and relative to the subject matter of the bill. The Chair does not feel that the provision of a penalty or the provision for civil relief from a law seeking to be enacted would be a matter unakin or unrelated to the bill. However, there is specific matter in this amendment, to wit, "or any other law relating to the immigration of expulsion of aliens" which is to be found in section 509 to which specific objection was made. The Chair has examined the bill before the Chair and is unable to find reference to any other law relating to the immigration or expulsion of aliens.

Therefore, because of the references just cited, the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. FOLK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute, and I state, this amendment that has just been ruled out on a point of order with section 509.
stricken out, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record at this point and considered as read.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The amendment is as follows:

"Title V—Agricultural Workers"

"Sec. 501. For the purpose of assisting in securing northward migration of agricultural workers and products as the Secretary of Agriculture deems necessary, by supplying agricultural workers and products to the continental United States, it is hereby provided that no such employer shall be admitted under this title into the continental United States or the Republic of Mexico unless the Secretary of Labor finds and certifies that such employer enters into an agreement with the Secretary of Labor in accordance with arrangements between the United States and the Republic of Mexico, the Secretary of Labor being authorized:

(1) to recruit such workers (including any such workers temporarily in the United States under legal entry);

(2) to establish and operate reception centers at or near the places of actual entry of such workers into the continental United States or the Republic of Mexico, and to arrange in substance and by agreement with the United States, the Republic of Mexico, and such workers, for the following:

(3) to provide transportation for such workers from centers of recruitment to such reception centers and transportation from such reception centers to such recruitment centers after termination of employment;

(4) to provide such workers with such subsistence, emergency medical care, and burial expenses (not exceeding $150 burial expenses in any one case) as may be or become necessary during transportation authorized by paragraph (3) and while such workers are at such centers;

(5) to assist such workers and employers in negotiating contracts for agricultural employment (such workers being free to accept or decline agricultural employment with any eligible employer and to choose the type of agricultural employment they desire, and eligible employers being free to offer agricultural employment to any workers of their choice not under contract to other employers);

(6) to guarantee the performance by employers of provisions of such contracts relating to wages and working conditions or the furnishing of transportation.

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

"(1) to indemnify the United States against loss by reason of guaranty of such employer's contracts;

"(2) to reimburse the United States for essential expenses, not including salaries or expenses of regular department or agency personnel, incurred by it for the transportation and subsistence of workers under this title in amounts not to exceed $60 per worker; and

"(3) to pay to the United States, in any case in which a worker is not returned to the reception center in accordance with the contract, an amount determined by the Secretary of Labor to be equivalent to the normal cost to the United States of the subsistence and transportation of such worker from the place of employment to such reception center, less any portion thereof required by law of the worker who, because of his or her own fault, fails to return to such reception center.

"Sec. 503. No workers recruited under this title shall be available for employment in any area unless the Secretary of Labor has had an opportunity to verify that such area has determined and certified that sufficient domestic workers are available, which are not members of employers associations only where the individual

"Sec. 504. Workers recruited under this title who are not citizens of the United States shall be admitted into the United States subject to the immigration laws (or if already in, by virtue of legal entry and otherwise eligible for admission to, the United States may, pursuant to arrangements between the United States and the Republic of Mexico, be permitted to remain therein) for such time as the conditions under which such entry may be specified by the Attorney General but, notwithstanding any other provision of law or regulation, no penalty bond shall be required which imposes liability upon any person for the failure of any such worker to depart from the United States upon termination of employment: Provided, That no workers shall be made available under this title to, nor shall any workers made available under this title remain in, the employ of any employer who has in his employ any Mexican alien when such employer knows or has reasonable grounds to believe or suspect or by reasonable inquiry could have ascertained that such Mexican alien is not lawfully within the United States.

"Sec. 505. (a) Section 210 (e) (1) of the Social Security Act, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subparagraph as follows:

"(C) Service performed by foreign agricultural workers under contracts entered into in accordance with title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended.

"(b) Section 330 of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subparagraph as follows:

"(C) Service performed by foreign agricultural workers under contracts entered into in accordance with title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended.

"(c) Workers recruited under the provisions of this title shall not be subject to the long tax levies of the Immigration Act of 1917 (U. S. C., sec. 125).

"Sec. 506. For the purposes of this title, the Secretary shall—

"(1) to enter into agreements with Federal and State agencies; to utilize (pursuant to such agreements) and such funds as may be provided by Federal and State agencies; and to allocate or transfer funds or otherwise to pay or reimburse such agencies for expenses in connection therewith;

"(2) to accept and utilize voluntary and uncompensated services; and

"(3) when necessary to supplement the domestic agricultural labor force, to cooperate with the Secretary of State in negotiating and carrying out agreements or arrangements relating to the employment in the United States, subject to the immigration laws, of agricultural workers from the Republic of Mexico.

"Sec. 507. For the purposes of this title—

"(1) the term 'employer' includes services or activities included within the provisions of section 3 (f) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, or section 1426 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended.

"(2) the term 'employer' shall include an association, trade organization, or similar body, by the member of which is or which includes on its membership list any one previously offered, with the exception that section 508 is stricken out.

"Sec. 508. Nothing in this act shall be construed to apply to Mexican workers in the event that the Attorney General, pursuant to the general immigration laws, permits the importation of aliens of any nationality for agricultural employment in the United States, to permit the importation of any such alien who entered the United States legally to remain for the purpose of engaging in agricultural employment under such conditions as the Attorney General may determine, if, for such a purpose, the Attorney General shall specify.

"Sec. 510. No workers will be made available under this title for employment after December 31, 1953."

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Did I understand the gentleman to say that the amendment now offered is identical with the one previously offered, with the exception that section 508 is stricken out?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chairman understood the gentleman.

Mr. FOLK. Mr. Chairman, the Ellender and Poage bills are somewhat similar in substance.

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

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

Mr. HOPE. Will the gentleman state whether or not his substitute now offered is exactly the Senate bill with section 508 stricken out?

Mr. FOLK. That is correct.

Mr. Chairman, the Poage bill, however, contains several very undesirable provisions and falls in several important respects to meet the test of adequate legislation in this field, namely to assure that Mexican workers, when needed, are obtained in an orderly manner and under a Government supervised program and to prevent and penalize effectively illegal traffic in Mexican wetback labor. The Ellender bill, Mr. Chairman, more adequately meets this test.

First, H. R. 3283 would provide for contracting of Mexican workers upon application for a limited period by a subordinate official of the Department of Labor instead of the Nation-wide certification of reasonable availability to be made by the Secretary of Labor under H. R. 844, the Ellender bill. This provision of the Poage bill not only ignores sound principles of Government by giving responsibilities by statute to subordinate departmental officials, such as the regional director of the Bureau of Employment Security, but also indicates a policy of ignoring American farm workers who may be reasonably available for work even though they are in the immediate area of regional certification.

Second, while the bill authorizes the United States Government to guarantee to Mexican workers amounts due them for wages and transportation expenses by the employment contacts, provisions relating to indemnification by employers' associations are not adequate to protect the Government from losses and to prevent and penalize effectively illegal traffic in Mexican wetback labor. A number of employers' associations are not incorporated and have little or no assets. Nevertheless they contract for Mexican workers on behalf of their members. The indemnification should protect workers may be made available to these associations only where the individual
members are liable upon the agreement of the association or where other satisfactory assurances of liability or solvency exist.

The second of the Ellender bill corrects this defect of H. R. 3283.

Third, the authority under the Poage bill for obtaining contract Mexican labor extends to processes which are industrial and not agricultural in nature whereas the Ellender bill is carefully limited to agricultural activities, as such, which, I understand, is the only area covered. In the present legislation can be reasonably directed and justified. Here, again, the drawbacks of H. R. 3283 would be corrected by the substitution of the Ellender bill.

Fourth, and this is the most important consideration, Mr. Chairman, the Ellender bill would effectively shut the door to the use of Mexican labor which is illegally in the United States and would provide measures for curbing the influx of wetbacks. Sections 501 and 504 of the Poage bill, on the other hand, provide only a tentative agreement and, with, I am sure, this country, even if they are here illegally, may be recruited and permitted to remain here if the Mexican Government supervises the adjustment and will in some cases hire these sections would be corrected so that no recruitment would be authorized only in the case of these Mexican workers who have legally entered the United States.

The approval of the Ellender bill as a substitute for H. R. 3283 will provide sound stand-by legislation for obtaining Mexican contract labor to the extent necessary during the present emergency. It will correct the defects in the machinery provided by H. R. 3283 and, above all, it will create for the first time effective remedies for the gradual control and eventual abolition of the wetback system. Moreover, in achieving substantial agreement with the Senate bill by accepting its bill as a substitute we will expedite the process of conference and cuts out any risk of the prompt enactment of a necessary measure. I cannot underestimate the importance or significance of the provisions of the Ellender bill which are designed to control the wetback situation.

In recent years the United States literally has been invaded by hundreds of thousands of Mexican agricultural workers—known as wetbacks—legally entering this country in search of employment. No one knows exactly how great this invasion is today. We do know it as a fact, however, that it has grown to fantastic proportions. For example, only 7,000 illegal Mexican wetbacks were picked up by the Immigration and Naturalization Service in 1940, whereas 55,000 of these wetbacks were apprehended in the year 1950. There are some reliable estimates that more than 1,000,000 illegal workers entered from Mexico. They entered this country in 1950 and I have not any doubt that while I am standing here today, Mexican raceros—sorop laborers—sorop laborers—are pouring across our southern border displacing American farm workers and reducing labor standards and spreading communicable diseases.

The record and effects of this illegal invasion have been dramatized so recently in the newspapers and magazines of the Nation that all of you must be somewhat familiar with the story. The report of the President's Commission on Migratory Labor has conservatively stated the facts. The Commission points out:

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

That the wetback traffic has severely depressed farm wages is unquestionable—the wetback wage tends to become the prevailing wage.

These illegal Mexican workers not only create vicious unfair competition, destroying American labor standards and displacing American workers, but also cause serious spread of death and disease, of housing and sanitation. These workers live in shacks and sheds which no one would wish to put a horse in. They bathe and drink from the irrigation ditches upon the banks of which they live.

There is another very important aspect to this wetback situation. In these precarious times when our country is extending every effort to bolster communist infiltration, the wetback invasion offers a serious threat to our internal security. It is no secret that one of the fastest ways for the Communist spy or saboteur or foreign organizer to enter the United States is across our southern border in the guise of a Mexican laborer. Wherever we encourage or invite or fail to control this invasion we are jeopardizing our very existence as a nation. It is our clear duty to support the Immigration and Naturalization Service in its task of holding back the hordes of illegal entrants which daily elude our border patrols. Rather than relax our immigration laws, we must tighten them. Above all things we must impose adequate penalties upon those who entice Mexican workers across our border or employ them without concern as to their legal status in this country.

With all of these factors firmly in mind, it is paramount that we act with deliberate speed and unity of purpose. Unity in these times is vital to a successful defense of the Nation. The need for speedy action to provide stand-by legislation is required not only by the prospect of farm-labor shortages which confront us but also by the most recent position taken by the Mexican Government with respect to obtaining Mexican farm workers in an orderly manner under Government supervision. It is my understanding that certain employers in the past have failed to meet their obligations under contracts signed with Mexican workers, Mexico has stated that it will end these contracts after the end of June unless the United States guarantees the fulfillment of the employment contracts with these workers. It is therefore the path of wisdom to choose a legislative course which provides the speediest method of agreement on effective legislation accomplishing the purpose.

To provide adequate legislation to assure that Mexican workers are, when needed, obtained in an orderly manner and under a Government supervised program the Senate recently passed a bill, S. 984, introduced by the distinguished Senator from Louisiana, Mr. ELLENDER. There is now pending before this House the bill, H. R. 3283, somewhat similar in substance, containing several very undesirable provisions and failing in several substantive respects to meet the test of adequate legislation in this field.

In my opinion, Mr. Chairman, the Senate bill is far sounder legislation than is H. R. 3283. Time is now of the essence. If we are to have an orderly program for obtaining Mexican workers for the coming harvest, we must proceed with dispatch. We must provide adequate time for the Government agencies to receive and study the Senate bill. We must provide adequate time for the Mexican Government to open recruitment centers in Mexico and for the United States Government to establish reception centers in this country.

Because H. R. 3283 does not meet the test, I propose at the appropriate time to move the substitution of the Senate bill, S. 984, the Ellender bill. The Ellender bill is a sound measure providing an orderly basis for obtaining legal contract labor from Mexico to the extent that American workers are not reasonably available. In addition, it will correct the glaring failure of H. R. 3283 to prevent and penalize effectively the illegal traffic in Mexican wetback labor.

Let me review, for a moment, the differences between the Senate bill and H. R. 3283.

First, H. R. 3283 would provide for contracting of Mexican workers upon certification for a limited area made by a subordinate official of the Department of Labor instead of the Nation-wide certification of reasonable availability to be made by the Secretary of Labor under S. 984, the Ellender bill. This provision of the Poage bill not only ignores sound principles of government by giving responsibilities by statute to subordinate departmental officials, such as the regional director of the Bureau of Employment Security, but also indicates a policy of ignoring American farm workers who may be reasonably available for work even though they are outside the immediate area of regional certification.

Second, the bill authorizes the United States Government to guarantee to Mexican workers amounts due them from the wages and salaries under the employment contracts, provisions relating to indemnification by employers' associations are not adequate to protect the Government's interests. A number of employers' associations are not incorporated and have little or no assets. Nevertheless they contract for Mexican workers on behalf of their members. The
Before World War II, the record shows wetbacks are being given legal status in increasing numbers. The tremendous increase in illegal entries is the result of the word being spread throughout Mexico that they may remain in the country if they are already here and Mexico agrees that they may remain here. In other words, Mr. Chairman, this bill does not only open the door to recruitment of wetback labor but also is completely silent on any means for controlling the present wetback situation. By providing for the legalization of wetbacks and giving publicity to this type of provision, we would encourage and invite the invasion of this country by a million more wetbacks seeking employment. If we were to employ to one-fourth of them, which is unlikely, the Immigration and Naturalization Service would be required to spend millions of dollars in rounding up and deporting those not employed.

In this direction, Mr. Chairman, are not the result of any illusion. Before World War II, the record shows quite clearly that we neither imported nor employed illegal aliens. However, in 1949, we made a colossal blunder when we entered into an international agreement with Mexico which permitted the contracting of wetbacks in this country. The number of apprehensions jumped from less than 30,000 in 1944 to more than 300,000 in 1949. Then in 1950 this figure grew to nearly 600,000. Because both sides have expressed the opinion that it is obvious that the tremendous increase in illegal entries is the result of the word being spread throughout Mexico that wetbacks are being given legal status in the United States through contract employment. Therefore, it is apparent to me, Mr. Chairman, that if we contract for the legal employment of workers, we encourage the entry of wetbacks in ever increasing numbers. On the basis of the figures in connection with the Report of the President's Commission on Migratory Labor, I believe that I can predict with certainty that the passage of H. R. 3283 in its present form will attract even greater numbers of wetbacks seeking employment on our farms and in our factories.

As the annual invasion is beginning right now, I am informed that while the United States Employment Service has been requested by States some distance from the Mexican border—where to wetback labor—to make certification for the entry of thousands of Mexican contract workers, nevertheless, farmers from the States which lie upon the Rio Grande River, which is the United States Employment Service requests for comparatively few contract Mexicans. The answer is obvious. Farmers from the State of Texas are receiving and using right now so great a number of illegal Mexican wetback laborers that there is little present need in the United States for wetback labor. The Ellender bill workers to wetback laborers to the Federal Government to spend that much. We just think it is a useless and unnecessary burden on the American economy to allow the Government to spend that much.

The other important matter in issue is the question of how much the expenses would be in bringing that worker from either Monterrey, Chihuahua or Hermosillo to the border. The House bill provides that the farmer will pay twice as much as the actual cost if the Government spends that much. The Senate bill allows the Government four times that cost. We just think it is a waste of money and an unnecessary burden on the economy to allow the Government to spend that much.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?
Mr. POAGE. No, I cannot yield.
Mr. POAGE. The gentleman does not know the facts.
Mr. BAILEY. I know what each bill provides. I know what it actually costs to bring these workers in. I know that the Government notoriously spends more than is necessary. I also know that the Government spends all the money. I know the House bill will save money. We just feel it is not a sound policy to deliberately waste the money of anybody, and we feel that $10 is a liberal fee. That is one of the matters in issue.

Another important matter in issue is the question of how much employment can be given to these Mexican nationals. The House bill provides that they may be employed not only on farms but in agricultural processing plants, such as gins, packing sheds and compresses, in the area where the production is taking place. We feel those activities are too closely related to the immediate agricultural work that to deny the use of Mexican nationals in these operations would in many instances seriously hamper the agricultural activities of the community and...
result in the loss of food and fiber throughout the county.

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

Mr. FOAGE. I yield.

Mr. HOPE. The gentleman from Texas is pointing out some of the differences between the Senate and House bills. He seems as, he says, of such great importance as the issue that was raised by section 509. But I do want to make this suggestion for whatever it is worth: This bill would have to go to conference in any event, even if we vote down the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio. The bill would go to conference, and at that time these questions can be settled.

On the other hand, if we adopt the gentleman's amendment with the merger debate which it is possible to have here in Committee of the Whole, I am afraid that a great many people would not know exactly what they are adopting. Does not the gentleman think it would be the wise thing to vote down the gentleman's amendment and then settle these differences in conference?

Mr. FOAGE. I think the gentleman from Kansas has expressed it excellently. Let us vote down this amendment and then let us consider the Senate bill to conference, and let us decide these questions there, rather than preclude the discussion of these questions in the conference.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the two speeches already made on this amendment really define the basic question. The bill, as the House is, I believe, qualified to pass on this legislation. The principal differences remaining now between the Senate bill and the House bill are four: The House bill in its present form permits the legalization of wetbacks, that is, of Mexicans who are already in this country. The effect of that, of course, is to encourage them to cross the border because once they are here, it is much easier to have them approved.

The Mexican Government itself is opposed to that provision. Is the gentleman to say that the House is, I believe, qualified to pass on this legislation? The language in the Senate bill is very clear.

Mr. FOAGE. If the gentleman will yield, I do not think the gentleman is correct in stating what the House bill contains.

Mr. McCARTHY. The language in the Senate bill clearly defines the limitation so that these contract workers cannot be used in food packing or processing plants as is allowed by H. R. 3283. The third important difference is that in the Senate bill the definition of an employer is strengthened so as to preclude exemptions which are possible in the House bill and the avoidance of the individual responsibility which is possible under the House bill.

Under the Senate bill employer associations are also defined as being employers. No employer can escape individual responsibility by saying that the association has done this thing. I think that is an important provision.

Finally, the Senate bill provides the certification of need shall be done by the Secretary of Labor rather than by a regional labor officer. This problem of farm labor is not confined to one region of the country only; the decision on supply of labor may not be made in a region, it should be made by the Secretary who has jurisdiction over all the regions. This is only a matter of good procedure. I am sure that the Hoover Commission would support it.

The Senate bill also provides that anyone who has an employment contract for Mexicans who is also found to be employing wetbacks shall forfeit his right to contract additional legal Mexicans. This gives statutory recognition to a provision already recognized in the international agreement. Those are the four general points of difference. I think the House should pass upon them and that the Senate should not be allowed to go to conference to speak for us.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to a point of order against the amendment. Any person who shall employ as a farm laborer any Mexican alien not duly admitted by an immigration officer or not duly entitled to enter or to reside within the United States under the terms of this act, when such person knows or has reasonable grounds to believe or suspect, or by reason of anything said or done by the person in the course of employment indicating that such alien farm laborer is not lawfully within the United States, or any person who, having employed such an alien without knowing or having reasonable grounds to believe or suspect that such alien farm laborer is unlawfully within the United States and who could not have obtained such information by reasonable inquiry at the time of giving employment, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine not exceeding $1,000, or by imprisonment for a term not exceeding 1 year, or both, for each farm laborer in respect to whom any violation of this section occurs.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. FOAGE. If the gentleman will yield, I do not think the gentleman is correct in stating what the House bill contains.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, I do not yield to the gentleman.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, under the House bill wetbacks can be legalized. The point is that the Senate bill is very clear to the effect that any Mexicans who are illegally in this country cannot be legally contracted. If we pass this amendment, we pass that particular point. The second point relates to the argument which has been made that this bill affects only agriculture. It is like a rather clear definition of agricultural workers in the Wages and Hours Act. The Poage bill, the House bill, attempts to extend that definition so as to permit employment of these people in processing plants, so it takes them out of the field and beyond agriculture. The Senate bill clearly defines the limitation so that these contract workers cannot be used in food packing or processing plants as is allowed by H. R. 3283. The third important difference is that in the Senate bill the definition of an employer is strengthened so as to preclude exemptions which are possible in the House bill and the avoidance of the individual responsibility which is possible under the House bill.

Under the Senate bill employer associations are also defined as being employers. No employer can escape individual responsibility by saying that the association has done this thing. I think that is an important provision.

Finally, the Senate bill provides the certification of need shall be done by the Secretary of Labor rather than by a regional labor officer. This problem of farm labor is not confined to one region of the country only; the decision on supply of labor may not be made in a region, it should be made by the Secretary who has jurisdiction over all the regions. This is only a matter of good procedure. I am sure that the Hoover Commission would support it.

The Senate bill also provides that anyone who has an employment contract for Mexicans who is also found to be employing wetbacks shall forfeit his right to contract additional legal Mexicans. This gives statutory recognition to a provision already recognized in the international agreement. Those are the four general points of difference. I think the House should pass upon them and that the Senate should not be allowed to go to conference to speak for us.

Mr. FOAGE. If the gentleman will yield, I do not think the gentleman is correct in stating what the House bill contains.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to a point of order against the amendment. Any person who shall employ as a farm laborer any Mexican alien not duly admitted by an immigration officer or not duly entitled to enter or to reside within the United States under the terms of this act, when such person knows or has reasonable grounds to believe or suspect, or by reason of anything said or done by the person in the course of employment indicating that such alien farm laborer is not lawfully within the United States, or any person who, having employed such an alien without knowing or having reasonable grounds to believe or suspect that such alien farm laborer is unlawfully within the United States and who could not have obtained such information by reasonable inquiry at the time of giving employment, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine not exceeding $1,000, or by imprisonment for a term not exceeding 1 year, or both, for each farm laborer in respect to whom any violation of this section occurs.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I call the Chair's attention to the fact that the amendment is almost identical with the amendment appearing in the Senate bill, the substantial difference being only in the matter of definition of the penalty provision, but otherwise it is almost identical with section 609 which was held to be not germane.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Take the point of order that the amendment now before the Committee is not germane to the bill under consideration.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York desire to be heard?
Mr. Celler. Mr. Chairman, I have stricken out the Senate bill and section 509, which was embodied in the Folk amendment, the words "or any other law relating to the immigration or expulsion of aliens." I make my amendment applicable only to alien farm labor. This bill covers alien farm labor—alien Mexican farm labor—and within the four corners of what is meant by Mexican alien farm labor the words of my amendment also would substitute relate. This is a bill concerning the operations of alien labor, what they shall do and what they shall not do, under the terms and conditions that they may or may not come over the border, and my amendment certainly is consistent with the purposes and aims of the bill in general. A penalty for violation of the terms laid down is germane.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

The Committee has before it a bill to which the gentleman from Ohio has offered amendment, to which, in turn, the gentleman from New York has offered an amendment providing specific penalties for violation of the provisions of the bill. Written law. The rule of germaneness has been interpreted rather narrowly, but the Chair does not feel that it can declare or hold that the point of order is overruled. The Chair does not feel that it can declare or hold that the provision of a penalty for the violation of the provisions of the bill is new subject matter or unrelated subject matter.

Therefore, the point of order is overruled.

Mr. Cooley. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. Gorz, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3263) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, had come to no resolution thereon.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. Jackson of Washington asked and was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes today, following any special orders herefofe entered.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. FRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. Eberhart asked and was given permission to address the House today for 5 minutes, following any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. Lane asked and was given permission to address the House tomorrow for 15 minutes, following any special orders heretofore entered.

T. L. MORROW

Mr. Byrne of New York. Mr. Speaker, I call upon the conference report on the relief of T. L. Morrow, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. Rept. No. 583)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of S. 451 to H. R. 1424 (for the relief of T. L. Morrow, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate, and agree to the following:

"Restore the matter stricken out by the Senate amendment with the figures in line 6, page 1, namely, $5,000. And the Senate amendment to the same."

Peter W. Rodino, Jr., Chairman of the Committee of the Part of the House.

Managers on the Part of the House:


Managers on the Part of the Senate:

Statement

The managers on the part of the House, at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1424) for the relief of T. L. Morrow, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the Senate amendment thereto, and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate, and agree to the following:

"Restore the matter stricken out by the Senate amendment with the figures in line 6, page 1, namely, $5,000. And the Senate amendment to the same."

Peter W. Rodino, Jr., Chairman of the Committee of the Part of the House.

Managers on the Part of the House:


Managers on the Part of the Senate:

The bill as passed by the House appropriated the sum of $5,000 to T. L. Morrow of Hattiesburg, Miss., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries sustained by him in a collision with a United States Army vehicle at the intersection of Route 50 and White Road, Biloxi, Miss., in January, 1942. The Senate reduced the amount to $2,500 and at the conference the sum of $5,000 was agreed to.

Mr. Rodino, Jr., Chairman of the Conference Committee.

Managers on the Part of the Senate:


The conference report was agreed to.

The managers on the part of the House, at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1424) for the relief of T. L. Morrow, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment.}

SAC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said Chester A. Macomber the sum of $130.63, such amount having been withheld from the annuity payable to him under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1950, as amended, on account of the dual employment referred to in the first section of this act: Provided, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of one percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with the claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

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

Mr. Keating. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman from New York whether the change in the Senate bill is simply of a technical nature?

Mr. Byrne of New York. The amendment of the Senate does not change the purpose of the bill. It is merely a safeguard.

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

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mrs. Albert W. Lack

Mr. Byrne of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 3229) for the relief of Mrs. Albert W. Lack, with a Senate amendment thereto, and continue in the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, strike out lines 9 to 12, inclusive, and insert "such award and act of September 7, 1916, to Mrs. Albert W. Lack, widow of Albert W. Lack, as on the basis of such findings shall appear equitable."

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

Mr. Keating. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, do I understand correctly that this is simply changing the name of the beneficiary in this bill?

Mr. Byrne of New York. No; the Senate amendment was merely to clarify the intent of the bill. It does not change the purpose of the bill as passed by the House.

Mr. Keating. In what respect does it change the bill? My understanding was that it changed the name of the beneficiary under the bill.

Mr. Byrne of New York. I do not believe this is the bill the gentleman has in mind.

Mr. Keating. I should like to know in what respect it does change it.

Mr. Byrne of New York. The bill itself does not indicate...
Mr. KEATING. I suggest the gentleman withdraw his request until tomorrow.

Mr. BYRNE of New York. Surely, Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my request.

MRS. WALTER J. BICKFORD

Mr. BYRNE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 512) conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Mrs. Walter J. Bickford, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, line 14, after "amended," insert "Enactment of this act shall not be construed as an implication of liability on the part of the United States." The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LUCY KONG LEE

Mr. BYRNE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 1800) for the relief of Lucy Kong Lee, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, lines 5 and 6, strike out "Lucy Kong Lee, widow" and insert "the estate." Amend the title so as to read: "An act for the relief of the estate of Chin Hien Lee.

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Sgt. BENJAMIN H. MARTIN

Mr. BYRNE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 1789) for the relief of Sgt. Benjamin H. Martin, with an amendment of the Senate thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 7, strike out "$15,000" and insert "$10,000."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. ARMSTRONG asked and was given permission to address the House for 45 minutes on Thursday next, following the legislative program and any special orders that may be entered.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BENNETT) is recognized for 30 minutes.

(Mr. BENNETT of Florida asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days to extend their remarks on the subject upon which I will address the House at this time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HERLON). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

CODE OF ETHICS FOR GOVERNMENT SERVICE

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, today, a concurrent resolution setting forth a proposed code of ethics for Government service has been introduced.

No one Congressman drew this code. It was done by an informal, bipartisan committee, which has been at work on this for several months. At the request of this committee, I have taken the initiative in the introduction of the resolution.

A number of Members of Congress join as sponsors of this legislation. They include: CLIFFORD R. HOPE, JAMES J. MURPHY, HALE BOGGS, BILL LANTAFF, ROBERT J. CORBETT, JAMES T. PATTISON, LAWRENCE BATTLE, FRANK BOYKIN, WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN DORN, KATHARINE ST. GEORGE, GEORGE FORD, MARCOURITE STITT CHURCH, JOHN PHILLIPS, Fred E. BURKET, WESLEY A. D'EWART, HAYLEY O. STAGGERS, ROBERT HALE, THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ, ROBERT T. SECREST, CLEVELAND M. BAILEY, PAUL CUNNINGHAM, CHARLES H. B. MILLER, HOMER D. ANGELL, WILLIAM L. SPRINGER, FREDZEE REAMS, CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI, JAMES P. M. DEVERUX, HENDERSON LAMHAM, ERNEST GREENWOOD, and A. S. HERLONG.

When the committee which studied this matter first undertook the task, it drew up a preliminary statement concerning the foundations of any possible code of ethics that could be formulated. This statement was as follows:

PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

Government exists for men and not men for government. In a democratic republic such as ours, government is of, for, and by men. He who participates in government—whether as voter, elected office holder, or civil servant—is under a solemn obligation to recognize its great purpose, and to conduct himself accordingly.

The Christian, Jewish, and other religious faiths which share a belief in the sacredness and dignity of man will base their civic conduct on certain fundamental principles, including the following:

1. Individual rights arise from the brotherhood of man under the government of God. The great freedoms of speech, of the press, or religion are imperative to be fostered and not disregarded.

2. Individuals are unequal in ability, but equal in their right to be regarded as individuals. Equality of opportunity, the American dream, is a major expression of this truth.

3. The office holder is the servant of the people and not their master. "He that is greater among you, let him be the servant of all."

4. Public office is a public trust. It carries with it the obligation of integrity. Honor and truth in the spoken and written word are basic to responsibility in government.

These are governmental principles that derive from the spiritual faith of our ancestors. They precede any code of concrete content. Those who sincerely hold them may be trusted.

No code of conduct can hope to cover specifically the multitude of concrete situations which the complex and vast sphere of contemporary government contains within itself. Yet we believe there is value in identifying certain concrete principles which should guide public officials—in whatever branch or level of government.

In approaching this question of a code of ethics for all Government employees, including elective officials, we did not wish to become theoretical, complicated, or falsely pious in treatment of the subject; for it was our belief that a practical, brief, and understandable code could be worked out that would be of real assistance in the daily workings of government.

We read that many had thought about the idea in the past but never presented a code for enactment. In the May 1922 issue of The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, Prof. R. M. MacIver, of the University of Toronto, wrote:

The false old notion that there was, for that most ancient, and still most imperfectly defined, profession of statesmanship, a peculiar code which liberated it from ordinary ethical standards, has died very hard. In truth there could be no conflicts of ethics and politics, for politics could justify itself only by applying to its own peculiar situations and needs the pattern which belong equally to every sphere of life.

We feel that there is a need for a code of ethics in the field of government at this time. And in saying this we do not wish to indulge in confessing the sins of others or even in denouncing the low state of public morals. There are plenty of people putting in full time in those activities without there being any need for volunteers to fill their ranks at this time.

It would be well for us to remember that on the walls of this Chamber there are the pictures of many legislators of ancient times who found it necessary to mention standards of moral conduct in connection with governmental procedures. Up there is Hammurabi who, in 2250 B.C., considered it fitting to announce that "If a man offer as a bribe grain or money to witnesses, he himself shall bear the sentence of the court in that case;", and in the laws of Moses we read: "And thou shalt take no gift, nor bribe, nor a gift blindeth them that have sight, and perverteth the word of the righteous."

In the early days of our own Republic, we find our ancestors establishing strong laws against those who might be found to be corrupt in public office. Bribery is one of the two specific grounds listed
forces of right and in increasing public words.

The code of ethics can help governmental employees in evaluating the quality of their employees. Federal employees, for instance, may be fired for unsatisfactory work. It would seem that violations of a code of ethics could be the basis of finding an employee unsatisfactory. So it would appear that the code could have a bearing on the continued tenure of not only elected officials but also of civil-service employees.

In an article on codes of ethics, at page 57 of the October 1924 issue of the International Journal of Ethics, the author, W. Brooks Graves, says of a code of ethics:

"If it does nothing else than direct the thought of men toward ethical matters, the effort is not lost, for when the normal man begins to think about ethics he is more likely to try to do better. And the group can only reach a higher ethical standard as its individual members strive for the realization of such a standard."

If it would appear that the above practical applications of such a code are not sufficient to accomplish concrete results, it could be implemented by penalties and procedures; but I do not think that such are necessary. However, I fear that any code of ethics will need revision from time to time; and I am rather certain that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service will make changes in the present resolution before it is brought to the floor for a vote.

I am sure that this code can be improved upon; but it is the best product that I could bring before you with the help of those attorneys and the others who have asked to remain anonymous.

The fact that the proposed code of ethics can be improved upon should not deter us from attempting to improve upon it, and thus to correct it. The fact that there will still be transgressions after such a code is approved should not discourage us. If it helps in any case it is justified. A defective attitude should not be allowed. Criminal laws have frightened many men away from evil. Religious have inspired many men away from evil. Codes of ethics have done a little of both. I am glad, indeed, to join together in attempting to perfect and establish a code of ethics for Government service that will be worth while.

The resolution to which I have referred reads as follows:

"Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring). That it is the sense of the Congress that the following code of ethics should be adhered to by all Government employees, including officeholders:

CODE OF ETHICS FOR GOVERNMENT SERVICE

Government employees, whether as an elected officer or not, require both conscientious vocational labor and righteous personal conduct. It should be characterized by devotion to God and country.

As a desire and purpose to forward the best interests of the United States are an essential part of the loyalty of citizenship, no person who fails to have such desire and purpose should hold Government employment.

A Government employee should:

1. Uphold the Constitution, laws, and legal regulations of the United States and of all governments therein and never be a part of any movement for unlimited or unlimited private control.

2. Give a full day's labor for a full day's pay.

3. Seek to find and employ more efficient and economical ways of getting tasks accomplished.

4. Never discriminate unfairly by the dispensing of special favors or privileges to anyone, whether for remuneration or not; and never accept favors or benefits from persons doing business with the Government.

5. Never use any influence or decision to him in public functions as a means for making private profit.

6. Do not accept or buy from the correction wherever discovered.

7. Never seek to influence another to violate these principles.

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

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. I yield.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I congratulate the gentleman for what he has done. I have seen him working on this and struggling with it for many months. It was his idea was the first. I am formally to the attention of individual Members of the House. I do not think at any time the gentleman fell—and I think he would say so today—that he would bring in for the first time a perfect Code of Ethics; any more than the code of ethics for the Bar Association for the attorneys, or a code of ethics for doctors, or a code for any other profession such as engineers, or what have you, was perfect at the first time. Such codes were placed on paper and brought to the light of day. I believe out of this will come eventually a code of ethics that we will look upon with pride as something to which we can say, 'This is what we stand for; this is our guide.'

I am glad, indeed, and I thank the gentleman for permitting me to associate myself with him as one of the sponsors of this initial introduction of what will be a code of ethics for people in public life.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. I certainly wish to thank the gentleman from California and to say he has given me great assistance in working this thing out and has given me much encouragement and worked in every possible way to assist me. I particularly agree that this code, in its present form, cannot be considered as being perfect. It has been a real inspiration to me to serve with the gentleman from California in trying to adopt this code of ethics to the best of our ability.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. I yield.
MRS. ROGERS of Massachusetts. This shows real courage. The gentleman has courage in every way and in every other respect. We do honor to him.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. I thank my good friend. She certainly has been a true friend to me in everything that I have attempted to do here. Your great career in Congress has been a challenge to me in what I have tried to do.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. I yield.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I wish to add my comment to those which have been made concerning the gentleman from Florida for this very splendid work that he has done. I know he has given a great deal of time and a great deal of thought to it. I also like this code of ethics because it is simple. It is straightforward. It is something we can all understand, and we want to have our own. It is not pompous, it is not preachy, it it not holding up anything or anybody as being better than anything or anyone else. It is simply a straightforward statement of facts. In this modern world it seems to me that such a statement is needed. The gentleman from Florida deserves the greatest credit for having put this into simple form and for having brought it to the attention of the Members of the House of Representatives, and finally for having brought it to the floor. I thank the gentleman for having allowed me to associate myself in some small way with this work, I hope it will grow forward. I hope it will prosper and I hope it will improve because I am sure it is something that is necessary and something that can do a great deal of good, not only as far as we are concerned, but also for our Government employees and as a reassurance to all the people of the country, that they may know that their public servants have God-righteousness and God-fearfulness in their hearts and minds.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. I certainly am deeply indebted to the gentleman for her remarks and her help in this project. Her splendid work in this House sets an example of public service at its best.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from Florida for his noble object in seeking to improve moral and ethical standards in Government. Although we cannot legislate high morals and good ethics I believe that the adoption of ethics as proposed by my colleague, would be helpful in bringing light on some of the evils which need to be challenged and eliminated so far as is feasibly possible.

But we must not attempt to disassociate immoral and unethical acts in Government from the lack of ethics and morals in our community and economic life.

Government, whatever it is, generally reflects the understanding, the intelligence, the morality, or the apathy and confusion of the public.

Deceptive propaganda of fronts and lobbies adds to confusion and immorality. For a high standard of morality and ethics in our communities, in the Government, or in the Congress the Nation's press must adopt higher moral and ethical standards.

Nothing can be more effective in promoting high moral and ethical standards than a press which is not only free but honest and clean.

If the stream of public information is polluted, it will not only affect morality in Government, but the unity of our people, the strength of our Nation, and the welfare of our people.

Mr. Speaker, I hope to discuss this question in greater detail at some future time.

MRS. ALBERT W. LACK

Mr. BYRNE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 3239) for the relief of Mrs. Albert W. Lack, with Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

Since I made my previous request I have taken this up with the gentleman from New York and satisfied him on the point on which I made inquiry.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 3, strike out lines 9 to 12, inclusive, and insert "such award, pursuant to said act of September 7, 1918, to Mrs. Albert W. Lack, widow of Albert W. Lack, as on the basis of such findings shall appear equitable."

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to answer the gentleman from New York came up before I had examined the text of this change and find it is simply of a technical nature. It does not in any judgment change the meaning of the bill.

I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There is no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from California [Mr. Jackson] is recognized for 30 minutes.

THE COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I dislike to impose upon the House at this late hour, but unfortunately my remarks are in the form of notes and not a manuscript which I could have had in the Raceon else I would gladly do so.

I should like in a few minutes to briefly discuss the work of the House Committee on Un-American Activities as it shapes up at this time some 6 months after the convening of the first session of the present Congress. We all know that since the creation of the House Committee on Un-American Activities it has been one of the most controversial committees of the Congress; and that the President of the United States has been little critical in public print or from other sources with respect to the committee. This statement, of course, excludes the Daily Worker, the Daily People's World, and other publications of a left-wing or Communist character.

Much of the universal acceptance of the present work of the Un-American Activities Committee can, of course, be traced to changed world conditions and to a changed public opinion, both in the United States and abroad, and to a new recognition and a fuller realization of the threat posed to free institutions by the international Communist conspiracy.

What was once considered by some well-meaning but misinformed people as "Red baiting" is now generally recognized throughout this country as a proper
activity in the defense of the American people and of our way of life against an organized and secret conspiracy which has sought and presently seeks the overthrow of constitutional government in the world that does not parallel that practiced in the Soviet Union. No thinking man today, Mr. Speaker, underestimates the threat of the Communist Party, so far as it is represented today, to achieve its goal by subversion and treachery. We have seen that conspiracy engage in the utilization of the armed forces of foreign powers in Korea. Political developments in Poland, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Bulgaria, Rumania, Albania, China, North Korea, Tibet, and other lands have shown the power of organized minorities working under cover and through subversive channels to disrupt and destroy human liberty and human freedom.

The utilization of the English language have been combined and cor-

rected to form the ironic phrase "people's republic." Neither "republic" nor "people's" has received the pedi-
nized misery and the concentration camp methods practiced within the Commu-
nist system.

Propaganda is one of the most lethal weapons in the hands of Communist leaders. It is a weapon which is wielded skilfully by those leaders. Communists, we know, uses the minds and the tools of individuals to influence the thinking and the mass actions of others. Perhaps no fields of human endeavor have offered quite the fertile field for Communist propaganda as have those activities associated with the arts, sciences and professions. Those fields were particularly subject to attack by communism during the period of the late war and in the years immediately succeeding that conflict. The stage, the screen, the radio, and every other medium of public entertainment and public information came under a premedi-
tated and determined attack during the war years, which there might be disseminated that information which they considered es-
tential to the creation of a political cli-

m ate in which communism could and would flourish. We, who have the privi-

e of living in the so-called democ-

ratie nations of the earth, are some-
times slow to use the weapons at our disposal for the defense of our freedom.

Hollywood, obviously then, offered the Communist movement four great things. If they could capture and control the moving-picture industry there were open to them four channels of insinuation value. In the first place, the Communist movement, if successful in Hollywood, would gain the prestige of great names, names known throughout the world as leading artists, directors, actors, writers, industry leaders. They would obtain, secondly, financial support from the world capital of the moving-picture industry in which fabulous salaries were being paid to the artists. They saw also the opportunity of gaining control of the craft unions and the guild unions in Hollywood, which control would, in turn, place them in a position to work terms to the industry leaders and lead, in turn, to the fourth great propaganda medium which they hoped to achieve, and that was the use of the Communist pro-
ganda in motion pictures by the inser-
tion of material favorable to the Com-
munist system.

Under the direction of V. J. Jerome, the Communist Party cultural director, the attack was launched. John Howard Lawson, one of the Hollywood 10 who was imprisoned for contempt of the Con-

gress, became the bellwether of the Hol-

lywood flock. It was to John Howard Lawson that confused and bewildered members of the party took their problems. It was John Howard Lawson who explained how the United States could be allied with one force on any given day and then move 180 degrees around the circle and be with the other side on the following day. John Howard Lawson did a splendid job of rationalization in this respect, because he did convince a number of people that these changes of course were logical and justified. Recruits were obtained in Hollywood and were obtained in every section of the mov-
ing-picture industry. Stars, direc-
tors, writers, grip, electricians—all of the guilds and crafts were finally rep-
resented in the Communist Party in Hol-
lywood when it reached the height of its strength during the war years.

If there is any question, Mr. Speaker, the answer is yes. There is no longer any question. Mr. Speaker, how is a high-paid mov-
ing-picture actor or actress induced to join the Communist Party, a political group which holds as anathema anything and everyone who might be connected with the capitalist system? Several reasons have been advanced by those witnesses who appeared before our committee as the reasons why people join the Communist Party and took part in its activities. In the first place, there was the thrill of the unique and unconventional which might be compared to the feeling of self-achieve-

ment experienced by one who sits on a flagpole for a hundred days. Secondly, there was the individual who had a sin-
cense of anger against some special thought and it appeared to him that he could best find an outlet for this expression in the ranks of the Marxists. Third, there was the careful choice of those who thought, that while the democratic way of life might continue to exist and pros-
per, there was always the chance that a Communist system might overcome the democratic form of life in the final strug-
gle. These people said, "Just to be safe I am going to keep a foot in each camp." There was another large group who suffered from a weird assortment of neuroses and who took those neuroses with them into communism and tried to solve their problems within the frame-
work of the Marxist system and later it was evident that the democratic form of life could and would flourish. We, who have the privi-
e of living in the so-called demo-
cratic nations of the earth, are some-
times slow to use the weapons at our disposal for the defense of our freedom.

Hollywood, obviously then, offered the Communist movement four great things. If they could capture and control the moving-picture industry there were open to them four channels of insinuation value. In the first place, the Communist movement, if successful in Hollywood, would gain the prestige of great names, names known throughout the world as leading artists, directors, actors, writers, industry leaders. They would obtain, secondly, financial support from the world capital of the moving-picture industry in which fabulous salaries were being paid to the artists. They saw also the opportunity of gaining control of the craft unions and the guild unions in Hollywood, which control would, in turn, place them in a position to work terms to the industry leaders and lead, in turn, to the fourth great propaganda medium which they hoped to achieve, and that was the use of the Communist pro-
ganda in motion pictures by the inser-
tion of material favorable to the Com-
munist system.

Under the direction of V. J. Jerome, the Communist Party cultural director, the attack was launched. John Howard Lawson, one of the Hollywood 10 who was imprisoned for contempt of the Con-

gress, became the bellwether of the Hol-

lywood flock. It was to John Howard Lawson that confused and bewildered members of the party took their problems. It was John Howard Lawson who explained how the United States could be allied with one force on any given day and then move 180 degrees around the circle and be with the other side on the following day. John Howard Lawson did a splendid job of rationalization in this respect, because he did convince a number of people that these changes of course were logical and justified. Recruits were obtained in Hollywood and were obtained in every section of the mov-
ing-picture industry. Stars, direc-
tors, writers, grip, electricians—all of the guilds and crafts were finally rep-
resented in the Communist Party in Hol-
lywood when it reached the height of its strength during the war years.

If there is any question, Mr. Speaker, the answer is yes. There is no longer any question. Mr. Speaker, how is a high-paid mov-
ing-picture actor or actress induced to join the Communist Party, a political group which holds as anathema anything and everyone who might be connected with the capitalist system? Several reasons have been advanced by those witnesses who appeared before our committee as the reasons why people join the Communist Party and took part in its activities. In the first place, there was the thrill of the unique and unconventional which might be compared to the feeling of self-achieve-
ment experienced by one who sits on a flagpole for a hundred days. Secondly, there was the individual who had a sin-
cense of anger against some special thought and it appeared to him that he could best find an outlet for this expression in the ranks of the Marxists. Third, there was the careful choice of those who thought, that while the democratic way of life might continue to exist and pros-
per, there was always the chance that a Communist system might overcome the democratic form of life in the final strug-
gle. These people said, "Just to be safe I am going to keep a foot in each camp." There was another large group who suffered from a weird assortment of neuroses and who took those neuroses with them into communism and tried to solve their problems within the frame-
work of the Marxist system and later it was evident that the democratic form of life could and would flourish. We, who have the privi-
e of living in the so-called demo-
cratic nations of the earth, are some-
times slow to use the weapons at our disposal for the defense of our freedom.

Hollywood, obviously then, offered the Communist movement four great things. If they could capture and control the moving-picture industry there were open to them four channels of insinuation value. In the first place, the Communist movement, if successful in Hollywood, would gain the prestige of great names, names known throughout the world as leading artists, directors, actors, writers, industry leaders. They would obtain, secondly, financial support from the world capital of the moving-picture industry in which fabulous salaries were being paid to the artists. They saw also the opportunity of gaining control of the craft unions and the guild unions in Hollywood, which control would, in turn, place them in a position to work terms to the industry leaders and lead, in turn, to the fourth great propaganda medium which they hoped to achieve, and that was the use of the Communist pro-
ganda in motion pictures by the inser-
tion of material favorable to the Com-
munist system.

Under the direction of V. J. Jerome, the Communist Party cultural director, the attack was launched. John Howard Lawson, one of the Hollywood 10 who was imprisoned for contempt of the Con-

gress, became the bellwether of the Hol-

lywood flock. It was to John Howard Lawson that confused and bewildered members of the party took their problems. It was John Howard Lawson who explained how the United States could be allied with one force on any given day and then move 180 degrees around the circle and be with the other side on the following day. John Howard Lawson did a splendid job of rationalization in this respect, because he did convince a number of people that these changes of course were logical and justified. Recruits were obtained in Hollywood and were obtained in every section of the mov-
ing-picture industry. Stars, direc-
tors, writers, grip, electricians—all of the guilds and crafts were finally rep-
party members to the Communist Party in Hollywood. We do know that several witnesses have testified that new salaries in amounts varying from $2,000 to $4,000 and $5,000 during the period when they were members of the party and that regular pledges were paid to the party over a period of many months.

As to the control of unions, there was a marked success during one particular period when the Conference of Studio Unions, under the leadership of Mr. Alger Hiss, succeeded in tying up the entire moving-picture industry over a period of many months. However, it must be said in all justice and all fairness that the Communists were not always successful, except in very isolated cases in obtaining control of any of the craft or guild unions.

Propaganda in picture content was successful to some extent, particularly during and immediately after the war years, when the Soviet Union was our ally. The so-called documentary film offered an excellent medium for Communist propaganda.

During the last 5 months the House Committee on Un-American Activities has been investigating the extent of Communist infiltration and organization in the moving-picture industry. I should like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that “industry” in this sense means not only the men who control the destinies of the studios, but also the thousands and thousands of American citizens who, after their work is finished, go to their homes and their families in much the same manner and with much the same spirit as do members of other American associations.

One of the first witnesses this year before the House Committee on Un-American Activities was Larry Parks, the star of the Jolson Story. The case of Larry Parks is outstanding because he was the first to appear before the committee and admit prior membership in the Communist Party. Since then the committee has heard two score and more witnesses from Hollywood, and they have been, according to their own determinations, cooperative, uncooperative, arrogant, or contemptuous. Each has been an individual case and has had to have its merits considered.

The majority of the witnesses have been represented by counsel. An attorney, Mr. Ben Margolis, of Los Angeles, who has represented a number of non-cooperative witnesses, has been identified on the witness stand as being himself a member of the Communist Party.

Great progress, I believe, has been made in this hearing, and there is reason to believe that a majority of the more prominent members of the party in Hollywood have at this time been identified. I believe it is the intention of the committee to carry on further investigations on the west coast, and unquestionably a number of additional subpoenas will be issued at the proper time. The absence of a witness to answer questions or not to answer questions put to him by committee counsel or by committee members has been scrupulously observed.

In general, I can say that witnesses who have appeared before the committee during the past 6 months can be classified in three categories. We have first of all the witness who has been a member of the Communist Party and whose membership in the Communist Party is documented. That category of witnesses breaks down still further to first, those who talk, and second, those who do not talk. Naturally, the first category is very helpful to us in gathering the information necessary to propose intelligent legislation.

In the first category of those who talked to the committee were Parks, Collins, Hayden, Rosenberg, Dmytryk, and Lawrence, among others. In the category of those who refused to cooperate with the committee were Gouzh, D. Silva, Polansky, and of course, in 1947, the original Hollywood ten. Obviously the committee obtains its best information from those who are willing to cooperate and who are willing to tell the committee what they know about the operations of the party and tell about those who held membership during the same period of time.

The Committee on Un-American Activities has a tremendous job to do. It has the job of spotlighting those whose activities are subversive in nature and those whose activities and whose public statements have made them suspect. Not only in entertainment, but in education, labor unions, and in industry the Communist Party is active. Obviously the case of Mr. Alger Hiss during the same period of time has been, according to their own determination, an individual case and has had to be evaluated upon its individual merits.

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

Mr. JACKSON of California. I yield.

Mr. HILLINGS. I wish to commend the committee on its excellent job. I wish to commend the committee for the excellent job it has done in exposing these subversive activities.

I wish to ask the gentleman if he is aware of the fact that an organization known as the American Union of Labor Relations recently is holding a meeting on the west coast at Whittier, Calif., in which a number of the individuals who are carrying on the work of some of this Communist propaganda are scheduled to be in attendance. Is the gentleman familiar with that?

Mr. JACKSON of California. I would say to the gentleman that I am not familiar with the meeting in Whittier, Calif., but I will look into it at my leisure.

Mr. HILLINGS. I will appreciate it if the gentleman would do that.

Mr. JACKSON of California. One of the participants in the institute in question is Mr. Henry J. Cadbury, a professor at Harvard University. Dr. Cadbury was one of the sponsors of the American Rescue Ship Mission arranged under the auspices of the United American Loyalist cause, recruiting men in organized, multifarious, so-called relief organization.

There are several other citations with respect to Dr. Cadbury.

Mr. HILLINGS. Would the gentleman find it possible to place that material in the Record?

Mr. JACKSON of California. I should be happy to place all of the material in the Record.

Another educator connected with the same institute is Dr. Maynard C. Kreuger, professor of economics at the University of Chicago. Dr. Kreuger's activities are too long to read in the time allotted to me, but I will ask permission to extend them in the Record.

Mr. HILLINGS. I wish again to thank the gentleman and urge that this material be brought to the attention of some of the people who are concerned about the particular meeting which I have mentioned.

Mr. JACKSON of California. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I feel that the Committee on Un-American Activities is doing a constructive, well thought out, and conscientious job in bringing to light these facts. This is not a question of thought control. It is not a question of supressing opinions. It is simply a question of certain individuals holding opinions which those under their control or those who are subject to their instruction should know.

This is an attack upon the facts about any political party, including the Communist Party, but it is another thing to propagandize under the guise of education. This is a matter of grave concern to everyone who is concerned with education. It is to be hoped that if any injustice has been worked upon any of the individuals I have mentioned, that they will come forward to repudiate the action and to make statements relevant to the matter. I might say, and I am sure that Judge Wood has said this same thing many times, that anyone who feels the House Committee on Un-American Activities has been unfair, or has been instrumental in damaging his character is welcome to come before the committee and make a full explanation. This does not mean that we are particularly anxious to have a long procession of people through the committee who decline to answer the questions that are asked of them. We are seeking information, and we are not trying to be a whistle stop on the way to jail; but the
only way we can get this information is from individuals who appear as witnesses and cooperate with the committee.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I should like to call attention of the membership of the House to the recently published document, "Subversive Organizations and Publications," which was prepared and released by the House Committee on Un-American Activities. It should be in the office not only of every Member of Congress, but of every educator, of every union official, of every captain of industry. This is the listing of organizations whose conduct across the country is so shocking as to indicate that they have been consistently following the Communist Party line. I recommend it to the attention of the membership of the House and of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may insert at this point in my remarks the information I referred to earlier in my remarks.

**EXCEPTION?** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The previous, final, and final as follows:

The public records, files, and publications of the Committee on Un-American Activities contain the following references to persons named in the subject above:

Henry J. Cadbury (Hollis professor of New Testament, Harvard University, and chairman of the American Friends Service Committee):

Dr. Henry J. Cadbury was one of the sponsors of the American Rescue Mission, another of the activities of the American Spanish Aid Committee, as was shown on a letterhead of that committee dated February 13, 1941. In 1937 and 1938, "the Communist Party threw itself wholeheartedly into the campaign for the support of the Spanish Liberal cause, recruiting men and organizing multifarious so-called relief organizations," among which was the United Spanish American Aid Committee of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, released March 29, 1944, pp. 62 and 138). Attorney General Tom Clark cited the United Spanish-American Aid Committee as Communist in lists furnished the Loyalty Review Board (press releases, April 1943, and July 26, 1944). He further cited the American Rescue Mission as Communist and "a project of the United Spanish American Aid Committee" on his list which was released to the press July 25, 1949.

The Daily Worker of September 24, 1940 (p. 1), reported that "33 prominent church men, educators, and other leaders in public life joined yesterday in an open letter to Attorney General Robert H. Jackson urging him to take action under Federal statutes on unlawful attempts to prevent minority participation in the election process." The letter was made public by Daniel Hammett, chairman of the Committee on Election Rights, 1940, of the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties: "There can be no reasonable doubt about the fact that the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties—regardless of its high-sounding name—is one of the visibly successful of the Communist Party" (also noted in the Special Committee's report of June 28, 1942, and June 25, 1942, for the National Committee on Un-American Activities cited the National Federation as "one of the organizations espoused purposes of defending civil liberties in general but actually intended to protect Communist subversion" (p. 9). Attorney General Tom Clark cited the National Federation as a Communist (letters to the Loyalty Review Board, released to the press December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948). Attorney General Biddle cited the National Federation as "part of what Lenin called the solar system of organizations, ostensibly having no connection with the Communist Party, by which Communists attempt to create sympathizers and supporters of their programs." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 89, part 6, page 7443.)

Maynard C. Krueger (professor of economics, University of Washington, participant University of Chicago Radio Roundtable):

A press release which was issued by the American Youth Congress named Maynard Krueger, vice president, American Federation of Teachers, as one of the prominent individuals who endorsed the American Youth Act. Attorney General Tom Clark cited the American Youth Congress as subversive and Communist (letters to the Loyalty Review Board, released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948); "it originated in 1934 and was identified as a Communist-front organization, manipulated and influenced by them to influence the thought of American youth." (ATTORNEY GENERAL'S REPORT, volume 89, part 6, page 7443; also cited in re Harry Bridges, May 26, 1942, p. 10.) The Special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the American Youth Congress as one of the principal fronts of the Communist Party and "prominently identified with the White House picket line under the immediate auspices of the American Peace Mobilization." (Report of June 28, 1942, p. 9; report of January 3, 1939, p. 82; January 3, 1941, p. 21; June 25, 1942, p. 16, and March 29, 1944, p. 103.)

On August 17, 1938, Mr. Walter S. Steele appeared before the Special Committee on Un-American Activities and testified as follows:

"Just as the Communist Party has its defense movement, the International Labor Defense, the Socialists, the Party, the Workers' Defense League. The latter organization was formed in May 1936 by leading members of the Socialist Party. . . . The National Committee of the Workers' Defense League is composed of the following Socialists: . . . Maynard Krueger." (Public hearings, vol. 1, pp. 676-679.)

Milton Meyer: Milton Meyer, identified as a professor at the University of Chicago, was reported to have addressed a meeting of One World Crusaders, as follows: "We must haul down the American flag. And if I wanted to be vulgar and shock the middle classes, I would say, 'Hang it up, down, on it and spit on it.'" (from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 93, part 3, pages 1720-21, Representative George W. Miller, Illinois, May 25, 1950, p. 234; cited in Tunstall's "Post-Standard" of February 16, 1947.)

The Daily People's World for July 5, 1950 (p. 4) reported that Milton Meyer, who described himself as a "radical anti-Communist," addressed the Quaker Institute of International Relations and told them that the United States policy in Korea "seems dangerously like the totalitarianism we are supposed to be fighting off.""
of Howard University, has publicly advanced the doctrines of communism. He read portions of speeches delivered by Dr. Johnson to substantiate his statement. (Vol. 3, public hearings before the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, pp. 2143-2161.)

RECORD and to include immediately following my remarks at this point in the reading portions of speeches delivered by Dr. Johnston. *Astonished* by the doctrines of Dr. Johnston, therefore, that he just cannot know what has become of the rugged individual you once were.

The Speaker pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, the National Association of Manufacturers, which was the big winner here in 1946 when the Congress crippled price control—and which was promising the people that prices would not go up out of line—was formerly Eric Johnston. It is now trying once again to persuade the Congress of the United States to rip off the only protection the people now have and add higher and higher cost-of-living prices. The NAM says get rid of price controls and use taxes and credit restraints instead. But the same NAM that says do not use price control to curb inflation because taxes can do the job, also was in here last week trying to kill the income tax. That kind of logic might appear to the NAM to be good for money, but that's not the theory that it does not take much to fool the Congress, but the NAM is wrong on that theory just as it is on most of the theories it tries to lobby into law.

I was very disturbed, Mr. Speaker, to see those statements, which is not above turning itself into a lobby for organized greed, has launched an attack on an outstanding American businessman. He has a job, and that job is to try to take over a difficult and thankless job of trying to stabilize this economy in the face of the dangerous inflationary threat. I am referring to Eric Johnston, the Administrator of the Economic Stabilization Agency, a man who has had the courage to stand up for the consumers and the people against this selfish drive for business-as-usual in time of national crisis.

The NAM says Eric Johnston now has a "new economic religion" from the one he followed when he was president of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States and an active businessman. It says he has "not been engaged directly in business for some time," meaning, therefore, that he just cannot know what he is talking about when he calls upon business to do its part in this emergency by holding down prices—and requiring that prices be held down.

I was very pleased to learn that when a businessman sent Mr. Johnston a copy of a NAM attack on him, and chided Mr. Johnston for allegedly changing his economic views, that Mr. Johnston not only read the article, but made public the exchange of correspondence.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the Members of Congress would be interested in reading that exchange of letters for a real insight on how an outstanding businessman can so readily fall for the job in the public interest despite smears from an outfit from the NAM.

The exchange of correspondence follows:

OTT-HIEKELL CO., Wheeling, W. Va., June 8, 1951.

Mr. ERIC JOHNSTON,

2143-2161.

Good Morning, Mr. Johnston: There is an editorial in the June 9 issue of NAM News captioned, "Eric Johnston's new economic religion." I think your position, as quoted in press interviews, gives ample grounds for this editorial.

Of course it's all right for an individual to change his mind. That is often done, but for one with your background—one with your past experience—it seems to me you would be a bit loath to give up all that you once believed in simply because of a changed position now. For one, I am still old-fashioned enough to believe that America should remain a land of freedom and opportunity. A system you once advocated and defended. It is still a pretty nice place to live. What has become of the rugged individual you once were?

Yours truly,

W. F. KENNEDY.

ECONOMIC STABILIZATION AGENCY

Mr. W. F. KENNEDY.

Wheeling, W. Va.

DEAR MR. KENNEDY: You are quite thought-ful enough to take a few minutes from your busy day to write to me about the editorial in the NAM News of June 9, I am taking a few minutes to write in reply.

Although my views on the need for temporary direct controls apparently differ from those of the gentleman whose position of Manufacturers, I have no quarrel with him. He has not been engaged directly in business for some time.

Now, what are the facts? I have been the operating head continuously, until I took the position as Economic Stabilizer in January, of four businesses in the Northwest, three of which I founded. These businesses are all successful financially. They give employment to a number of people. The businesses are expanding and are creating more jobs. The stockholders appear to be satisfied with the operation and with the dividends they are receiving.

But the reports of the NAM are not the only unfortunate aspect of the NAM editorial. Isn't the writer saying, in effect, that he is unable to get facts and figures upon his own authority?

Among those is the statement: "It is far to point out, however, that Mr. Johnston has not operated a business in this country for some time. His cast of thought and motivation are no longer governed by the requirements of running a business successfully to safeguard the jobs of employees and the rights of stockholders."
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Churchill saw him, not only as "a magnificent organizer and builder of armies," but as a "statesman with a penetrating and commanding view of the whole scene." Admiral Leahy said that "his drive, courage, and imagination trans­formed his country's military strength into the most magnificent fighting force ever assembled." These are but a fragment of the tributes paid Marshall for his work as Chief of Staff during the greatest war in history. As if his wartime service were not service enough, George Marshall became Secretary of State in January 1947, at a time when Soviet aggression was on the march and many of the problems we face today were in their early stages. Here, again, the record speaks for itself. The Marshall plan is best known to us as the major achievement of his term in office, but there was achievement, and, of course, frustration in other fields. You may ask why modern military aid to Greece and Turkey, forerunner of our present vital program of military assistance, was to the Marshall plan as the Little Assemblies were to the continuing problems of the international situation. It was Marshall who asked the United Nations to eliminate the much-misused veto in the Security Council. It was Marshall who, on September 17, 1947, placed the problem of Korean independence before the General Assembly because he was determined that Soviet obstructionism should not prevent the just and rightful claim of the Korean people to independence. The New York Times' James Reston wrote of Marshall as Secretary of State, "a man who has the clarity that is necessary to form a sharp vision of the problems of the international situation. Today, far more than in 1929, such a position invites disaster. When I speak of unity, I do not mean that we must stifle constructive debate on foreign and domestic issues. We cannot afford to formulate sound policies without intelligent discussion both in Congress and elsewhere. But I do say that there is no place in the United States for the kind of divisive and partis­an agenda on the domestic scene. In the case of the Soviet Union there is, I suppose, a method in their madness. As regards the attacks on George Marshall, there is no method involved of which we can be proud. Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I do not understand these charges, but it will not be fooled.

Farewell to these attacks in which only a public servant for political purposes? Here, perhaps, is a possible motive. But those who attempt to do so underestimate, in my opinion, the public esteem for their target. The public may listen to such charges, but it will not be fooled. Mr. Speaker, in these attacks, it is to create dissen­sion and distrust in this country when we need, as we have never had quite so much before, to present a unity of purpose and design to the world. I suspect that those who expound these charges are less happy with our relative newness in the role of international responsibility. They would, I suggest, retreat into the foxhole of isolationism that offers, at best, only temporary protection from the realities of global life. Today, far more than in 1929, such a position invites disaster.
Mr. DOLLIVER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. WERDEG asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a letter.

Mr. PATTERSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous material.

Mr. MCCARTHY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a news item.

Mr. HANNAH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an address by Mr. A. P. Frame, entitled "Observations of a WOC," notwithstanding the fact that it will exceed two pages of the Record and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $191.34.

Mr. BROOKS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous material.

Mr. McCRAY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in six instances and include extraneous material.

Mr. ZABLOCKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous material.

Mr. MANSFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and in two include extraneous material.


definition of the Department of Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

562. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed legislation entitled "a bill to repeal the provisions of the Federal Credit Union Act, as amended, to the Virgin Islands;" to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

96. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "a bill to exempt certain civilian employees of the Department of Defense from the laws governing the employment, removal, classification, pay, retirement, leave and disability and death compensation of Federal officers and employees;" to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MITCHELL: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 265. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 3231, a bill to amend section 207 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 so as to authorize payment of claims arising from the correction of military or naval records without amendment (Rept. No. 647). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. CANNON: Committee on Appropriations. House Joint Resolution 276. Joint resolution making temporary appropriations for the fiscal year 1952, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 653). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1288. An act for the relief of Sidney Lomax, deceased; without amendment (Rept. No. 684). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1289. An act for the relief of the estate of Sidney Lomax, deceased; without amendment (Rept. No. 686). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MACHROWICZ: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 901. An act for the relief of Betty Minori, without amendment (Rept. No. 688). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MACHROWICZ: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 910. An act for the relief of Grady Franklin Welch; without amendment...
PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. McCORMACK:
H. R. 4601. A bill to provide that the admission tax shall not apply in respect of attendance of uniformed members of the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TEAGUE:
H. R. 4602. A bill to provide additional compensation for members of the Army, Navy, and Air Force during periods of combat duty; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BEALL:
H. R. 4604. A bill providing for an investigation and study by the Interstate Commerce Commission of the adequacy and convenience of passenger carrier facilities and services and the reasonableness of fares in the metropolitan area of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:
H. R. 4605. A bill for the establishment of a temporary National Advisory Committee for the Blind; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa:
H. R. 4606. A bill to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 4607. A bill to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By AUGUST H. ANDRESEN:
H. R. 4608. A bill to control imports of fats, oil-bearing materials, peanuts, butter, cheese and other dairy products, and rice and rice products; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FORD:
H. R. 4609. A bill to amend part VIII of Veterans Regulation No. 1, so as to increase the subsistence compensation which a veteran may earn while receiving subsistence allowance thereunder; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BUDGIE:
H. R. 4610. A bill to provide for the grant of the American Falls and Owyhee Falls Industry Act; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HAVENNER:
H. R. 4611. A bill to amend the Trading with the Enemy Act to extend the time for filing claims by American citizens; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan:
H. R. 4612. A bill to amend section 402 (a) (3) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CANNON:
H. J. Res. 277. Joint resolution making temporary appropriations for the fiscal year 1952, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. WENDELL of Florida:
H. Con. Res. 128. Concurrent resolution providing a code of ethics for Government service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HALE:
H. Con. Res. 129. Concurrent resolution providing a code of ethics for Government service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GIBBONS:
H. Con. Res. 130. Concurrent resolution providing a code of ethics for Government service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BATTLE:
H. Con. Res. 131. Concurrent resolution providing a code of ethics for Government service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:
H. Con. Res. 132. Concurrent resolution providing a code of ethics for Government service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. SHEEHAN:
H. Res. 592. A bill creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the massacre of Polish Army Officers in the Katyn Forest, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and the disappearance of other Polish Army officers who fled for protection to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics in 1939 and 1940; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DEMPSEY:
H. Res. 385. Resolution favoring the negotiation of a treaty for the defense of the Mediterranean area against Communist aggression; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:
H. Res. 386. Resolution to provide for a Select Committee on Problems of the Aging; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BLATNIK:
H. R. 4613. A bill for the relief of Karlo Mattiazzi and Kostanza Mattiazzi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOLLING:
H. R. 4614. A bill to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WARE:
H. R. 4615. A bill for the relief of Gattas A. Maloof; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GORDON:
H. R. 4616. A bill for the relief of Stanislav Stein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRAHAM:
H. R. 4617. A bill for the relief of Luis Lourenco Diniz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:
H. R. 4618. A bill for the relief of Victoria Lardizabal Valencia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

God of our fathers, above all the confusion and confusion of the busy present, with its demands that drain our souls, we would turn for this hallowed moment to seek the quietness of Thy presence at the beginning of the day's deliberations. In the secret of Thy pavilion we take refuge from the strife of tongues. By tasks too difficult for us we are driven unto Thee for strength to endure and wisdom to interpret rightly the signs of these trying times. In these hallowed halls may Thy servants, trusted by the people with high responsibility, serve with fidelity the cause of our country and our common humanity, and so help to build the city of God on the ruined wastes of this disturbed and disorderly world. We ask it through riches of grace in Christ Jesus our Lord. Amen.

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

On request of Mr. McFarland, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, June 26, 1951, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 51) providing for United States participation in the celebration at Philadelphia, Pa., of the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of the signing of the Declaration of Independence.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1103) for the relief of Sidney Young Hughes; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. Walter, Mr. Feighan, and Mr. Graham were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1424) for the relief of T. L. Morrow.

The message also announced that the House had severally agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the following bills of the House:

H. J. Res. 513. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Mrs. Walter J. Bickford;