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

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

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

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will
the Senate from Arizona yield?
Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

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

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

RECESS

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

The motion was agreed to; and (at
9 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.) the Sen­
ate took a recess until tomorrow, Thurs­
day, June 28, 1951, at 12 o'clock me­
ridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the
Senate June 27, 1951:
COMMISSIONER OF INTERNAL REVENUE
John B. Dunlap, of Texas, to be Com­
missioner of Internal Revenue, in place of
George J. Schoeneman, whose resignation
is effective July 31, 1951.

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

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

IN THE NAVY
William C. Bagot (Naval ROTC) to be an
ensign in the Navy, in lieu of ensign in the
Navy as previously nominated and confirmed,
correct name.
The following-named (Naval ROTC) to be
ensigns in the Service Corps of the Navy,
in lieu of ensigns in the Navy as previ­
ously nominated and confirmed:
Kenneth N. Anderson
Richard S. Jonas
Maurice Leenay

The following-named women (civilian col­
lege graduates) to be ensigns in the Navy:
Barbara A. Garrett
Helen L. Rieke

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

LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE)
James C. Larkin, Jr.
William R. Floss

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

LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE)
Howard H. Morrison
Paul H. Ohlen
Edwin F. Weyant, III

The following-named to be ensigns in the
Nurse Corps of the Navy:
Annette K. Dingman
Nancy A. Hamlen

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the
Senate June 27, 1951:
IN THE ARMY
The nominations of John F. Conoly et al.
for appointment in the Regular Army of the
United States, confirmed today, were received
by the Senate on June 13, 1951, and appear in full in the Senate
proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date, under the caption "Nominations."
beginning with the name of John F. Con­
nole, which appears on page 6581, and end­
ing with the name of Webb S. Wrath, which
is shown on page 6593.

IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE
The nominations of Willard Mayes Shanksle and
other officers for promotions, the United States Air Force, which were
confirmed today, were received by the Sen­
ate on June 11, 1951, and appear in full in the Senate
proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date, under the caption "Nominations."
beginning with the name of Willard Mayes Shanksle, which appears on page 6386, and ending with the name of John Patrick Foy, which is shown on page 6571.

WITHDRAWAL
Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate June 27, 1951:
POSTMASTER
Bruce W. Frew, Fall River, Wis.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 27, 1951

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.
Rey. George M. Crox, First Reformed
Church, Easton, Pa., offered the follow­
ing prayer:

Our Heavenly Father, we give thanks
unto Thee for Thy guidance in times past.
We pray for Thy continued guidance in
future days, with an ever-increasing
Thy providence.
We are grateful especially in this place
for Thy national blessings. We thank
Thee for our many blessings. Only
enable us to use our liberty as an occasion
to the flesh but in love serving one another.
We thank Thee for our Union. Only
guide us as the united people in the spirit of brotherliness.
We thank Thee for our democratic in­
commission may deem desirable to acquaint the public with the nature and significance of the resolution;

(2) If the commission deems it advisable, invite the participation of other nations in the celebration, and arrange for such participation in one or more of the events of the celebration;

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

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

(c) The commission shall submit to the Congress, on or before March 1, 1953, a report on the resolution after the date on which the commission ceases to exist.

Sec. 3. (a) The commission may appoint not more than two employees in 1 year and may fix the compensation of such employees without regard to the Classification Act of 1949. All expenditures of the commission shall be allowed and paid upon presentation of itemized vouchers and approved by the chairman of the commission.

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

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

The joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to adjourn was agreed to.

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

Through the past 175 years, under varying conditions, celebrations have been held on July 4. Due regard has been observed on this our Nation's birthday of Independence. When we contemplate the sacrifice of those who gave their all for our country, and the inhumanity of this nation towards others, surely we should rejoice and make every preparation for its proper observance. Some days ago both the major political parties of the nation and the country endorsed the House assisted by our distinguished colleagues from Pennsylvania, Judge GRAHAM, gave due notice of preparations under way for a celebration to be held on July 4. We in Philadelphia under the joint auspices of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the city of Philadelphia. Now it is entirely proper that the Federal Government should join in the program. Plans are under way to have an informal session of the Congress convene in Independence Hall, thus perpetuating the history of our great country. I sincerely hope that most of us may be present and join in the joyous observance of the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of our national independence. It is my hope that this resolution when our patriotism traditionally expresses itself in an exuberant manner, and rightly so, for not only will mark the birthday of our country but will give the Nation one of the most significant dates in the history of the world. In the slow march of mankind from his primitive beginnings there are certain occasions which stand out like great mountains towering over the plain whose impressiveness is shown into true perspective the farther one recedes from them. There have been many of these great benchmarks in the course of the past 10,000 years and the day on which the intrepid patriots, assembled at Philadelphia, "conceived and brought forth this constitution" is one never to be forgotten. It was one of the major contributions to the enlightenment and progress of mankind.

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

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

The bottom four-fifths of the world are going Communist because they are hungry, desperately hungry, and gripped with a titanic desire to rise out of their destitution.

We can stop communism cold—

Says Dr. Laubach—

by lifting these wretched people above their misery and unrest, grows daily more intense until its solemn declarations of peaceful intent have become a ghastly farce. In the face of this admittedly grave situation many people quite sincerely see no possible alternative to complete surrender to the tide of communism but war with the source of communism itself. There are the good people—and I repeat, I do not question their sincerity—that we must be practical, we must face up to the reality of the situation, we must look facts in the face.

But I protest that it is not the true picture. This realization that communism is not justified. In short, I do not believe war inevitable. Why not, you may ask? Because, my fellow citizens, we have at hand an instrument which, if zealously cherished and perfected, may yet save the peace and sanity of the world. I refer, of course, to the United Nations.

In 1920 the United States became because of a tragi·domestic political battle failed to join the League of Nations. I will not here enter into the merits of that bitter controversy—it is past and "let the dead bury their dead." That the League had embryonic structural foundation of Versailles which brought it into being was in many respects both foolish and Iniquitous, I presume no man today will question. At any rate, that as it may, we did not embrace to participate in the first genuinely international organization for the preservation of world peace.

Now we have another opportunity. In the United Nations, gathered around one common board, the nations of the earth, through their representatives, are brought face to face. Here is an unparalleled chance to know what our neighbors think of us. Of course there are differences. Of course there are misunderstandings. Of course there are hot words, stubbornness, and temporary re­sentments. But is it not remarkable in that? Could not the like be found in any town meeting, municipal body, or State legislature? These 60 nations, including our own, are composed of many groups who are heterogeneous and it is not to be expected that all can always be sweetness and light. No, we are all very fallible but that does not excuse us from trying to make a better world. And if any undertaking ever de­serted a fair trial it is the United Na­tions, launched with so many hopes. Already it has passed through many fiery tests each, it would seem, more crucial than the preceding one. It has had to contend with the constant, unvarying, inflexible obstructionism of the Soviet Union and its satellites. The wonder is that it has persisted in the face of so much opposition within its own camp where it had the right to expect at least a degree of cooperation, the frail new structure did not collapse. It undoubtedly would have collapsed but for certain nations—among which I am proud to number my own—whose steadfast loyalty kept life in the body and gave it time to stabilize its functions. All this is very fine, very praiseworthy, but it is not enough. We must have more than passive loyalty; we must bring to the support of this great agency for
ternational peace that fiery zeal, that fierce determination, which is the work of the crusader in a great moral cause. We must have faith, real faith, that ours is a great moral cause; that it can, must and shall triumph. We must have the bravery and the courage of the crusader, and that no temporary setbacks, no crisis of the moment shall prevent our victory. We must have faith in ourselves. As Franklin D. Roosevelt said at another great crisis, "The only thing we have to fear is fear itself."

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

We have recently been witness to the uncovering of numerous traitors—men and women who have accepted all the benefits and protection of this great country, and yet who stood ready to betray it. It was a horrifying revelation and in my opinion no punishment the law permits is too great to be inflicted on these debased creatures. Yet we must be careful not to use the word ap­ology too loosely. We must not automatically assume that every man and woman who honestly, openly, sincerely, and zealously endeavors to bring to fruition the goal of world peace is an ap­ology. Certainly no American need fear the word nationalism. Certainly no American need fear the word nationalism.
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votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4260), entitled "An act to make certain revisions in titles I through IV of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, as amended, and for other purposes."

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPOINTMENT BILL, 1952

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

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Secretary of the Senate be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to reengross the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3880) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, and corporations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes; and to reengross Senate amendment numbered 1 as follows:

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

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

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THOMAS) please explain the reason for the request on the independent offices appropriation bill?

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

This makes the mistake in printing at the other end of the Capitol.

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

Mr. THOMAS. That is all.

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

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

There was no objection.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

OFFICER PERSONNEL ACT OF 1947

Mr. VINSON submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 4260) to make certain revisions in titles I through IV of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, as amended, and for other purposes.

CIVILIAN PHYSICAL FITNESS AND TRAINING PROGRAM

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be discharged from further consideration of House Concurrent Resolution No. 192, which is not the sense of the Congress that a civilian physical fitness and training program should be established in the interest of national security, and that the concurrent resolution be referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

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

There was no objection.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA EMERGENCY RENT ACT

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 1560) to extend and revise the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act, with an amendment of the Senate thereof, insist on the amendment of the House and agree to a conference with the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

TEMPORARY APPROPRIATIONS FOR GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 267, Rept. No. 657), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 277) making temporary appropriations for the fiscal year 1932, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the joint resolution not to exceed 3 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member or minority leader of the Committee on Appropriations, the joint resolution shall be read for amendment. No amendment shall be in order except amendments offered by the direction of the Committee on Appropriations. At the conclusion of the consideration of the joint resolution for amendment, the Committee shall arise and report the joint resolution to the House with such amendments as may be adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

IMPORTATION OF FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL WORKERS

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

The motion was agreed to.

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

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

A wetback is brought before the United States district court by the Immigration and Naturalization Service. The case went to the Supreme Court. The import of the opinion of Mr. Justice Rutledge, handed down in 1948 in the case of a defendant named Rutledge, is this: Mr. Justice Rutledge said that there is no doubt that the Supreme Court intended to make the act of concealing and harboring any alien not duly admitted or unlawfully present here and not entitled to enter in the United States or to remain in the United States a criminal act. The actual bringing in of such aliens undeniably is intended also to be a crime. But Congress's intent as to the penalty thereof is so unclear as to make it impossible for the Court to set it out.

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

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

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

Mr. CRAWFORD. Are the rules being discussed as to the subject now before the Committee, and I cite the position of the distinguished Senator on the wetback problem.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Yes; I think I am. Mr. WIER. I quote: "Mr. President!" Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

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

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

Mr. CRAWFORD. There is weighty opinion in Washington in both Houses to the effect that we should put sanctions in this statute. In the other body they provided that the sanctions would be in the form of a penalty involving 2 years in jail, if you violated a felony. The penalty here is too slight. It would make it a misdemeanor involving a fine of not exceeding $1,000—it could be anything up to $1,000—and a jail sentence not exceeding 1 year; it could be for a day or more than a day up to 1 year.
Mr. Chairman, I would like to make it perfectly clear that the House Committee on Agriculture is not interested in perpetuating the influx of wetbacks into this country. There is nothing in this bill that impairs or imperils any of the immigration laws of this Nation. It is amazing to me to hear the distinguished gentleman from New York, the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, charged with the responsibility of giving attention to the immigration laws, standing in this House and denouncing a bill from the Committee on Agriculture which in no way interferes with the jurisdiction of the gentleman's committee. He stood here yesterday with tears in his eyes, almost, begging you to protect the health of the people of this Nation from the loathsome hands of the Mexicans that were coming in with all kinds of diseases that were likely to destroy the health and habits of our people. Why does the gentleman not go to his own committee room and assemble his own committee and say, "Mr. Chairman, is not this a problem? That is not my problem; that is his problem. The wetback problem is deplorable. There is a responsibility, and if of us know what we are doing and it is not in the Committee on Agriculture.

If we, by chance, should be bold enough or audacious enough to come out with a bill that interfered with the gentleman's jurisdiction, he would be the first one to protest about it. Why does he not look after the aliens of New York and catalog them and examine them? What is fair for the goose is also fair for the gander. If they want to clean up this country of all aliens, they will have the cooperation of the gentleman from North Carolina and other members of our committee. I am anxious to enforce the immigration laws and want them enforced, and I am not willing to do anything to weaken them.

Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield for a question.

Mr. CELLER. I would say that the Committee on the Judiciary has inaugurated a very bad precedent. Mr. Chairman, this is a very bad precedent. We have never had a continuous and unequal access to wetback labor causes resentment, as is well expressed in the testimony of the manager of the Arizona Cooperative Cotton Growers' Association:

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

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

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.
predatory pimps and procurers is intolerable.

Mr. CELLER. I did not say that.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. COOLEY. That is right.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question before the Committee is the unanimous consent request of the gentleman from North Carolina. Is there objection? There was no objection.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. COOLEY. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. He sets out a certain class of people to whom the law should be applied and gives the general practice to make it apply to all. Mr. COOLEY. It applies only to farm laborers. If it is adopted, you could bring them in for any other work except on farms. That is the very place we need them. I do not need them in my district, but there are 16 States in which the farmers are calling for aid to help them harvest the crops.

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

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

Mr. SHELLEY. May I ask the gentleman from North Carolina in all fairness if this is a fact, that the proposal in a general nature, applying to all workers and to all employers, was stricken out on a point of order yesterday? Mr. COOLEY. Yes. Mr. SHELLEY. Therefore, the only way that any penalty provision could be brought into the bill at all was by applying it to the title of the bill and narrowing it to agricultural labor.

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

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

Mr. COOLEY. Of course it is.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. YATES. How would the gentleman enforce compliance with the law other than through a penalty provision? Mr. COOLEY. This is the confusion. We are not trying to legalize the entry of wetbacks. We are not dealing with the wretched problem except insofar as we are providing a legal method by which contract labor can be brought into this country under contracts negotiated between the Republic of Mexico and the United States Government.

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

Mr. COOLEY. That is right.

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

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

Mr. YATES. How?

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

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

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

Mr. POAGE. There are two provisions involved there, first the provision that before the farmer can get the contract labor he has to enter into an obligation with the United States Government to carry out the provisions of the contract, and second, that if he violates any of the terms of the contract he cannot get any more contract labor. To any man who
in the farming business, that is the most effective way to keep him from a violation.

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

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

Our distinguished colleague who represents the State of New Mexico stood in the well yesterday and pointed out that under normal conditions, without any probability he would find, it is extremely difficult to secure employment anywhere under normal conditions or when there was labor, because nobody could look at him and tell whether he was born in the United States or born in Mexico, and that he could not prove that he was born in the United States. There are 3,000,000 of these citizens of Latin ancestry in the United States, and they are just as much citizens as the gentleman and I are. They were born here, and they are just as much citizens as you and I are. They were born in the United States or born in Mexico. They are the ones on whom the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary would impose the burden, because it would be they who would not get employment. With this amend­ment in force, what farmer would employ an American of Latin descent if he could find somebody else to work? He would say, “Why take a chance? Why employ you?” I might suspect that any man was of Mexican ancestry because perchance he could speak Spanish. This is the same thing that happens on every street where who speaks Spanish. Are we going to do that sort of thing in the United States? Are we going to create discrimination by law against a great part of our citizens? Is that the kind of treatment the gentleman from New York advocates for minorities?

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

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

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. CELLER. Since my name was not mentioned—reference being made to the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary—I want to point out that it will simply be the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary who are concerned, of them being possessed of a court order admitting them, and they could show that to the prospective employer. So far as engaging workers of Spanish-American origin, I am not troubled about hiring those of Spanish-American origin.

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

Mr. Chairman, I think in this debate we have lost sight of the purposes of this bill. This bill was introduced to give some relief to the agricultural producers of the United States, to be called upon to produce as they have never produced before. Down in my section of Missouri, and some people do not consider Missouri a cotton-producing State, we will need not 10,000 Mexicans if we are to get out the cotton crop that we have been asked to produce. I make that statement based upon a statement made by the Division of Employment Security at Jefferson City, in which it is said that we are going to need these employees. Substantiating this statement, I herewith quote a letter from the Division of Employment Security at Jefferson City, Missouri, under date of May 5, 1961, addressed to S. Crenshaw, president, Missouri Cotton Producers Association, Portageville, Mo.:

Dear Mr. Reynolds: I want you to know that I share the concern expressed in your letter of May 3, regarding labor supply for your crop this year. We are directing our efforts to the supply of every possible assistance in recruiting the necessary workers for cotton picking in our county. I understand that, as usual, Missouri, and I expect to fully support the importation of any workers from outside the United States that may be necessary to supplement our available labor supply.

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

1. Under normal conditions the production of 600,000 acres of other crops in the cotton counties, requires about 50,000 workers at the peak of cotton picking. Due to mechanization, labor is reduced, and due to the fact that acreage for other crops varies in relation to the amount of acreage set aside for production, we believe that labor for crops other than cotton can be handled without any material increase in the total of workers estimated for the cotton crop. This same observation also holds for the harvesting season.

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

4. We estimate that a total of 100,000 workers will be required under normal conditions to harvest the cotton crop. This means 100,000 “different” workers, as the average worker does not work throughout the cotton-plucking season. Further, we estimate that approximately 80,000 workers will be needed for the peak of the cotton picking season during the latter half of October and other similar periods.

5. It is our estimate that approximately 60,000 workers will be needed in the cotton-picking season for the 100,000 acres fixed at 550,000 acres; 50 percent planted; and 35 percent of this crop constitutes the largest cash agricultural product produced in the State of Missouri; and the increase in acreage as well as increased production required in the production of all agricultural products, will
necessarily require a substantial increase in the number of farm workers to plant, cultivate, and harvest such crops; and

Whereas in the year 1950, out of a total of approximately 100,000 workers required to bring forth a good bill, which will give

Whereas the Department of Labor is building and will operate an atomic bomb plant at Paduach, Ky., which will require thousands of employees in its operation, most of whom will come from our State; and the exclusion of Missouri on the neighboring States of Kentucky and Tennessee, thus further reducing the poten
tial labor supply; and

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

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

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded by the chief clerk of the House to the President of the United States; to Senator H. V. Hays, the Senators from Missouri; to Representative Maurice Tobin Secretary of Labor; Hon. Robert Goodwin, Director of the United States Employment Service; to Judge Coolidge, Smith, and to Honor A. Ricker, director of the Division of Employment Security of the State of Missouri.

I think it is very unfair for people who are not acquainted with this situation at all, and I have noticed that most of those who are speaking against this bill have never had any experience with this type of labor, to attack the bill. This bill is not for the purpose of bringing in any foreign labor to get the country. If you will read the bill as it was approved by the committee, you will find it was not to permit the legal entry of emergency temporary farm workers. No one who does would try to cover up or correct mistakes which should have been corrected by some other committee, by putting on a rider to this bill. I think you should consider the fact that in the other body the section which was adopt
ed as an amendment to the original bill was declared out of order here yesterday. Then they seek to put on another amendment here which has not been considered by the committee and which could not properly have been considered by the committee on Agriculture. This bill brought forth a good bill, which will give relief.

In view of the action taken yes
terday, I believe most people will agree that we should pass the bill as originally reported by our committee.

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

any illegality that may exist to the proper committee.

All I ask is that the farmers and the people who are producing be treated fairly and not be forced to bring in these workers who are so sadly need
ed in this emergency.

For that reason I ask that the amend
ment of the gentleman from New York be defeated and that the Senate substitu
tee be defeated, and that we adopt a bill which has been considered and ap
proved in committee, and not a bill writ
en by the Committee on Agriculture, which we will make the same mistake in doing that that they made in the other body when they adopted an amendment which was out of order, although the point of order was not raised there at the time—and I think if it had been raised there, we would not have had this thing come up here.

Some of the opponents of this bill who apparently are posing as experts on this subject merely because they have read a series of newspaper articles written by a New York correspondent seem to place implicit confidence in the opinions and apparently have sought no further information. It is rather amusing to note that not less than three of the opponents have each seen fit to have in
ertered in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, either all or excerpts from this series of articles and appear to be basing their opinions and apparently have sought no further information. It is rather amus
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The urgency for this legislation is brought about by the fact that the agreement be
nown United States and Mexico under which Mexican agricultural workers are per

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

Mr. Chairman, this piece of legislation is desirable to some of us because we think it opens the door to bringing in people who are undesirable and who might be permitted to remain here. However, the present administration has always been opposed to this condition and has felt that it is necessary that some of our fruit growers and farmers have help. This administra
tion has taken the boys from the farms, out of the orchards and berry picking and put them in a war the purpose of which is still—after a year of fighting—unknown.
This administration will have 2,000,000 or 3,000,000 more young Americans, if their plans succeed, over in Germany. Our men in military service for seven or more years if it has its way.

The old folks, 65 and 65 years of age, in my district, and I notice along the road as I go through Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Indiana, who are operating the tractors in the fields long after the sun goes down, yes and often all through the night. The old men and women are tending to farm, and produce the food for our people and for our Armed Forces. They are finding it difficult. They just cannot complete their task and do a work-while job without help.

The gentleman from New York (Mr. Celler) who knows so much—and I do admire his educational ability—he has traveled, as I understand, all over the world and he knows quite a lot about slums. I take it that he could have learned more about that right at home in New York than anywhere else. Gradually, of course, he will pay them out and I do not think that anyone else did—he gave it to us from the goodness of his heart, he criticized and took a crack at the farmers because, he contends, they are not treating migrant laborers as they should be treated. He intimated some of our farmers and fruit growers are compelling these people to live in slums. Well, it is unfortunate that the gentleman does not get on a horse or take his automobile, or a plane, and get out to Michigan, for example, over on the west side of the State, next to the lake where people live like human beings and treat not only their neighbor—yes, everyone with whom they come in contact with kindness and consideration. He will find mile after mile along that lake shore and going back several miles from the lake shore clear up to Pesotum, Mich., land under a high state of cultivation; he will find squalls of berries and fruit of all kinds being grown and harvested. He will find miles of orchards producing millions of bushels of apples, peaches, cherries. He will find people coming in from Mexico principally, however, from some of the other States to the southwest living there, some of them making as much as $60 a day picking berries by the pound. He will find them, true, living outdoors in tents, cabins or shacks. He will find them out in God's sunshine and clear air, their living and working accommodations similar to all living and working conditions where people are seasonably employed. He will find them eating good food, sleeping in good beds. He should go and see those so-called slums, as he calls them. People are there who have come back year after year for 10, 15, or 20 years. Those people come back every year, and the conditions they see on the work profitable, the living conditions satisfactory. They get this fresh air, they get this good food, pure water, plenty of milk, eggs, fruit and vegetables. They get something in once in a while, too, quite often, much oftener I think than the average dweller in New York city; and year after year they come back. They live better in western Michigan than many do at home. They like it, they earn good wages, they have families, and many cases with members of their families; they work and save their money, and they go back home with a pocket full of money and they go back much stronger, healthier, better educated than they left like it; the work is good for them. They go home, fat, healthy and happy—thinking of the day when they can return. These folks from all over the other cities who are complaining about legislation—I suggest to the gentleman and others that they go back to their home cities, clean up their own slums and send some of the people who live there, if they really want to enjoy a vacation this summer, send them out to Michigan. We will give them plenty of everything they ought to have not only for their material body, but we will get a little more religion and patriotism into some of those who have never seen or lived in the country—in the great outdoors. Because they go back, and they come around—to see and enjoy the sunshine during the day—good restful sound sleep during the quiet nights—they will be better Americans and citizenship.

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

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

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Chairman, I object.

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

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

In addition to those people I have already mentioned, there are thousands of the Mongs who have lived here 10, 15, and 20 years, many of them with dependent children who were born in the United States, and are American citizens. Yes: in order to convict him, you could have farmers being hunted up to court and harassed, and the farmer shuns litigation like the plague. So he would demand an entrance certificate before taking the risk of employing anybody with a Spanish name.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Yes; in order to prove that the employee was not a citizen of the United States and secondly, he would have to prove intent on the part of the farmer to employ a noncitizen.

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. FERNANDEZ. If the substitute does that, the gentleman seems to be supporting it. Then the amendment is that it is wrong in principle. To starve people into submission is wrong in principle, it is un-Christian, it is un-American. We are using a weapon which is wholly foreign to American concepts of justice. This country is too great to resort to that. That great humanitarian, President Roosevelt, would have never tolerated any such inhumanity to poor people seeking a livelihood. Our immigration officials can, if they will, cope with the problem. Proof of that is that this last year they returned over 500,000 illegal Mexican immigrants back to Mexico. The trouble is that the border officials are not enforcing the law in some places as they are in Arizona and New Mexico, where there is no problem of excessive illegal immigration.

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

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

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

Mr. FERNANDEZ. That is correct.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. FERNANDEZ. That is right.

Mr. LYLE. It would be embarrassing to them, they would hesitate to drive up and talk with their Mexican neighbors.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Yes. We have native Americans in New Mexico, natives we are called, who go to Wyoming to the sheep camps, to Colorado for the best fields, to the Northern and Western States on other crops. They could not afford to make the trip and then come back disappointed, because they could not present an immigration card, which of course is that which is the trouble with the amendment.

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

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I have nothing against our farmers. I am certainly not against the best interests of the farmers of my own State. I do want to do something about the wetback problem. As one of the gentlemen from California suggested previously, this is a very old problem. It was with us when I went to the Legislature of California over 18 years ago. It involves, as well as foreign labor, migrant workers who are not from Mexico. The conditions under which these people work are deplorable and if I had time enough to describe them I think the Court might see even if the description would shock the conscience of every Member of this House. These unfortunate people have to live under deplorable conditions without medical attention or the most elemental necessities.

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. McCARTHY. I have a memorandum from the Ministry of Foreign Relations, Government of Mexico, which expresses great concern over the news report that the House Rules Committee had refused to consider the amendment. S. 964.

Furthermore, the statement shows that the Ministry is so concerned over the apparent desire of some American farmers to use wetbacks they announce the possibility that the Government of Mexico would refuse to permit illegals to come back into Mexico. In other words, there are 500,000 or more over here, and when they come back to this under the Mexican delegation says, "Prove that you are a Mexican citizen."

Mr. YORTY. I thank the gentleman. This whole thing is a misstatement, if you will, that maybe the committee did not have jurisdiction.

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

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

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to direct the attention of the House to the following three telegrams which I have just received. I am not acquainted with the senders of the messages. I feel, however, that the Members will be interested in what they have to say about the pending bill.
Whereas the League of United Latin-American Citizens, a national organization covering five Southwestern States—Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, California, and Colorado—representing more than 5,000,000 Spanish-speaking people of the Southwest United States, held its annual convention in Laredo, Tex., on June 23 and 24, adopted the following unqualified resolution pertaining to wetback and imported labor:

There should be no certification of a shortage of domestic labor to bring in braceros (Mexican workers) under contract.

Whereas, the practices of recruiting labor illegally to replace American citizens, the bringing in of wetbacks, should not be considered for any purpose in determining wage levels.

Whereas the signs are that the business is going back to the days of the 1920s of labor unions and the像 in the interior of Mexico; and

Whereas, the practice of hiring illegal aliens has far more detrimental effect upon the economy of the valley, particularly in lowering purchasing power at the retail level and thereby weakening the local economy of the valley of these illegal aliens in great numbers.

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

Therefore be it

Resolved, That a copy of this letter be sent to the following: Vice President Alben Barkley; Secretary of State Dean Acheson; Speaker of the House Sam Rayburn; Representative Lloyd M. Bentsen, Jr.; Senator Tom Connally; Senator Lyndon Johnson; Senator Herbert Lehman; Representative of Maryland, is subject to a immigration law of Maryland; and the District of Columbia.

The largest farm in either area would have picked crops in the United States and is subject to the immigration law of Maryland; and the District of Columbia.

The largest farm in either area would have a tremendous expense is entailed in the maintenance of a veritable army of border guards and, recently, of an airlift to the interior of Mexico; and

Whereas the American economy. The Douglas amendment in its original form must, in any case, be a part of any treaty with Mexico regarding use of imported labor. Herewith follows a copy of resolution adopted by the forum at its latest convention at Corpus Christi, April 29, 1951:

"Whereas Texas, and especially the Rio Grande Valley of Texas, is subject to the constant influx of alien known locally as wetbacks; and
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The largest farm in either area would have a tremendous expense is entailed in the maintenance of a veritable army of border guards and, recently, of an airlift to the interior of Mexico; and

Whereas the American economy. The Douglas amendment in its original form must, in any case, be a part of any treaty with Mexico regarding use of imported labor. Herewith follows a copy of resolution adopted by the forum at its latest convention at Corpus Christi, April 29, 1951:
through less excusable misunderstanding, by the gentleman from California [Mr. Young], who ought to know. I hope he will not write in an amendment which, while the Department of Agriculture asks for a 60-percent increase in cotton and a 40-percent increase in food because of the war emergency, will take away pay not necessary. The agricultural labor which has always harvested the crops but which will impose a burden upon every person in the United States who speaks Spanish has looked upon the fact that he has not a birth certificate you can depend upon to prove that he is an American citizen. Even though his children may have served in the American Army and even though his children may be married to American citizens, you do not know whether he will come under the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York. This is no cheap labor. Mr. Chairman. That will be brought out in the discussion.

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

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

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

We do not employ any Mexicans from Mexico in Ohio but we do employ Mexican labor occasionally. Pay not being very good, they cannot find jobs down where they come from because there are too many illegal en-

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I yield.

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

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

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

Some of these arguments are more than specious, they are just a little bit foolish, because some of the people who have been standing in the well of the House here worrying about the poor Mexican workers are some of the same people who have fought civil rights ever since I have been in the Congress. So as I see it, it is just a question of whether they can get something for their own territory or their own State, without too much responsibility to the people who are affected. I agree with you that the situation in agriculture is such that there is a need for labor—yes—but I do not agree with you that it is so bad the Federal Government should step in and assume all the responsibilities and let the employer go on paying to it from it assume none of the responsibility. Certainly, if I want labor, I am willing to assume some responsibility for it.

Mr. Celler. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Keating].

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

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

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

Mr. Keating. I yield.

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

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

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

Mr. Keating. I have no power to make that change. If the gentleman from New York would attempt to make it, it would be entirely out of order.

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

Mr. Keating. I suggest that the author of the amendment would be the appropriate person to ask for unanimous consent to do that. I shall cer-
Mr. KEATING. I yield.

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

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

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

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

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

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, it was carefully drawn and thoroughly considered by the committee on the Judiciary rather than on the floor.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Could this be killed on the floor and then perhaps the chairman of this committee or the gentleman from New York could bring it out later in the form in which the committee itself approves?

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

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

The question was taken; and on a motion to amend the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Potter] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Potter], Mr. KEATING, the amendment was rejected.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the substitute. The Clerk read as follows:

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

"(2) To reimburse the United States for essential expenses, not including salaries or expenses of regular department or agency personnel, incurred by the United States under this title. Direct expenses for transportation and subsistence shall be assigned, by the Secretary of Labor, to individual employers to the extent possible, in an amount not to exceed $20 per worker. The Secretary of Labor shall determine on January 1, 1932, and on each succeeding January 1 during the life of this title, if such payments fully reimburse the United States for the essential expenses (as defined in this paragraph) incurred by it under this title. If the Secretary of Labor finds that the United States is not so fully reimbursed, he shall prorate the remaining amount due the United States among all employers in accordance with the number of man-hours of labor received by such employers from workers made available under this title. For the purposes of this paragraph, the Secretary of Labor shall determine the essential expenses (as defined in this paragraph) incurred by the United States for man-hour of labor provided under this title, and employers shall keep such records as the Secretary of Labor deems necessary to determine the amount due the United States under this paragraph."

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

I want to prevent the payment of a subsidy and I want to call to your attention statistics and figures of what it cost to bring in farm labor during the war. In that period 300,000 foreign workers were brought in at a cost of about $75,000,000. Figured out on a per capita cost it amounts to $214 per man. That is over $200 more than the amount the Government from Texas proposed that the farmers pay.

More immediately, if we take the question of cost of transportation and subsistence, the most recent report of the Farm Replacement Service indicates it was $54.50 per man for transportation and subsistence. If we are going to have to take care of the problem of getting the foreign worker who skips back to Mexico, then the cost is increased on the average by another $33 per man. So in effect, if there is a program to subsidize the farmers of the Southwest and of the West, even though they protest that they want no subsidization.
My amendment carries out what certain representatives of farm groups asked from the committee. The farmers came in and said, "This is what we want." The committee said, "We will give you what you want and more."

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

My amendment does not go that far. It provides that the direct expenses which can be determined shall be as-signable to and charged on the farm worker in whose behalf they are incurred up to $20. All of these other incidental expenses that we cannot determine at this particular point will be added and on January 1 following the crop season de termination will be made. If an employer had a hundred thousand man-hours of labor under this contract, and the Government allowed him cost $2.50 per man hour to provide that labor to him, the farmer will then be assessed that amount and will be expected to pay it into the Treasury of the United States. There will be no subsidy if my amendment is adopted. If it is not adopted, then the cost depends on how many men may be brought in. The more we bring in the more it will cost the Government. Remember it cost $214 per man to provide these laborers during the only period in which we had any experience.

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

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

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

Mr. MccARTHY. I understand that and also that the penalty bond which used to be in force requiring each employer to put up $25, which was forfeited if he did not return to Mexico, has been eliminated and the Poage bill now provides that if a worker is not returned and is not apprehended, then the employer shall pay to the Government what it would have cost to take the worker from the farm to the reception center. If the worker gets away and is never caught the original does not pay thing. If he had to pay $15 transportation in the first place, he could give the Mexican $5 and say: Get lost, and you save yourself $10. That is exactly what is permitted in the bill. It gives incentive to skipping. The immigration people estimate that if the Poage bill passes $50 percent of the contract labor will likely skip. At the present time about 20 percent skip, even with the $25 penalty in force.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

There was no objection.

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

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

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

Mr. MccARTHY. The actual cost is estimated at $34.90 for transportation and subsistence plus $33 which it costs to apprehend skips on the average.

The actual program, when in effect during the recent war, cost on an average $214 per man per year.

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. PHILLIPS. I should like to ask the gentleman if the large figure he gave for World War II did not include a great many other items in this cost for bringing these people in from countries outside the United States.

Mr. MccARTHY. These are foreign workers.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I have the affidavit of George A. Graham, who testified that on May 18, 17, and 18 he recruited 1,067 Mexican workers at Hermosillo, Mexico, and transported them to Nogales, Arizona, and the transportation expense between those points was $2.40 per person.

I have affidavits here from many others. They averaged out less than $2.50 cost of transportation from the Mexican centers to the American border, including the payment for food on the wagon that means less than $5 a round trip. That is what these people are actually today paying and what the
actual cost is, not what somebody estimates. It is actually being done for less than $5 round trip right now.

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. POAGE. That is right.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. O'TOOLE. No.

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

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

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

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

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

"Yes, we will take care of them; we will put $20 in there. We are going to insist that the Government of the United States collect $20 from that farmer. We will dress him up, so he cannot farm."

This seems to be the attitude of those who oppose the Poage or committee bill.

Let us see what the facts are. I hold in my hand an affidavit made by a man from my district who has made trips down there repeatedly to get labor from the cotton farmers in my section of Arkansas. He says the average cost to the association for processing a worker, feeding him, and transporting him to Laredo, Texas, and back, is $6.62 per worker. Multiply that by 2 to get him back home when he has completed his contract, and that is the total cost for these items. It is $1.34 each way. He is an expert in doing this thing apparently, because he has been there so much he knows how to do it economically.

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

One letter states:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. SABATH. Why is it that it is working so much to the disadvantage of the farmers? Why is it that it is working so much to the disadvantage of the farmers to import and deport these Mexicans?

Mr. GATHINGS. The Immigration Service has its men in the field regarding this, and they have these fellows, enforcement officers, all around over the country.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. Chairman, you have listened to some wild-eyed statements from some of the proponents of this legislation. You have noted the presentation of certain affidavits from interested parties as to the cost of this transportation. I am dealing with the cost here and the procurement of these Mexicans south
Mr. McCARTHY. I think the gentleman is mislead the committee, or even try to kid the committee. If you take that figure between the House bill and the Senate bill of $10 and the actual cost of $9 to the Federal Government is going to have to pay $25 on each one of them. Suppose you bring in the 125,000 laborers they say they need in southern California and the approximate figure is $35, another 100,000 in the State of Texas, why, I can figure here by just saying that you can bring in in the last year it is going to cost the Government $18,000,000 on that one item alone.

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

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

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

Mr. BAILEY. Correct. That is correct.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

Mr. CHAIRMAN. We are confronted with a very critical time in the history of this Government. Downstairs in the Committee on Appropriations we are considering a bill which would provide $80,000,000,000 for additional national defense for the coming fiscal year. Mili­ tions of war are important, but, of course, there are other things essential if we are to measure up to the requirement that America be strong at this time. You have to have guns and airplanes, but you have to have food and fiber just as well. For example, the Quartermaster General is asking Congress to appropriate $300,000,000 to create a pool for supplies of cotton duck and cotton seed. That is needed in the military effort. But if we are to have these fibers we must be able to grow them and harvest them. It is absolutely essential in my judgment in the interest of national defense that this Poage farm-labor bill be passed. The committee worked on it for weeks; they considered all aspects. I was up there and testified before the committee; I saw the committee at work. They have been trying with the Senate on the basis of the Senate bill which is now being offered as a substitute to the Poage bill. In conference the differences between the two bills can be ironed out. I trust the House bill will prevail in conference.

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

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

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. POAGE. I would like to call the attention of the gentleman from Texas and the attention of the House to this cost of $5.50. It is going to cost the farmer $25 to transport the laborer from Mexico City. Do not try to kid the committee.

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

Mr. BAILEY. You are going to get them, they can get them, and you know are.

Mr. COOLEY. No.

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. McCARTHY. I think the members of the committee are quite certain if the demand for these contract laborers increases, as we have heard indications here that it will increase, the Mexican Government would have to set up their recruitment centers much farther south of the border and this $34 which the Department of Labor, or the Immigration and Naturalization Service says it will cost is based on the quite certain possibility that we are going to have to go 600 or more miles into Mexico in order to recruit them.

The Mexican Government does not want them. They did not go to Mexico. This is the average cost based on the experience of the Farm Placement Service, from the migration center in Mexico through the United States Reception Center at or near a port of entry and return; recruitment, 75 cents per individual; transportation $13.95; subsistence, $6—a total of $22.49.

Reception processing, assignment, re-assignment, and return to Mexico, 50 cents; subsistence at the center on the border, $12—making a total of $12.90, or an over-all total of $34.90.
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Mr. McCARTHY. I think the members of the committee are quite certain if the demand for these contract laborers increases, as we have heard indications here that it will increase, the Mexican Government would have to set up their recruitment centers much farther south of the border and this $34 which the Department of Labor, or the Immigration and Naturalization Service says it will cost is based on the quite certain possibility that we are going to have to go 600 or more miles into Mexico in order to recruit them.
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satisfied. This is no case of sweatshop labor, but this is a case of giving the people south of the border a chance to participate in American prosperity and at the same time help the American farmer and contribute to the defense effort. They will be adequately and almost fabulously paid for the labor they perform in the cotton fields of the country, particularly in West Texas. The bill will have adequate safeguards to prevent any injustice to laborers from the Republic of Mexico.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment. Mr. Chairman, yesterday—and I am sorry that I am not from Colorado (Mr. HUL.) is not on the floor—he and I had a little colloquy over the milking of cows, and he made the assertion at the figure that many Members of the House probably would not know the producing end of a cow and, before revising his remarks, inferred that I might be one of them. Now, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. Clawson), one of the leading farmers in the State of Maryland, says he has some cows, including a Guernsey and a Holstein, and he has offered to stage a milking contest. If the gentleman from Colorado will accept this challenge, I will be glad to furnish him with cows and with any equipment that I do know something about the milk-producing end of a cow.

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

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

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Are they all unemployed?

Mr. POAGE. No.

Mr. GROSS. How many?

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

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

Mr. POAGE. We have to bring in enough to harvest the crop. It will be impossible to process that many now. You cannot process more than 7,000 a day at 40 cents a head. The immigration authorities cannot process them today to exceed about 7,000 a day. The result is that the number that would come in during the season is limited by the number that can be processed. Had we been able to get this bill passed 2 or 3 months earlier, we could have brought them in here legally, but the number will be less now.

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, how many troops has that country sent to fight in Korea?

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

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

Mr. POAGE. If you can testify to that. I thought the gentleman wanted to ask me a question.

Mr. GROSS. You are going to take the skilled labor off the farms and out of the processing plants of this country, bring in Mexicans to do the work and draft American into the military. The gentleman knows what the draft law says, that farmers and processing workers are not draftable if they are married.

Mr. POAGE. So what?

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Michigan who is also an eminent farmer (Mr. Clawson) made some sort of hypothetical statement about giving three people a house and $40 to buy a steak, then having them leave before they have done any work. He used that then as a basis to try to show I did not know anything about farming. I admit, Mr. Chairman, I never had that happen to me, just possibly because I am not so miserably difficult to get along with that potential employees leave before they do any work.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. McCarty). The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. McCARTHY) there were—ayes 47, noes 85.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Mr. Chairman, some question was raised as to the proposal of the gentleman from Minnesota as to a pro rata arrangement on this cost. Here we are dealing with the actual
costs of approximately $35 each as compared to $10 in the House bill and $20 in the Senate bill.

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

The basic policy of the American Farm Bureau Federation in this connection is that the payment should be limited to the maximum feasible extent, by farmers themselves. We believe that Government's place is to give a primary assist of "opening doors" so that farmers and their organizations can do the job for themselves. We are opposed to the payment by the Federal Government of any portion of the transportation of either foreign or domestic workers within the United States.

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

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

I quote Mr. Bailey's reply:

We believe in no subsidy whatever for the program.

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

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

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

Mr. BAIRD. Yes, sir.

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

Mr. BAIRD. Yes, sir.

Mr. Baird further testified:

The group from our area generally has opposed the theory of the payment of any transportation costs by the Government, either for foreign workers—for foreign workers, because we are limiting this to a foreign labor pool. At a conference in January with the National Farm Labor Advisory Committee, there was quite a discussion on the payment by the Government of all transportation costs over 800 miles. Up to 800 would be paid by the employer. We scaled off here on the basis that even Dallas would qualify for a certain payment of Government expense.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I call attention to page 87 of the hearings on this bill before the House Committee on Agriculture. The statement begins on page 88. Mr. Baird says:

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

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

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

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

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I yield.

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

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

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. The primary purpose of this provision in the bill is to limit the cost to the taxpayers. In other words it would limit the amount of money that these agencies can use in carrying out the functions of this law. Would not such a limitation be a big step in the right direction?
Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Of course.
Mr. POAGE. But if they propose to use common carrier or buses—common carrier buses, the kind that haul ordinary people, they can bring them in for $1 apiece.
Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. The gentleman is right.
Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?
Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I yield.
Mr. McCARTHY. I simply wanted to say that if the immigration people feel it is cheaper to move them out by airplane, it might be cheaper to move them in by airplane.
Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I do not care about the mode of transportation. I just wanted to make it clear that every past experience shows that the workers can come in much cheaper than $10 and to show the statements were made contrary to the testimony given before the committee. The cost should be below $10, and the limit should be $10.
Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?
Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I yield.
Mr. COOLEY. The $15.65 figure that the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. BAILEY) used could vary very well be for air transportation because our information is to the effect that the bus fare from those centers ranges from 66 cents to $1.15.
Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. That is correct.
Mr. CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.
Mr. McCARTHY. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. BAILEY) to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. POLK).
Mr. COOLEY. The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BAILEY) there were—ayes 26, noes 81.
So the amendment was rejected.
Mr. CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. POLK).
Mr. COOLEY. The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. POLK) there were—ayes 12, noes 83.
Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.
Mr. CHAIRMAN. Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. POLK and Mr. POAGE.
Mr. COOLEY. The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 44, noes 137.
So the amendment was rejected.
Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.
Mr. CHAIRMAN. The Clerk read as follows:
Amendment offered by Mr. JACKSON of Washington: On page 2, strike out lines 3 to 8, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:
"To establish and operate for such workers such reception centers in the continental United States as may be necessary to accomplish the purposes of this title."
Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I am offering this amendment for two reasons. First, the State of Washington has a need for emergency farm labor help. I may say at the outset that Oregon and Washington pay the highest farm-labor wage in the United States. We need outside of our own domestic labor supply, and I have received through the Bureau of Employment Security of the State of Washington, between five and six thousand imported foreign workers.
Second, under the terms of the bill now pending before the committee, the reception centers will be located along the Mexican border. If we are going to have legislation on this subject it ought to be on a fair and equitable basis. It should be possible for farmers throughout the United States who are short of help on the farms to get help on the same basis that the States along the border obtain them. After all, there is a subsidy in this bill and if we are going to provide assistance, it should be fair, just, and equitable to every farmer in the United States where a need exists. At the present time under the existing bill the people along the border will be able to get farm-labor assistance. The people in the North, East, and West will have to pay an inordinate share of the cost of transporting the farm workers to their particular section or State.
Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?
Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.
Mr. COOLEY. Does the gentleman have any idea what the cost would be if the amendment which he has offered were adopted?
Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I do not have an estimate, any more than the gentleman has an estimate on what his bill is going to cost.
Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman knows that under his amendment they could recruit two or three hundred thousand workers south of the border and transport them to reception centers in the State of Washington.
Mr. JACKSON of Washington. If you are going to bring labor into the United States why should not each State be entitled to get that labor on the basis of equality of cost?
Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman knows that under his amendment they could recruit two or three hundred thousand workers south of the border and transport them to reception centers in the State of Washington.
Mr. JACKSON of Washington. If you are going to bring labor into the United States why should not each State be entitled to get that labor on the basis of equality of cost?
Mr. COOLEY. The farmers in the State of Washington can get this Mexican labor by going to the reception centers at the Mexican border and paying the charges in the same basis that the same basis that the charges in the State of Washington.
Mr. JACKSON of Washington. The obvious effect of the legislation is to give an advantage to the States along the border. You do not have to study this bill 5 minutes to come to that conclusion.
Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman knows they are the States where the problem really exists.
Mr. JACKSON of Washington. In my State of Washington, where we pay incidentally over one dollar an hour for farm help, after the exhaustion of all of our domestic farm labor we will need between five and six thousand imported laborers. Why should they not get some assistance under those circumstances?
Mr. COOLEY. Why should not your farmers pay the cost?
Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Why should they pay a greater share of this bill that is now before the Congress than the Mexican labor that is now crossing the border?
Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman’s amendment puts a subsidy in this bill.
Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?
Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Is not this a bill to provide farm labor assistance to all 48 States if it is needed? If so, is it equitable to have the farmers pay the cost?
Mr. COOLEY. The logic of the gentleman’s argument is to the effect that we should have reception centers in all of the States and that such reception centers shall be exactly the same distance from every farmer’s farm.
Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Obvious not. The reception centers should be in the same general areas where they were located during World War I. I am not sure we should be established in every State; but the gentleman has a bill now before the House that has only one purpose and that is to provide preferential treatment. That is the effect of his bill. It is not spelled out in so many words but that is the effect in actual practice. It gives the farm employer located close to the Mexican border an advantage over farm employers in the North, West, and East. It hurts the employers that are paying the highest farm-labor wage.
Mr. COOLEY. Have the farmers in your State been dependent upon Mexican labor to harvest their crops?
Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Yes; they have.
Mr. CHAIRMAN. How have they arranged for the transportation cost up there?
Mr. JACKSON of Washington. During the war they had a reception center not far away. As I recall, I believe it was Portland, Ore., and they paid the transportation cost from that point.
Mr. COOLEY. And they were not Mexican citizens altogether. They recruited them from many States and paid the transportation cost.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. POAGE. I yield for a question.

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

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

Mr. BAILEY. Are those not subsidies?

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I yielded to a question. I cannot see how a gentleman did not see fit to ask a question.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

There was no objection.
Mr. HORAN. I think this bill is going to cost the Government millions of dollars. We do not want to kid ourselves.

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. HORAN. I am only talking now in support of this amendment. I do not want to take the country by surprise. We have made an effort for the Federal Government to pay the cost of transportation from Mexico to the reception centers in the United States.

Mr. HORAN. That is right.

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

Mr. HORAN. I yield.

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

Mr. HORAN. That is right.

Mr. JACKSON OF Washington. So if the gentleman knows that the bill is to be logical and consistent, then that transportation ought to be borne and all the costs of the bill ought to be borne by the Government.

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

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

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

Mr. COOLEY. Who paid the bill?

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. HORAN. That is Government money.

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

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

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

Mr. JACKSON OF Washington. If the gentleman followed my amendment, of course, he would simply require the Government to pay for the reception centers of Mexican nationals. It would apply to the States of Minnesota and Maine, as well as the State of Washington.

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

Mr. JACKSON OF Washington. I do not.

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

Mr. STAGGERS. I represent a great farming section in West Virginia, the main farming section of my State, and I agree with my colleague, the gentleman from Washington. If we are going to be fair to the State of the United States, we should be fair to all the farmers of the different States.

Mr. HORAN. What is your amendment?

Mr. STAGGERS. We have an apple-growing section in my district in which all of the orchardists are raising heck because they cannot get apple pickers.

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

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

Mr. STAGGERS. I yield.

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

Mr. STAGGERS. It is a matter of cost.

Mr. GROSS. It is a matter of cost with any individual because we have no similarity to the domestic workers with whom have the freedom of the United States. I am saying this ought to be considered. That if cheap labor is made available to the State of the United States it should be made available to all sections. In the first place, I do not believe in any foreign labor being brought into this country. It has a demoralizing effect upon the farmers and the workers who are doing the fighting for this country before we bring in outsiders to do our work. Do you want to bring them in? If so let us bring them in as nationals. Let them become citizens of the United States. Do they want citizenship in the United States? What is the trouble? You have been talking about costs. It is a matter of principle. There is not a man in the Committee of the Whole here who can say it is a matter of cost. It is a matter of principle.

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

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

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

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

Mr. STAGGERS. I yield.

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. Chairman, it had been my very sincere hope that the Poage substitute amendment, the Senate bill, would be adopted by the House as a substitute for the Poage bill. That bill had certain restrictions set up in it which make it far more practical, far more practical, to those who completely understand this problem—to the fair-minded farmer, to those from the field of labor, from business, from the press and magazines of this country and, particularly, to those who directly concern ourselves with the problem. It was recognized as a wartime and emergency necessity. However, as a result of the poor actions sat together with members of the State Department and the Labor Department and the Immigration Service, and representatives of the growers' associations sat together with members of the President's Commission on Migration Labor, the bill which was passed by the Senate included in their bill, imposing strict penalties for the employment of wetbacks, and without the amendment of any contracting to those who have legally entered the United States, I cannot in good conscience vote for this measure. To do so would be to accept part of the blame for the deliberate violations of our immigration laws which are now encouraged, and to accept part of the guilt for the shameful peonage under which these Mexican workers exist.

There is abundant evidence that Mexican contract workers have been brought into this country when there is no real need for them. The Poage bill places the responsibility for certifying that a need exists on the Regional Director of the Bureau of Employment Security rather than on the Secretary of Labor, as provided in the bill passed by the Senate. The Poage bill has been before the floor of the House during this debate that Mexicans have been contracted for when there is a large number of unemployed Americans looking for work in the same area. To avoid that condition the determination that there is no American labor available should be made on some uniform national basis.

There is no question in my mind but that the Bureau of Employment Security local officials have not done a good job of canvassing all possible sources of labor before certifying to a shortage, and for that reason I am firm in the belief that the responsibility should be given to the Secretary of Labor. Continuance of the present system will just insure that our local domestic labor who continues to be done out of jobs in favor of imported Mexican citizens. I believe that the Poage bill should be tightened up so that all Mexican workers are required to work at a skill and that only workers who can work at a skill can come to this country, and that the fact that there is available the same people in Mexico that they may have come here.

Mr. SHELLEY. A very great many of those people came into the States, and the agricultural labor problem was to some extent solved. There was no objection at the time to what was recognized as a wartime and emergency necessity. However, as a result of the very able and affable gentleman from California has expired. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

Mr. SHELLEY. A very great many of those people came into the States, and the agricultural labor problem was to some extent solved. There was no objection at the time to what was recognized as a wartime and emergency necessity. However, as a result of the very able and affable gentleman from California has expired. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

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

There is abundant evidence that Mexican contract workers have been brought into this country when there is no real need for them. The Poage bill places the responsibility for certifying that a need exists on the Regional Director of the Bureau of Employment Security rather than on the Secretary of Labor, as provided in the bill passed by the Senate. The Poage bill has been before the floor of the House during this debate that Mexicans have been contracted for when there is a large number of unemployed Americans looking for work in the same area. To avoid that condition the determination that there is no American labor available should be made on some uniform national basis.

There is no question in my mind but that the Bureau of Employment Security local officials have not done a good job of canvassing all possible sources of labor before certifying to a shortage, and for that reason I am firm in the belief that the responsibility should be given to the Secretary of Labor. Continuance of the present system will just insure that our local domestic labor who continues to be done out of jobs in favor of imported Mexican citizens. I believe that the Poage bill should be tightened up so that all Mexican workers are required to work at a skill and that only workers who can work at a skill can come to this country, and that the fact that there is available the same people in Mexico that they may have come here.

Mr. SHELLEY. It is not opposing the idea of bringing labor in when necessary, to substantiate my statement that we are aware of the problem, let us go back on some history. This wetback and Mexican labor problem is not new; it has been with us for many years, since long before World War II. Because of the fact that in World War II we have been moved to the service, the factories, and the metropolitan areas, a shortage of agricultural labor developed and the proposal was made that we set up machinery for bringing in groups of agricultural workers from the neighboring Republic of Mexico to help solve the problem. Representatives of the workers of this country, representing the interests of this country, and representatives of the growers' associations sat together with members of the President's Commission on Migration Labor called for a correction of the conditions. The wetbacks move from agricultural areas into the metropolitan areas, not only in the four States along the Mexican border but in many States much farther north. They have created new impacts, new sociological situations. In the metropolitan sections of many States. Yet the Poage bill actually legalizes the presence of these people, for it states "Those who are temporarily...n in talking of contracting for their employment, without specifying how they may have come here. It is an open invitation of more thousands of them to pour into the country. Without the amendment to the Poage bill which the Senate included in their bill, imposing strict penalties for the employment of wetbacks, and without the amendment of any contracting to those who have legally entered the United States, I cannot in good conscience vote for this measure. To do so would be to accept part of the blame for the deliberate violations of our immigration laws which are now encouraged, and to accept part of the guilt for the shameful peonage under which these Mexican workers exist.

There is abundant evidence that Mexican contract workers have been brought into this country when there is no real need for them. The Poage bill places the responsibility for certifying that a need exists on the Regional Director of the Bureau of Employment Security rather than on the Secretary of Labor, as provided in the bill passed by the Senate. The Poage bill has been before the floor of the House during this debate that Mexicans have been contracted for when there is a large number of unemployed Americans looking for work in the same area. To avoid that condition the determination that there is no American labor available should be made on some uniform national basis.

There is no question in my mind but that the Bureau of Employment Security local officials have not done a good job of canvassing all possible sources of labor before certifying to a shortage, and for that reason I am firm in the belief that the responsibility should be given to the Secretary of Labor. Continuance of the present system will just insure that our local domestic labor who continues to be done out of jobs in favor of imported Mexican citizens. I believe that the Poage bill should be tightened up so that all Mexican workers are required to work at a skill and that only workers who can work at a skill can come to this country, and that the fact that there is available the same people in Mexico that they may have come here.
Another factor in the practically unlimited use of Mexican labor which has developed as a result of the present system of importation and use of Mexicans, legally or illegally, is the terrific downward pressure on wages and piece rates paid to farm workers. The prevailing wage to be paid the Mexican worker or that offered, or get no job at all, since if the American worker does not take what the farmer chooses to pay, he can then be certified that domestic labor is not available, and Mexican nationals can be contracted for. Without a formula for impartial determination of what the prevailing wage should be, the Poage bill is only a device for holding wages down and is not acceptable to me or the great majority of right-thinking people who are more concerned about the welfare of the American wage earner than they are about the profits which the large corporate farmers of this country squeeze out.

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

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

Mr. SHELLEY. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. How can the gentleman say that the Poage bill throws the doors wide open? The gentleman must know, if he knows anything about it at all, that these people come here under contracts, and this bill in no way affects the Mexican border.

Mr. SHELLEY. Because the labor coming in at the present time comes in under an agreement between the Republic of Mexico and the Government of the United States, which expires on June 30, 1930. The Government of Mexico has said it will refuse to continue that contract or that agreement between the two countries unless this Congress adopts legislation which will protect their nationals coming in here and which will bring an end to exploitation of these human beings of Mexican nationality who, the Recosa shows, are being exploited by some of the large farm operators. I say to you that the Poage bill makes no contribution to that end.

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

Mr. SHELLEY. I most assuredly do.

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

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

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

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. Jackson).

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

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment as follows:

The Clerk read as follows:

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

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

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

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I wish to read briefly a statement submitted to me by the Bureau of Immigration and Naturalization. That language of the amendment speaks for itself. It is language submitted by the Bureau of Immigration and Naturalization. Accompanying the suggested amendment, they wrote to me as follows:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. HOPE. I thank the gentleman.

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman please state the grounds of his point of order?
Mr. COOLEY. First, that it broadens the scope of the legislation under consideration. It is not germane, and it actually constitutes an appropriation. In the last sentence of the amendment we find this language:

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

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

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

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

Mr. Celler. I would be perfectly willing to strike out any reference to appropriation, but I do not think the gentleman is not aware of the language that is therein:

[Reads the amendment]

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

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

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

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

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

The Clerk reads as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Rogers of Texas: Add a new section to be numbered 7275 and to read as follows:

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

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

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I want to urge the adoption of the Poage bill, as it is legislation that will be of great benefit to farmers of this Nation. The amendment that I offer at this time is offered as a further aid to the farmers and an aid to migrant workers of this Nation, and for the purpose of correcting an injustice that is now present in existing laws. This injustice that I refer to was brought about by a senate amendment to the Fair Labor Standards Act in 1949. The wording of the amendment operated to prevent and prohibit the employment of the children of these migrant workers. The result is that the migrant workers who are following the harvest in order to earn a living cannot use their children to assist them. In many cases these workers have large families, that is, 9, 10, or 12 children. All of these children who are under 16 years of age cannot work in the harvest if school is in session in the district in which they desire to work. This creates a situation where the children of these migrant workers must be left to roam the streets or find something to do while their parents are working in the field. The law does not require them to attend school in those districts but prohibits them from working in those districts while school is in session. My amendment merely provides in effect that these children may work so long as they are not legally required to attend school. It does not in any manner permit anyone to engage in unfair child-labor practices nor in existence of sweatshop tactics. I would not allow a child to do any work that he is not allowed to do under the present law. It merely clarifies ambiguous and misleading language now existing in the law that has created a serious problem and will continue to do so. The migrant worker with a large family who is not allowed to use his family while work is available is forced to appeal to the relief boards in order to get a living for his family while he is working and following the harvest. This has resulted in a serious social problem, and unless this law is corrected it will operate to contribute to child delinquency and in many cases to crime. The reason that many of you are not familiar with the problems of which I speak is because the enforcement of this law began only last year, and the full force of its bad effects will not be felt until the harvest season of this year.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I yield.

Mr. MAHON. I want to thank the gentleman from Texas and commend him for offering his amendment. It has been my pleasure to collaborate with him in drafting the amendment and in seeking support for it. I wish to urge that no point of order be made against it.

Is it not true that the amendment offered by the gentleman should be incorporated in this bill, and if it is held to be subject to a point of order, should it not be incorporated in a separate bill? We have not created a serious problem as it is, we need not only the Poage bill written but a provision in some form which would meet the situation described by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Rogers].
adoption of this amendment. Let us put it in this bill, so that the farmer can be helped in harvesting crops and in producing the agricultural products we so badly need.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. FISHER. The amendment offered by the gentleman is absolutely sound, whether it meets the parliamentary situation or not. The gentleman has a bill pending, and so do I, and the gentleman who just spoke, Mr. Marx, before the Committee on Education and Labor now on the same subject. As it now stands, a terrible injustice is being heaped upon the migrant laborers themselves, because they are not permitted to pursue their normal livelihood and accumulate money to buy food and clothing and so forth during the school year which follows immediately after the harvest.

The gentleman is to be commended on bringing this up and for presenting the reasons for it. I am hopeful that we will have a hearing, if the amendment is not in the bill, and that legislation correcting this injustice can be brought in soon.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I thank the gentleman.

There is one particular situation I have in mind, and I can bring you isolated cases by the dozen. A boy finished school before the harvest. He was expelled from the school because he was under 16, he could not work in agriculture so long as they were not legally required to attend school. That was amended in 1949 by a Senate amendment, and the language was changed at the insistence of the Secretary of Labor. In that way, those children could not work in agriculture so long as school was in session in the district in which the employee was living at the time of the employment.

So the result is not creating a new pool of child labor. The children are allowed to labor right now under those exemptions, but you are prohibiting a child who is legally out of school and who does not work and help in another district where school is in session.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The gentleman represents part of the great districts of Texas, does he not?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. That is right.

Mr. CRAWFORD. A district where the children of families in that district attend universities and are college graduates and live on the ranches and on the wheat farms and grow cattle, and all of them, I would venture to say, in all of the families which the gentleman represents, where they live on the farms, the children start work at anywhere from 5 to 7 years of age and work right on through. Is that not true?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Yes, sir. I did when I was that age. The situation under the present law is that a man who owns a farm and has four or five children can keep his own children out of school to harvest his own crop, but a man who is not fortunate enough to own land himself—

Mr. CRAWFORD. But who works in agriculture.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. That is right—he cannot keep his own children out to work another man's harvest.

Mr. CRAWFORD. It is a case of destroying the child and destroying his future to live within the concepts of some crazy law that Congress has passed.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. That is right. In many instances it seems to be the situation of the day to use every available means to teach a child how not to work and to pass laws making it a penalty for anyone to show a child how to work. This is not the kind of principle on which this country was founded and it is not the kind of practice upon which this country will endure.

I want to express my deep appreciation to my distinguished colleagues from Texas, Mr. George Mahon, Mr. Clark Fisher, and Mr. Omar Burleson, for their uniring efforts in seeking relief for the injustice of the present law, and I am sure that they join with me in the observation that our efforts will continue to remedy this situation should the point of order be sustained and this amendment not be made a part of this act. The outstanding work of these gentlemen toward a solution of this problem is well recognized by all the Members of this House.

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

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

The amendment is obviously not in order, since the author of the amendment clearly indicates it is an effort to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act, which is not before the House at this time.

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

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be heard on the point of order.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I do not care to be heard further on the point of order.

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

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that there is an amendment to the Fair Labor Standards Act already in the bill, and it would seem to me another amendment to the same effect would not constitute a serious obstacle.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. MILLIS). The Chair is ready to rule.

The gentleman from Texas offers an amendment to which the gentleman from North Carolina makes a point of order, which the Speaker having as a point of order on the ground that it is not germane to the bill before the committee.

The bill H. R. 3283 refers to a certain class of Mexican nationals, as described in the bill. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas does not relate to this group described in the bill, but to an entirely different group of individuals—American citizens and residents of the United States. The amendment therefore is beyond the purview of the bill H. R. 3283, and the Chair sustains the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gorga). If there are no further amendments under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose, and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. Lloyd, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3283) to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, passed the same, and to House Resolution 257, he reported the bill back to the House.
The SPEAKER. Under the rule the previous question was ordered. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill. The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill. Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit. The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays. The yeas and nays were refused. The motion to recommit was rejected. The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, on that, I ask the yeas and nays. The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 240; nays 139; answered "present" 1; not voting 52; as follows:

Mr. Speaker, on the preceding page.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (S. 984) to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

"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 such workers temporarily in the United States) for its immediate consideration."

"(2) to establish and operate reception centers at or near the places of actual entry of such workers into the continental United

Mr. Speaker, on that, I ask the yeas and nays. The yeas and nays were refused. The motion to recommit was rejected. The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays. The yeas and nays were refused. The motion to recommit was rejected. The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, on that, I ask the yeas and nays. The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 240; nays 139; answered "present" 1; not voting 52; as follows:

Mr. Speaker, on the preceding page.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (S. 984) to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

"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 such workers temporarily in the United States) for its immediate consideration."

"(2) to establish and operate reception centers at or near the places of actual entry of such workers into the continental United

Mr. Speaker, on that, I ask the yeas and nays. The yeas and nays were refused. The motion to recommit was rejected. The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays. The yeas and nays were refused. The motion to recommit was rejected. The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, on that, I ask the yeas and nays. The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 240; nays 139; answered "present" 1; not voting 52; as follows:

Mr. Speaker, on the preceding page.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (S. 984) to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:
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 United States for expenses of regular department or agency personnel, incurred by it for the transportation and subsistence of workers under this title in amounts not to exceed $20 per worker, and

"(3) to pay to the United States, in any case in which a worker is not returned to the reception center in accordance with the contract entered into under section 501 (9) and is apprehended within the United States to such reception centers as may become necessary during transportation authorized by paragraph (3) and while such workers are at reception centers.

"(5) to assist such workers and employers in negotiating contracts for agricultural employment (such contracts to be entered into by or under the authority of the Secretary in accordance with title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended);

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

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

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

"(2) to reimburse the United States for essential expenses of such immigration, including salaries of personnel, incurred by it for the transportation and subsistence of workers under this title in amounts not to exceed $20 per worker, and

"(3) to pay to the United States, in any case in which a worker is not returned to the reception center in accordance with the contract entered into under section 501 (9) and is apprehended within the United States, an amount determined by the Secretary of Labor to be equivalent to the normal cost to the employer of returning other workers from the United States to such reception center, less any portion thereof required to be paid by other employers.

"SEC. 503. Recruiters or employers under this title shall be available for employment in any area unless the Secretary of Labor for such area determines that such agricultural workers are not available at the time and place needed to perform the work for which such workers are to be employed, and (2) the employment of such workers will not adversely affect the wages and working conditions of domestic agricultural workers similarly employed, and (3) reasonable efforts have been made to attract domestic workers for such employment by the payment of wages and standard hours of work comparable to those offered to foreign workers.

"SEC. 504. No workers shall be made available under this title who are not citizens of the United States who shall be admitted to the United States subject to the immigration laws (or if at ready, in the event of such admission, by virtue of such immigration, or otherwise eligible for admission to, the United States may, pursuant to arrangements between the United States and the Republic of Mexico, be permitted to remain therein) for such time and under such conditions as may be specified by the Attorney General but, notwithstanding any other provision of law or regulation, no penalty bond shall be required with respect to 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 be required to remain in the employ of any employer who has in his employ any Mexican alien when such employing conditions are such as to believe or suspect or by reasonable inquiry could have ascertained that such alien is not lawfully within the United States, or any person who, having employed such an alien without knowing or having reasonable ground to believe or suspect that such alien is unlawfully within the United States and who could have ascertained such unlawfulness by a reasonable inquiry at the time of giving such employment, shall obtain information during the course of such employment indicating that such alien is not lawfully within the United States and shall fail to report such information promptly to an immigration officer or other public authority. Such failure shall be guilty of perjury and conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine not exceeding $2,000, or by imprisonment for a term not exceeding 1 year, or both, for each alien in respect to whom any violation of this section occurs.

"SEC. 505. No workers will be made available under this title for employment after December 31, 1962.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The clerk read as follows:

Mr. COOLEY moves to strike out all after the enacting clause of S. 984, and insert the provisions of H. R. 3263, as passed, "That the Agricultural Act of 1949 is amended by adding at the end thereof a new title to read as follows:

"TITLE V—AGRICULTURAL WORKERS

"SEC. 501. For the purpose of assisting in such production of agricultural commodities and products as the Secretary of Agriculture deems necessary, by supplying agricultural workers from the United States, 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); and

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

"(3) to provide transportation, for such workers from recruitment centers outside the continental United States and for 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 for any one case) as may become necessary during transportation authorized by paragraph (3) and while such workers are at reception centers.

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

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

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

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

"(2) to reimburse the United States for essential expenses of such immigration, including salaries of personnel, incurred by it for the transportation and subsistence of workers under this title in amounts not to exceed $20 per worker, and

"(3) to pay to the United States, in any case in which a worker is not returned to the reception center in accordance with the contract entered into under section 501 (9) and is apprehended within the United States to such reception centers as may become necessary during transportation authorized by paragraph (3) and while such workers are at reception centers.

"(5) to assist such workers and employers in negotiating contracts for agricultural employment (such contracts to be entered into by or under the authority of the Secretary in accordance with title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended);
personnel, incurred by it for the transportation and subsistence of workers under this title, shall be federal expenses, not to exceed $10 per worker; and (3) to pay to the United States, in any case where a worker is not returned to the reception center in accordance with the contract entered into under section 501 (5), and required 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, the amount thereof which shall be paid by such employer.

"Sec. 503. No workers recruited under this title who are not citizens of the United States shall be admitted to the United States subject to the immigration laws or any amendments thereto made by any provision of law or regulation, no penalty bond shall be required which imposes liability upon any person for the failure of any such worker to depart from the United States upon termination of employment."

"Sec. 505. (a) Section 210 (a) (1) of the Social Security Act, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new sub-paragraph as follows: "'(c) Service performed by foreign agricultural workers under contracts entered into in accordance with title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended.'" (b) Section 1426 (b) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new sub-paragraph as follows: "'(c) Service performed by foreign agricultural workers under contracts entered into in accordance with title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended.'" (c) Workers recruited under the provisions of this title shall not be subject to the head tax levied under section 2 of the Immigration Act of 1917 (8 U.S.C., sec. 182).

"Sec. 506. For the purposes of this title, the Secretary of Labor is authorized— (1) to enter into agreements with Federal and State agencies; to utilize (pursuant to such agreements) the facilities and services of such agencies; and to allocate or transfer funds or otherwise to pay or reimburse such agencies for expenses in connection therewith; (2) to use 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 to the detriment of the labor laws, of agricultural workers from the Republic of Mexico.

"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 124 of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended, for the processing of perishable or seasonable agricultural products."

The amendment was agreed to. The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table. By unanimous consent, the bill (H.R. 3283) was amended.

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

"The term "employer" includes associations or other groups of employers."
gets beyond control, the American public will lay the responsibility where it rightly belongs.

President Truman; Charles E. Wilson, Director of Defense Materials; Dr. James E. Johnston; General Eisenhower; General Bradley; and all responsible leaders of our war effort are asking for legislation which will give them authority to proceed unhampered by economic problems in their fight for an effective war and defense program.

Some of our legislators still think that the American people will not submit to wartime sacrifice and inconvenience unless our own country is attacked. These people are being misled by self-seeking politicians and profiteers who in their mad rush for political and financial advantage, are gradually bringing our private enterprise economy to the brink of ruination. Since last January, military orders have been placed at an average rate of one billion a week. More than twenty-seven billion has been obligated for military requirements since the outbreak of hostilities in Korea. It is estimated that July 1, 1952, at least an additional $60,000,000,000 will be spent and obligated.

SMALL BUSINESS

Iron and steel production will increase over 16,000,000 tons in the next 18 months. Aluminum, copper, manganese and dozens of other strategic metals and other necessities must be grooved into a priorities and allocation system in order to make our wartime program effective. Failure to provide the necessary distribution of basic materials could not only ruin small business, but hamper our production effort. This legislation provides for these regulations.

Many small business enterprises, unable to meet increased prices for necessary materials, are already forced out of business and numerous others are on the brink of collapse. Competition for skilled labor in an already tight labor market would be certain to force wages, and thus prices, upward. In the absence of a stabilization program, it would be foolhardy to expect the distribution of essential materials if prices are allowed to soar. Secretary of Defense Marshall has pointed out that since Korea, the increased cost of military items alone has risen approximately $7,000,000,000 through inflation.

WAGES AND PRICES

We are beginning to witness devastating tie-ups by strikes throughout the country. Ninety percent of the wage problem today is brought about because of high living costs and ineffective price control. It is unrealistic to talk about trying to stabilize wages at a time when our over-all economy is not stabilized and prices and profits continue to soar. High prices and the cost of living have soared deplorably since the Korean trouble started. The vicious circle has been expanding since 1944. In 1944, industry was satisfied with a small normal profit satisfactory, but during the last 7 years, profits have increased 97 percent and wages increased, on the average, only 26 percent. In other words, profits have increased three and one-half times beyond wages. The Government has clamped controls on wages, sales, and other goods. Sellers of labor are rigidly limited to a 10 percent increase. This does not apply to millions of unorganized workers. Prices soar, but wages are dormant for millions. Everyone admits that there should be equality of sacrifice in the war effort. Very few of our employers and state men will agree to place this equality in practical operation.

PROFITS

Ten years ago we had only two large corporations with gross incomes of one billion or more. Today we have 19, including ten large corporations which have annual income of seven and one-half billion; A. T. & T., three and one-third billion; Standard Oil, A. & P., and Sears, Roebuck, around three billion, and on the verge of one billion is one-half billion income. I am not complaining against an industry or business just because it is large, but these institutions should not be expected to assume what should aid millions of consumer families. Today millions cannot enjoy even the simplest pleasures and conveniences because of wartime inflation.

Stabilization and control legislation is absolutely necessary in industrial areas or our war production in these areas will be wrecked. The industrial Calumet region of Indiana is but one of many metropolitan centers throughout the United States wherein thousands of workers have come from other areas of the country to work in the steel mills, oil refineries, transportation companies, and factories of all descriptions. The cost of living for meats, groceries, clothing, and rents has leaped immeasurably since June, 1950. Hundreds of steel workers in this district have not been able to provide a sufficient food budget. Further, they cannot provide necessary comforts and conveniences of life.

Many families have already disposed of their umbrellas and handbags in order to buy the bare necessities of life. In my last two visits home, committees and individuals have informed me of this serious situation.

POST OFFICE WORKERS AND RETIRED CITIZENS

Postal employees are resigning because they cannot support their families on their postal salaries in that high-cost-of-living area. Postal service in Hammond, Gary, and East Chicago, Ind., has greatly deteriorated because over 50 percent of the postal employees are new and inexperienced. This situation is brought about by reason of the resignations of the regular postal workers.

School teachers and office employees have been made similarly jobless. Retired folks and older people living on pensions and retirement income cannot stretch their paltry income on the present inflationary prices. We are spending billions to curtail communism, but unless the cost of living is reduced we are creating millions of discontented and unhappy citizens upon whom the communist agitators can find a fertile field to add memberships to their cause.

DEEP AS INFLATION EXAMPLE

The rapid rise of the cost of beef is an example of inflation in a wartime economy. At January 16, 1953, the price of beef stood at 115 percent of parity. In April of this year the price of beef stood at 153 percent of parity. The ceiling after the first roll-back represents a 50 percent of parity. After October 1, if the third roll-back is allowed to take place, cattle prices should be between 120 and 125 percent of parity.

Figures of the United States Department of Agriculture show that in the past 11 years feeders in the Corn Belt have made an average profit of 28.8 percent for each head of cattle they sell. Their profits in the past 12 months have been the highest in history—$68.54 per head. This is 268 more profit per head of cattle than in the plump 1946-47 season, after CPA price controls were killed. The 10-percent roll-back of May 22 has cut back profits per head of cattle to $47.69, according to the Government's agriculture experts. Yet the story the cattlemen tell the public is that they are losing money. What they mean is that instead of making all-time record profits they are earning 129 percent more than the 11-year average profit per head. In other words, if the Government roll-back is not carried out meat foods of all kinds will disappear from the tables of the working families of America.

RENT CONTROL

Rent control is provided for in this legislation. Shelter is the second most important expenditure in the family budget. At military establishments and in industrial defense areas the housing crisis is deplorable. On May 4, when this Congress reduced the number of defense housing units to 5,000 annually, it struck a body blow to tenants in the above-described areas. For 15 years the real estate people have stated they could provide low-priced housing. They have not failed miserably. At least 125,000 low-priced public housing units should be built annually so workers and their families could leave trailer camps, shacks, and slums.

It is estimated that in the industrial area of northern Indiana and south Chicago, over 100,000 defense workers and their families live in trailer camps and dilapidated shacks. Furthermore, owners of these shacks and run-down apartment buildings are charging outrageously high rentals.

Mayor Penrod, of Gary, Ind., recently testified before the Banking and Currency Committee that during the past 15 years, thousands of defense workers in this area slept on cots in store building attics. These workers were working three times in 24 hours to workers on the various shifts in the steel mills. The steel mills in this area provided old pullman cars in the switching yards for additional sleeping quarters for defense workers.

When this Congress refused the public housing legislation a few months ago,
it threw another wrench around the real estate lobby’s neck and relegated millions of workers in urban and industrial areas throughout America to live under abhorrent conditions. Defeat of legislation of this kind will eventually bring dissatisfaction and discontent and lead on to strikes which will greatly hamper our war effort.

In decontrolled cities in my district, I have received numerous letters and telegrams where rents have increased 50 to 150 percent. On the other hand, I have received letters from landlords who have not profiteered in this housing crisis. These landlords should be given every right to receive a reasonable income on their investment and it is so provided in this legislation. Rent control in these critical areas should be immediately abolished when the housing crisis relaxes.

**IMPORTS AND DEFENSE PROPERTY**

This legislation will also regulate the importations of manufactured products of any raw material upon which domestic priorities or allocations are in effect. Even for authority to acquire property by condemnation or by purchase, donation, or other means of transfer. The Defense Production Act at present provides only for the repositioning of real and personal property for defense needs. Under these provisions, agreements by the Armed Services Committee of the House and Senate will be necessary for the acquisition of any real property for the use of the military.

Provisions are also set out in this legislation for the protection of the small-business man.

**AUTO AND CONSUMER CREDITS**

Provisions are also made for the relaxation of regulation W. Automobile dealers and car purchasers in my district, as well as other areas throughout the country, have recently curtailed on the sale and purchase of new automobiles because of the unreasonable high down payments and short-time credits on the sale of cars. The automobilist must be once again able to purchase an automobile on fair and reasonable terms.

The winner of every working family in America needs an automobile to go to and from his employment and for other personal and family purposes. Under the present regulation, the average worker cannot comply with the large down payment and limited time credit required for an automobile.

**TAXES AND INFLATION**

Last week the House passed a large tax bill which was necessary in order to pay for the largest defense and military war cost in our history.

Seventy-four cents out of every Federal tax dollar goes to pay for war and defense. Approximately five and one-half billion is expended every year for interest on our national war debt. Almost eight billion is expended for benefits to surviving veterans of past wars. The billions that have been spent to rehabilitate France, Italy, Greece, and Turkey in the last few years have been spent on all western Europe from communism. Paul Hoffman, Eric Johnston, Generals Marshall, Bradley, Eisenhower, and other nonpolitical leaders have testified that this has been our greatest war expenditure. It has not been a question as to whether our country can afford it, but the fact is America could not afford to refuse this expenditure.

The future of the free world, including ourselves, depends upon it. Unless this stabilization and price-control legislation is enacted into law, millions of our citizens will not have the cash to pay the taxes called for in this war and defense effort. Uncontrolled inflation could ruin our economy and also our war and defense effort. Every true American is looking forward to the day when controls of all kinds can be eliminated, but we must undergo sacrifice when we are preparing our country in a Heraclean effort to curb the spread of communist dictatorship. After all, the hundred percent tax dollar goes to pay for war and defense.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Did I understand the gentleman to say that labor had received only a 26-percent increase since 1940?

Mr. MADDEN. That is right.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. What authority does the gentleman cite for that?

Mr. MADDEN. I got this from the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Would the gentleman like to check on it.

Mr. MADDEN. I will recheck on it.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Because the cost of Government has increased about 500 percent.

Mr. MADDEN. I might say that in my area the beneficiaries of postal workers, school teachers, and white-collar workers have not received even that much. I am referring to the grand average of all groups.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I think the over-all increase for labor has been far more than 26 percent.

Mr. MADDEN. That was the general average.

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

Mr. MADDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. FELLOWS. The gentleman said that 52 percent of the postal employees had left their positions.

Mr. MADDEN. In my area, yes.

Mr. FELLOWS. And that was to seek a better job.

Mr. MADDEN. That is right.

Mr. FELLOWS. Does the gentleman know where they went?

Mr. MADDEN. No, I do not.

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. McGREGOR).

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The Speaker. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, on June 20, Secretary of Defense General Marshall submitted a request to the Congress authorizing the additional appropriation of $8,561,283,687 for expansion and construction of military installations.

Incorporated in this request was one installation located in the Seventeenth District of Ohio which it is my honor to represent in Congress. This request was for $13,237,000 for the Shelby—Eight Hundred and Thirty-first—USAF Specialized Depot, Shelby, Ohio. I am in complete accord with any request that is absolutely needed and essential to the war effort, which will give the necessary material and equipment to those in the armed services in order that they might defeat their lives and the liberty of our country. I am definitely opposed to any expenditures, either civilian or military, that are not necessary.

This request for $13,237,000 for the Shelby Depot might be essential and needed, but I want to be shown that such is the case.

I have written Secretary Marshall asking for complete information so that I can determine whether or not this Shelby Depot expenditure is necessary. I call upon every member of Congress to carefully investigate the projects in their districts which might be included in this $8,561,283,687 request and see if we can safely reduce this enormous expenditure.

The taxpayers are heavily burdened and no expenditures should be made on any projects regardless of whether or not they are in our own districts, that are not essential and absolutely necessary to our war effort.

Let us forget selfish interests and remember that unnecessary expenditures lead to increased debt and higher taxes, and will destroy the freedoms for which our boys are fighting. Economy should begin at home.

I hope every Member of this Congress will join me in a complete investigation of General Marshall’s request.

**CALL OF THE HOUSE**

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

The Speaker. That is right.

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

[Roll No. 91]
Mr. HALLECK. I wonder if the gentleman learned in the presentation before the Committee in that discussion. That seemingly is a very controversial issue.

We will have before us the question of increasing the amount of money which can be expended or loans which can be made under certain provisions of the Defense Production Act. We have the question of price roll-backs. I think perhaps some of the Members of the Committee and this matter have been before the House in the recent weeks on the question of the roll-back orders that have been issued on meat, for instance. However, this question involves other questions as well in connection with the roll-back of prices, or the authority or the right to roll back prices.

We have another important question involved in this legislation in which every farmer is interested, and that is the one of parity prices; whether they shall be fixed once a year or seasonally, or how. I think perhaps we may have a more large amount of discussion on that subject when this bill is read under the 5-minute rule. Then there is the amendment dealing with Presidential authority to condemn property or to enter into Government operation of certain industrial plants.

Why am I calling your attention to these particular provisions of the bill, and amendments I have mentioned, the 57 amendments which I have already discussed in the Committee on Rules, to amend the Defense Production Act, of which course, the many other amendments of which may possibly be offered on the floor of the House by the membership? Simply for this reason:

The Defense Production Act of 1950 expires at midnight on June 30. That is this coming Saturday night. This rule provides for 5 hours of general debate. But we have other legislation scheduled this week. So, whether we can consider 57 important committee amendments to this bill, as contained in the measure as it is reported by the committee, each of which will be subject, as I mentioned, to debate under the 5-minute rule before Saturday night is indeed questionable. And remember this, these 57 amendments in the Committee of the Whole each of the 57 will also be subject to a roll-call vote when we get back into the House. While I am willing to vote on each of these amendments on the record, I sort of shudder and become a little weak when I think of the possibility of answering 57 roll calls, and perhaps more if other amendments are offered and adopted, plus, of course, a roll call on a motion to recommit if somebody makes such a motion, plus a roll call on the passage of the bill. The physical strain alone will be almost unbearable even if we can find the 24 hours of time such roll calls would require.

It seems to me the situation is such that if this legislation is to be thoroughly discussed and considered by the House of Representatives, all the amendments voted on, the final House decision made, the measure sent over to the other body, a conference committee appointed, the conference report brought back here and agreed upon here,
and the measure reaches the President by this coming Saturday night, midnight, that we are going to be mighty, mighty busy here in the House during the next few days. No one, even the most critical constituent, will be able to close this Congress has been doing nothing this week, at least.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I shudder along with the gentleman from Ohio, but I wonder where in the world those in charge of this legislation have been all the time that they should have brought this up just a few hours before the legislation expired. Here we are on the brink of the close of the fiscal year. We are now discussing the question of putting this thing over. When do you expect to resume consideration of this legislation after you have gone along and extended it temporarily? I assume you are going to attempt to extend it temporarily and then take it up later.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The gentleman and I have conversed privately, at times, the very grave and important question as to whether or not each of us is our brother’s keeper. In this particular instance, I do not believe or feel that either of us are our brother’s keeper. I certainly do not want to assume the responsibility and shall not assume it, of the majority leadership of this House. I certainly do not think the Republican minority can or should be held responsible for the flow of legislation to the floor.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I think the responsibility rests elsewhere. So I believe your question should be directed elsewhere.

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. The gentleman has referred to the rather unusual manner in which this bill has been reported by the committee. I think he has been nonsense here in its present form. I think the committee on Rules could not decide whether this should be a clean bill or the type of bill that it is. I have listed the different amendments and some of the different issues and questions which will be involved when this bill is under consideration, simply for the purpose of impressing upon you, if I can, what appears to me the utter hopelessness and impossibility of getting this committee to undertake to put forth their best effort to put the bill into a shape which the House contemplated.

There is here in its present form. The Committee on Rules could not decide whether this should be a clean bill or the type of bill that it is. I have listed the different amendments and some of the different issues and questions which will be involved when this bill is under consideration, simply for the purpose of impressing upon you, if I can, what appears to me the utter hopelessness and impossibility of getting this committee to undertake to put forth their best effort to put the bill into a shape which the House contemplated.

Therefore it seems to me if we are going to legislate wisely and well on the issues in the bill that we will have to find some method of getting more time. Yet at the same time I certainly do not want to continue, or see continued, any of the many inequities which have crept into the administration of the Defense Production Act of 1950.

There are a great many Americans who are demanding, as I believe they have a right to demand and should demand, prompt relief from the unfair and unworkable administrative orders and regulations which in too many instances have been the provisions of the 1950 act which is now in existence.

So we do have the grave responsibility of deciding how to best meet this particular situation which confronts us. I say, in justice to the House, that we have been placed in an untenable position where it is impossible to do that which we are called upon to do, and we must find some other solution to the problem.

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DOLLINGER. The gentleman has stated that it will be impossible to complete the bill because of the shortness of time. Does not the gentleman agree that this bill is so important we should work day and night in an effort to see if we can dispose of it before we make a determination that we can put the thing over, or should put it over?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I agree fully with the gentleman. But I regret—and you know I have the greatest affection, sir—for you personally—that your committee did not see fit to start earlier and work longer hours on this legislation.

Mr. DOLLINGER. Our committee did work night and day.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Oh, yes; for the last few days, I am sorry to say. I would feel much better if we did not have so many Members of the Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday Club here in the House and if we had a little better attendance in the House, and a little more time for our consideration.

Mr. DOLLINGER. May I point out that of course the gentleman is not referring to me.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Oh, no; I am not referring to you personally. Of course I would not refer to the gentleman personally. Indeed I would not refer to anyone personally on the floor of the House.

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. HALECK. I think the gentleman would agree with me that the failure of the Committee on Banking and Currency to get this measure here prior to this time, the last week before the expiration date of the act, is completely indefensible. The fact of the business is that this measure should have been here weeks ago. Everyone knew that the time was running out on the measure. I, for one, cannot see any adequate reason why it should not have been here weeks and weeks ago in order that we could have acted upon it in a careful, orderly fashion.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I agree fully with the gentleman. I call the attention of the House, and the attention of the gentleman from New York, that another reason why it is going to be difficult to complete this legislation is the fact that it is going to be necessary to take some action in the next day or so to meet the appropriations needed to run the Federal Government after midnight of June 30, simply because the Committees on Appropriations of the House and of the other body have not yet completed the work which has been assigned to them.

We have not yet put through this Congress and sent to the President a single major appropriation bill, after having been in session for practically six full months. So I insist that the House of Representatives as such, and the great membership of this body as a whole, are not responsible for the situation in which we find ourselves. We should not be held responsible for something we cannot help. We should not be expected to accomplish the impossible in the next few hours or the next few days.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Replying to the gentleman from Indiana I wish to state that practically everybody in the United States wanted to be heard for or against this bill, many witnesses. It took us 6 weeks to get to the point where we could write a bill that we thought was workable and present it to the House.

I resent the implication that the Committee on Banking and Currency was doing nothing.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I have not time to yield further, but I want to be fair. The gentleman from Georgia bears a splendid surname. I know that he was here working on the job as a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, and he endeavored to the best of his ability to get a clean bill reported by his committee to meet the present situation. Nevertheless, the fact remains that we have an unclean bill, and a situation, that is impossible to meet and care for properly between now and June 30.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. Smith).

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I do not think anybody is going to be
opposed to this rule; we all realize we have got to give consideration to this bill, and I imagine that the rule will pass without any real trouble.

I was disturbed when the matter was brought before the Committee by the report on the bill. Under the Ramseyer rule the report is required to contain a comparative analysis of the bill proposed and existing law. The bill that was proposed in the Committee, and which compliance with the Ramseyer rule is tied to the original bill. It therefore does not mean anything, and you will find it most difficult to understand from the report of the committee what changes are actually taking place.

The chairman of the committee very kindly at my suggestion has had a committee print made that complies with the Ramseyer rule as tied to the bill after it was amended as the committee amended it; so, through the cooperation of the printing committee and the committee, if you will look at the report on the bill as amended, you can have both the report of the committee and the committee print in compliance with the Ramseyer rule as tied to the bill as amended. You can therefore see just exactly what changes have been made in the bill. I think that will relieve a good deal of the difficulty, and I am very glad that the committee so willingly complied with that suggestion. I would suggest to Members who are interested that they ask the chairman of the committee to supply the desks here with the committee print so that we can understand the contents of the bill.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The gentleman will agree, I believe, as a very able parliamentarian, that the parliamentary situation as I described it actually exists with these 87 amendments.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Yes; it exists and is unusual. However, the Committee on Banking and Currency had the right to do it. I am sure that it was a most shrewd parliamentary way to do the thing from the standpoint of certain members of the committee, and I do not have any criticism of them; I probably would have put it across myself if I had been on that side and on the committee.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. SPENCE).

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I was not in the Chamber and I did not hear the debate upon the resolution; however, I think that the gentleman from Ohio, a member of the Rules Committee, taking to task the Banking and Currency Committee because it reported a bill with amendments. In my opinion, it is not within the province of the Rules Committee to dictate to legislative committees in what form they should report their bills. I do not think any committee including the Rules Committee is the keeper of the measure and the judgment of other committees.

I was for the committee bill being reported with amendments. That is why the Congressional Record is printed, that is why the doors of the gallery are always open—in order that the public may see its representatives at work and know how they vote.

Should the committee adopt the resolution resulting from report a bill that will assure to our constituents this right?

Then the question came up as to the Ramseyer rule. The Ramseyer rule did not apply to the amendments. So we had the staff of the committee file a supplemental statement which shows the history of these amendments that gives full effect to the Ramseyer rule.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. May I say to the gentleman that we have not questioned the right or the privilege of the committee, and I did not criticize the committee for introducing what the parliamentary situation is.

Mr. SPENCE. I am glad to have the gentleman's statement. I suppose it came with some praise, but it did not seem to me to make the recommendation when I came into the room. That is the reason I have taken the floor at this time for a few minutes to explain to the House that we reported the bill with amendments. I was deeply interested in them and I assume all the blame for it. If it is hard on gentlemen to make their positions known, I am sure that we represent should know where we stand, what we are for and that that was a good way to do it.

I like to treat my colleagues with every consideration and courtesy. I like to help make their lives pleasant here, if I can, but I do feel in this particular case it is very desirable to have everybody show where he stands on this very great piece of legislation that means so much to the future happiness of the people of America and the stabilization of our economy.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SADLAK).

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, the unusual procedure under which House bill 3871 comes before us and a listing of some of the controversial amendments has been mentioned by members of the Rules Committee, among them the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) who has yielded me this time.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that there is also another unusual amendment in the bill which should be specifically listed in the highly controversial category. It is section 110, amendment 13 and 14, actually commencing at line 7 (e) on page 12 and is a new section of title III of the Defense Production Act of 1950.

I reiterate my contention that if it had not been for the amendment, herebefore, it will be very much so by the time we begin general debate and take up the amendments now incorporated in the measure, and under consideration of section 5 by my colleagues which is earnestly invited during the interim before this part of the bill is reached will, I hope, convince each of you to my belief that it is illogical, uneconomical, and a detriment to our national defense and should be removed from the bill.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. DEMPSEY).

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate very much the kindness of the gentleman from Ohio in giving me 3 minutes. I tried to get time on the other side of the aisle, but it was already allotted and for that reason I could not obtain it.

Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purpose of calling the attention of the committee to a matter which it may desire to take into account and amend in this bill. A few days ago in purchasing an automobile, and exchanging my old one for the new one, the salesman asked me if I needed a spare tire. Well, I would not drive a car without a spare tire. I said, "Yes, where are you not one on the car? Have you not charged me for it?" He said, "No. The manufacturer is only permitted to provide four tires with a new car. That is due to the "Priority Production Authority.""

He said, "I can sell you a tire, but unfortunately, it will cost you more money because we are only permitted to allow you $6 in lieu of your fifth new tire. That is the price the General Motors Co. would have to pay to buy a new tire and put it on there; but I have to sell it to you at retail, so I am charging you $34.60."

I said, "Do you mean that in the manufacture of some 5,000,000 cars this year, every person who buys a car is going to be penalized that much?"

I assumed this was because of a direct shortage of rubber. He said, "There is no shortage of rubber. I wish you would give me an order for a thousand tires, and I will have them at your home before you get there."

So I consulted the National Production Authority. The rubber question is something whatever to do with this regulation.

Now, if the committee wants—and I do not think that it is their desire—to penalize the purchasers of automobiles to the extent of from $110,000,000 to $125,000,000 a year, then let this regulation stay in, and that is what you are going to do. But remember that in doing so you are not helping this defense effort one dime's worth. You are simply taking that much money away from the people at a time when we are trying to stop inflation. I am going to offer an amendment to repeal this situation if the committee does not. I would much prefer that they would do so, because it is not that I take any pride in calling this to your attention. But every person who has spoken to about the spare tire situation believes that we are making some little sacrifice to the war effort when, as a matter of fact, rubber is going to be a drug of the future. We are going to reduce the number of cars we manufacture by reason of the steel situation. Rubber has nothing to do with
Mr. Larson is about through buying for the stockpile.

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

Mr. DEMPSY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. AYRES. I come from a rubber city, and I can confirm what the gentlemansaid. Information has come to me from the workingmen in the factories, the stores, and the warehouses and the officials of the company, to the effect that there will be no shortage of tires.

Mr. DEMPSY. I do not have time to go into detail about the reason for this, but there is no reason for it at all, and we are not doing anything except adding to inflation, putting another burden of from $110,000,000 to $125,000,000 on the purchasers of cars. Considering that after the tax bill we passed, it is just about the last straw on the camels back, in my opinion.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MITCHELL].

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I am very glad to have the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] that this is a very important bill coming before the House on this rule. Certainly, I agree with the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE] that each of us, as individual Members of this body, has a very definite responsibility to determine whether the majority of the Committee on Banking and Currency reached conclusions in the best interests of the consumers of this country.

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

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

Mr. O'TOOLE. I just want to comment that I am very happy that the gentleman from Washington did not go down to the well of the House, because if he had spoken from the well of the House, he would have been up to his ankles in crocodile tears over the fate of this bill, as explained by the gentleman from Ohio and the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, if the American consumer is to be protected and if our national economic strength is to be maintained, improved price and production controls must be enacted by Congress. The day following the outbreak of the conflict in Korea, I called for the enactment and enforcement of across-the-board price, rent, and production controls. History certainly will prove that that action should have been taken on June 26, 1950. It must be taken now.

During this past year, the consumer taxpayer has been forced to bear the brunt of unnecessarily high prices and spiraling inflation. The millions of American families who have carefully and traditionally set aside a portion of their incomes have been confronted with the fear and alarm while the value of their savings has constantly depreciated. A symptom of this is the fact that reemp-
which was the final straw that brought about the action in New York. That one company has already gone out of business, because the bonds were permitted to go down below par. Many veterans throughout the country, as well as thousands who are not veterans, who would like to build small, modest homes, are unable to get the money because the insurance companies would have to sell their bonds below par in order to let them go. Therefore, we will have less housing in this country as long as that rule prevails.

WILL NOT COST PENNY FOR FEDERAL RESERVE TO SUPPORT BONDS AT PAR

So I hope the amendment I have to require and compel the Federal Reserve Banking System through its Open Market Committee to support these bonds at par will pass. I can assure you, too, that it will not cost the Government of the United States one penny. It will not cost the taxpayers one penny. Remember that. Without cost of any kind the bonds can be supported by Congress, but it has been in the past up until recently.

We owe an obligation to the people who bought these bonds. Preceding the financing of World War II we made a commitment through laws passed by this Congress that we would not permit bonds to be sold on the market, as they were after World War I, down to 82, $18 below par. The people lost up to $18 on a bond after World War I. Lots of people lost that. I see some people right here now that had that experience. We promised the people that would not be done during and after World War II, and they so managed its business, to be charitable, that those bonds are now held by large banking institutions, but they are not worth what they ought to be: that the price has dropped: that they are worth less than face value.

Who is at fault? Who has been in charge of this government since World War I, and who has so conducted our affairs that we are bankrupt, our bonds are not worth par? Who other than the gentleman's party? Who is the leader of the gentleman's party? Who is the gentleman and his party responsible for? For a policy which causes him to come here and ask the Congress of the nation to support these bonds now? The nation's bondholders are not worth what they ought to be: that the price has dropped; that they are worth less than face value.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield my remaining time to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, as I pointed out earlier in the week, if you took the whole debt of $26,000,000,000 of savings bonds which the gentleman from Texas referred to, you would have a loss of only $3,350,000,000, while those who hold the $65,000,000,000 of savings bonds which are now outstanding have certainly lost 25 percent on the whole. They have already suffered a $16,000,000,000 loss. The gentleman from Texas gets up here and makes a speech such as he has just made, and he accused the gentleman from Michigan and not accurately, that we are bankrupt, our bonds are not worth par?

I have said that the gentleman from Texas, after World War I, down to 82, $18 below par. The people lost up to $18 on a bond after World War I. Lots of people lost that. I see some people right here now that had that experience.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I am very glad the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] made the remarks he did. He is going to present to the House an issue of transcendent importance to countless millions of people throughout the country. It was only a few months ago when the change in the policy of the new 10 years took place. I remember I took the well of the House and made a speech at that time against it. We now see what has happened, with bonds down to 82, $18 below par. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] fails to remember history. After World War I our bonds were down to 82 and 83. Then those with plenty of money stepped in and made purchases. The people who had bought them had to sell them. Those with money, and this is a statement of fact, purchased them when they were low in price, then when the bonds came back, sold them at 105 and 106. We now have the same situation occurring after World War II as a result of action outside of Government, and not by the Congress of the United States, action by a small group who determined the financial policies of great importance to our people. Who is the gentleman from Texas proposing? Nothing new. It has been going on for 10 years without legislation by administrative action and agreement. We remember the controversy a few months ago between the Federal Reserve and the Treasury. The Federal Reserve prevailed and, as a result, our bonds have gone down below 100. That is what happened after World War I, and millions of persons who owned the bonds during World War I and sold them were the ones who suffered. Those who purchased them, because we will certainly hold them, waited until the market came back and disposed of their bonds, in many cases, at anywhere from 106 to 110.

I hope we are not going to have the same story now which took place after World War I.

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

The previous question was ordered.

Mr. Speaker, the question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution (H. Con. Res. 134) requesting the President to return the enrolled bill, H. R. 2349.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the President of the United States is hereby requested to return to the House of Representatives the enrolled bill (H. R. 2349) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue patents in fee to certain allottees on the Crow Indian Reservation; that if and when such bill is returned by the President, the action of the Speaker of the House of Representatives and of the President of the Senate in signing such bill is hereby rescinded; and that the Clerk of the House of Representatives is hereby authorized and directed, in the enrollment of such bill, to strike out in the phrase which reads "the northwest quarter of the southeast quarter," and to insert in lieu thereof "the northwest quarter of the southeast quarter of section 26."
Mr. MOIRS. That is correct. Yes, sir.

THE SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONTINUING SUSPENSION OF DUTIES AND IMPORT TAXES ON METAL SCRAP

Mr. EBEBARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 3181) to continue until the close of June 30, 1952, the suspension of duties and import taxes on metal scrap, and for other purposes.

The Clerk reads the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk reads the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of the act August 30, 1920 (Public Law 892, 61st Cong., ch. 1119, 62d sess.), is hereby amended by striking out "June 30, 1951" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1952."

EXPLANATION OF H. R. 3181

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, this bill would continue the exemption of metal scrap from import duties and taxes for another year, until the close of June 30, 1952. Import duties and taxes on metal scrap were suspended from March 14, 1942, to June 30, 1949, inclusive, under Public Law 497, Seventy-seventh Congress, and Public Laws 384 and 613, Eighty-first Congress. The import duties on metal scrap were again suspended from October 1, 1950, to June 30, 1951, under Public Law 869, Eighty-first Congress.

The rates of duty on the principal types of ferrous and nonferrous metal scrap, suspension of which would be continued by the bill, are shown in the following table from a report of the United States Tariff Commission:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ferrous scrap:</td>
<td>37½ cent per pound plus additional duties on alloy content.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relaying and rerolling rails:</td>
<td>4½ cent per pound plus additional duties on alloy content.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonferrous scrap:</td>
<td>Aluminum: 1½ cent per pound.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Copper and copper-base alloy: 2½ per cent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lead: 2½ cent per pound.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Magnesium: 20 cent per pound.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zinc (including zinc dross and skimming): ½ cent per pound.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1Free of duty under the Tariff Act of 1930, Sec. 1623 of the Internal Revenue Code provides for an import-excess tax of 4 cents per pound on the copper content of copper and copper-base scrap, which was reduced to 2 cents per pound under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

According to the Tariff Commission, these rates are equivalent to an ad valorem rate based on import values in 1950, as follows: Iron and steel scrap, 1.4 percent; aluminum scrap, 1.4 percent; copper scrap, 11.7 percent; brass scrap, 22.2 percent; and zinc scrap, 6.2 percent.

Imports of alloyed iron and steel scrap were small, and the insignificant imports of relaying and rerolling rails and of magnesium scrap were not separately reported.

Favorable reports on the legislation have been received from the Department of Defense, the Maritime Administration, and the Office of Defense Mobilization.

In his report dated May 7, 1951, the Director of Defense Mobilization stated, in part, as follows:

The demand for metal scrap, both ferrous and nonferrous, exceeds available supply. Consequently, it is essential to the defense production of steel, and, if the importation of metal scrap from overseas sources be encouraged to the maximum extent possible. Continuation of the suspension of the duties and taxes on imports is an important factor for the accomplishment of this purpose. Accordingly, I urge enactment of H. R. 3181.

The Assistant Secretary of Defense, in his report dated May 11, 1951, stressed the importance of enactment of the bill, as follows:

Metals are generally in short supply to meet all the requirements in the United States. It is believed that metal scrap imports to this country can supply a considerable portion of materials beyond the current scrap production. The suspension of import duties on scrap provides a margin of cost which makes it feasible to market foreign scrap in the United States. In view of the urgent need for foreign scrap, and to facilitate its flow, the Department of Defense recommends enactment of H. R. 3181.

Inflationary aspects of a reimposition of the duty as well as the importance of defense recommend prompt this recommendation.

According to the Acting Secretary of Commerce in his report of May 11, 1951:

The situation with respect to metal scrap is critical at the present time, the requirements of the stockpiling program, and of essential civilian uses being far in excess of the available supply. Suspension of the import duties affects favorably the flow of metal scrap into this country from foreign sources, while the present and prospective shortages of these materials, leaves a stable market for domestic scrap.

The Treasury Department has advised that it anticipates no unusual administrative difficulties under the provisions of the bill.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of H. R. 3181, a bill to continue until the close of June 30, 1952, the suspension of duties and import taxes on metal scrap, and for other purposes. This important bill was reported by the Ways and Means Committee by unanimous vote.

This extension is necessary during this emergency for the reason that this country is desperately short of metal scrap, and has been ever since we furnished Japan all of our surplus scrap iron, steel, and metal scrap during the Japanese assault on China. It will be recalled that during the period from 1937 to 1941, Japan imported 18,000,000 tons of scrap iron, steel, and metal scrap, and also thousands of tons of other essential war material. I remember it was in the very year 1937, when Japan opened war on China, our exports of scrap iron and steel amounted to 2,081,037 tons, or enough to build 20 battleships of 45,000 tons each, 300 submarines of 2,400 tons each, 10 aircraft carriers of 30,000 tons each, and 26 cruisers of 13,000 tons each.

The next year, 1938, our scrap iron and steel exports to Japan were 1,465,000 tons; in 1939, 2,179,000 tons; and in 1940, 1,248,000 tons. I mention this without going into further detail to show why we have been short of scrap iron and steel, and other forms of materials from 1940 to the present time.

This bill, of course, is to remove the tariff on essential war materials to relieve the Government from paying duties and import taxes during the present Korean war.

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

THE SCANDAL OF MIGRATORY LABOR

Mr. POLK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include a portion of an article.

THE SCANDAL OF MIGRATORY LABOR

(By Most Rev. Robert E. Lucey)

(ARCHBISHOP Lucey of San Antonio, Tex., a member of the President's Commission on Migratory Labor, in an article in the magazine, America, of May 26, 1951, under the heading "The scandal of migratory labor, we are tolerating the intolerable," wrote, in part, as follows):

THE SCANDAL OF MIGRATORY LABOR

(ARCHBISHOP Lucey of San Antonio, Tex.)

(Archbishop Lucey of San Antonio, Tex., was a member of the five-man President's Commission on Migratory Labor, which turned in its report at the beginning of April. The archbishop is episcopal chairman of the Bishops' Committee on the Spanish-Speaking and is a vice president of the Catholic Association for International Peace.)

A migratory farm laborer is a worker whose principal income is earned from temporary farm employment and who in the course of his year's work moves one or more times often over long distances through the States. During the last 50 years migratory labor has been dealt with in many investigations and reports by Federal, State and private agencies. Few improvements have resulted.

Since there are more than 14,000,000 workers of farm laborers, one might reasonably ask why a special commission was appointed to study the 1,000,000 or so of the workers who farm. The answer is obvious. These people are human beings, largely defenseless against injustice. Their housing, food, and wages are often pitiful. The pattern of their economic life is unworthy of our Nation.
In 1949 only 5 percent of the migrants old-farm-day workers. Seventy percent of these workers had fewer than 75 days at farm jobs. Many migrants do some nonfarm work. During the year 1949 the fruit of farm workers spent 31 days of nonfarm work, making a total average of 101 days employment. For farm work they averaged for and nonfarm work 810, making a total average income of $514 for the year. Several of these workers had fewer nonfarm work. During the year 1949 they averaged an average of 15,600,000 bales of cotton we will recognize that we need. The reason given was that we are at war: that there is a year of emergency. It is true that there are many workers. Another public servant, in an address to a growers' association, went all out with the statement that we will need a million contract workers this year. Since a majority of migrant farm workers suffer from unemployment there seems to be no good reason why alien labor should be imported to make a bad situation worse.

Some will reply that we are at war, this is a year of emergency. It is true that the Department of Agriculture has recommended a cotton-production goal of 15,600,000 bales to produce more wool, feed grains, and livestock. But when we recall that in 1949 we produced 16,100,000 bales of cotton, we recognize that we need not get excited about cotton. And the use of migratory labor in the production of wood, feed grains, and livestock is insignificant.

The number of farm family workers remained almost constant during the World War II emergency. At the peak of the war effort in 1945, farm family workers were only 4 percent less than in 1940. In contrast, the number of hired workers declined sharply. Hired farm workers in 1945 were approximately 15 percent below 1940—a drop of almost 20 percent. Yet at this stage of the war emergency we were producing more crops and livestock than ever before. How did we do it? By bringing order into the chaos that is hired farm labor. On the average, the farm family and hired domestic workers together worked 10 days more per year in agriculture than they had in 1940. Employment for the year 1951 is 3.8 percent above 1949. This additional production could be supplied by our present domestic pool of farm family labor, if each laborer put in 6½ days more per year.

WAGES AND BARGAINING

Two things are expected of migratory workers: to be ready to go to work when needed; to be gone when not needed. Domestic family migrants sometimes find it difficult to be gone when not needed. Many farm employers prefer alien labor; it is cheap; it is docile. If the labor market can be flooded with migrants, domestic and foreign, wages would be reasonably low.

During 1949 some 65,000 Latin Americans left their homes in southern Texas to work in agriculture in other States. Wages in their home State are as low as 15 cents an hour. But in Texas, where Texas farmers imported 46,000 Mexican nationals to work in agriculture in Texas. And this does not include the big crop of farm family labor, if each worker put in 6½ days more per year.

Collective bargaining, or indeed any kind of equal bargaining, between migrants and farm employers, has been virtually unknown. The farmers are organized. As members of growers' associations, and even as individuals, they can influence wages and working conditions. Through the foreign labor program, interstate recruitment and radio and newspaper advertising bring workers from far and near. When thousands of migrants converge on an area where only hundreds are needed it would be fantastic to mention collective bargaining. The migrant worker has even less chance to obtain justice than the domestic workers because the threat of deportation gives him take what he gets and say nothing.

Domestic migrant farm workers not only have to pay since the usual complaints bargains, but employers as a rule refuse to give them the guarantees they have to extend to alien contract workers whom they import. These include guaranties of employment, workers' compensation, medical care, standards of sanitation and payment of the cost of transportation. As these protections can be extended to alien contract migrants, it ought to be feasible to extend them also to domestic workers.

HOUSING AND LIVING CONDITIONS

In recent years much has been written about on-job housing and home-base housing of migratory workers. The former consists of barracks. The unit is a trailer, rooming house, auto-court cabins, shack houses, and not infrequently, a spot under a tree near a ditch. When units are grouped for several families they are usually called camps. Much, if not most, of on-job housing of migratory farm labor in the United States is below minimum standards of decency.

Housing is an aspect of labor supply. An employer who offers particularly bad housing has difficulty in holding his workers. They "bargain by the yard" and the worker moves out. In the case of the Mexican wetback, he has to take what work he can get, housing or no housing. He often lives "in the brush." Not infrequently a migratory worker finds that to get a job in an area of active seasonal work the employer offers poor housing, and once hired cannot retain the housing and work elsewhere. In some cases employers say the food is good even when the workers sought alternative employment only on idle days. In other words, job and housing are synthesised.

Housing at the home base where migratory workers live for 6 to 8 months of the year is among the most deplorable in the Nation. Overcrowding, lack of running water, and use of pit privies are common. When 12 or 14 people, young and old, must live in one small room it is physically and morally unwholesome.

The director of a Florida county health department said President's Commission on Migrant Labor:

"This is an actual observation. A sanitarium reports 180 people living in 60 rooms with only 100 beds. With May 11th workers this has been corrected somewhat by three additional stools which were added by the time of the last inspection."

"One of our public-health nurses visited a nursery maintained on a private farm and found 48 infants. I said 48-infants on two double beds. I might add that two of the babies in that location subsequently died.

Members of the Commission personally observed the meager and unsanitary living conditions of many migrants in sections of the Country, and have been disturbed by a realization that in many instances these conditions have persisted for decades without correction. The efforts of Federal, State, and local governments and of agricultural employers during recent years, commendable as they have been, have not left a great deal of remedial work still to be done.

The use of migrant farm labor is as insufficient to maintain health as is their shelter. A physician testifying before the Committee charged with the responsibility for our immigration policy, "I say from the reports of the nurses that we do have dietary deficiency diseases such as pellagra—and cases that have come to our attention, cases of diet consisting of cornmeal and perhaps rice and very little else, with no vitamins. There are also evidences of merely ordinary starvation among many of these people."

A survey which I made and photographed in the Matias, Tex., labor camps showed that 95 percent of the children in that camp had not consumed any milk whatsoever in the last 6 months. It also showed that 8 out of every 10 adults had not eaten any meat in the last 6 months. The reason given was that they could not afford it with the money that was coming in.

Regardless of future developments in American agriculture, the enormous injustices that the whole system of foreign and domestic labor must be stopped now. Some powerful employers will put pressure on Congress to prevent these in their evil ways. Many of the findings of the Commission will be called communistic; social justice is often killed by an epithet. Only an informed and articulate public opinion can compel Congress to translate into law the recommendations of the President's Commission on Migrant Labor. Meanwhile, we are tolerating the intolerable.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR TOMORROW

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute to inquire about the program for tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, in response to the inquiry of my friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts, the business in order tomorrow will be the continuing resolution on the appropriations for the mushrooms of Massachusetts. That will probably last all day.

Mr. MCCORMACK. I expect it to.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I understand that there is 1 hour on the rule and 3 hours for general debate.

Mr. MCCORMACK. That is my understanding.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Hugh D. Scott, Jr.) is recognized for 6 minutes.

WHY STAND WE HERE IDLE?

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, this is the first anniversary of our entry into the Korean war which for a little while was referred to as a police action, but which in time by virtue of its magnitude and the casualties involved, was recognized for what it really was, a very bitter and deadly war. What is past is beyond recall and is useful now only in helping us to avoid similar mistakes in the future and perhaps in estimating the fitness of those charged with the responsibility for our national security.
On the day on which we entered the war the distinguished majority leader read to the House a statement which had just been made by the President indicating that the night before a decision had been made to throw this Nation into war. At that time I rose to say to the majority leader in this House that while it was gratifying to know that the State Department's policy in Asia had at last been invested with some abdominal fortitude, that I hoped our changed approach in Asia did not come too late. Whether it did or not history will record.

The testimony before another body by the Secretary of State comprised several main points which I am going to review briefly for the purpose of setting the record straight and for no other reason.

The Secretary of State made the point that the Yalta agreement which he had defended as essential to bring in the Russians against the Japanese satisfied even Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek when it was made. The subsequent testimony reveals that this was totally untrue. The Secretary of State testified that the proposition to bring the Chinese Communist Chinese Nationalists together had the approval of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek, General MacArthur, Admiral Spruance, and General Wedemeyer. Subsequent testimony revealed beyond any possibility of successful contradiction that such proposition did not have the support of Chiang Kai-shek, General MacArthur, or General Wedemeyer. I do not at this moment recall the position of Admiral Spruance.

The third major point insisted upon by the Secretary was that the United States withdrew its troops from Korea at the request of the South Korean President, Syngman Rhee, after the Russians had moved their armies to the north, and on that point did not reveal the warning of many American military officials and a good many Members of this House, speaking especially at the time of the Korean aid bill, that such removal would lead to the conquest of all Korea by the Communists.

The Secretary of State further made the point that the United States intervened in Korea in defense of collective security. That point is at least admissible. The State Department, according to the Secretary, further contended that the Department had proposed last November to various U. N. countries that United Nations be authorized to continue hot pursuit of Red planes into Manchuria. That is admitted, but our failure to press our allies for consent to do so has never been satisfactorily explained.

The Secretary makes the final point that the United States objectives in Korea were to reject the aggressors, and to restore peace and security. Nothing is said of any announced purpose of punishing the aggressors and nothing is said about unification of Korea, nothing is said about achievement of an over-all policy in the Far East, except to deny at this late date that these too were among our objectives, a denial which contradicts earlier statements.

But all this is past. The Korean war has been a most severe war, more costly in casualties and materiel, and costlier in money than the war with Japan over a similar period.

In the first year of the war in Korea, as compared with the war against Japan, 8,000 men were killed in the Japanese war, 11,000 in the Korean war. Six thousand were wounded in the Japanese war, 46,000 in the Korean war. Forty-three thousand were missing, thus the Japanese war, 11,500 in the Korean war. The total casualties as of about 3 weeks ago were 57,000 in the war with Japan, 70,500 in Korea. They are now over 77,000. These, of course, are only the battle casualties and not the seventy-five-thousand-odd so-called nonbattle casualties also involved. The men involved of Navy and Air Force in the Japanese war were 347,500. In the first year of the war in Korea 350,000. Of the men involved in the Navy, there were 350,000 in the Japanese war, 60,000 in the Marine Corps, 78,000 in the Japanese war and 35,000 in the Korean war. These figures of course, do not include other U. S. forces.

As far as cost goes, the cost of this war has run greater than the cost of the war against Japan, so far as can be allocated to that enemy.

Up to now our policy of a limited war has been based on the killer theory; that is, to kill enough of the enemy so that he will sue for peace. But there is evidence from Hong Kong and elsewhere, particularly from inside Red China, that she is building up her forces in Korea for new and bigger efforts, with special reference to a tremendous buildup of enemy air power now going on and upon airfields we were not permitted to destroy.

We have received the so-called peace bid through United Nations channels which is so clear and conclusive we do not need to examine it, as no peace bid can be ignored or dismissed out of hand without every opportunity being given to determine the question of good faith and the possibilities of peace. We must at the same time be wary of the overtures of Mr. Malik, while we must hold open the door to a peaceful outcome. The vital question is why Mao should seek peace, rather than what Jacob Malik says, perhaps for propaganda purposes.

Malik knows we will not bomb Red China. We told him so. He knows we will not let the Nationalist troops attack because we told him so. He knows we will not cross the Yalu or bomb its bridges or bring military installations in Manchuria or those in upper Korea, because we told him so.

Now, that is the record.

What have we gained at the end of the war, of supreme importance, surely. We have helped to apply, for the first time in history, the power of armed force in behalf of the principle of collective security. We have been forced to realize the magnitude of the Communist menace, and we have been driven to build a big armed force and launch a program which we might otherwise not have undertaken until it was too late.

Now, until the Senate investigation the Truman administration, which some have called the "war deal," and I spell that w-a-r d-e-a-l and not as others have spelt it w-a-r d-e-a-l, although there might be some justification for the second spellings—the Truman administration had admittedlythouse something to hide. It had no foreign policy for Asia, other than to let the dust settle. Settle it did, in Korea, upon the sightless eyes of our dead.

I recall on the floor of this House, back in the spring of 1944, saying to the Members of Congress that we had no foreign policy, or at least none which the people had been informed of, and none which the public could understand, and I said, "When we get out of this war, at the end of a long dark tunnel, will we have any friends left anywhere in the world? Who are our friends? Will the Russians be our friends?" In the well of this House on March 21, 1944, I asked: "Will our foreign policy leave us any friends?" I said then: "We entered the war with numerous friendly allies. When we come out at the other end of the long dark tunnel and return some day to the ways of peace, will we have any friends left? Who will they be? Russia? France? China? Italy? Argentina? Would anyone be so sanguine as to predict it?"

"What kind of a policy have the President and the State Department been following that we have come to this pass? Why will they not confide in the American people? What kind of people do they think we are? Have we a foreign policy? Whose? A people's foreign policy? Will our foreign policy be dictated by American public opinion? Not ours. She asked that the Chinese be our friends? Will the Chinese be our friends? France? Italy? Argentina? Would anyone be so sanguine as to predict it?"

"What kind of a policy have the President and the State Department been following that we have come to this pass? Why will they not confide in the American people? What kind of people do they think we are? Have we a foreign policy? Whose? A people's foreign policy? Will our foreign policy be dictated by American public opinion? Not ours. She asked that the Chinese be our friends? Will the Chinese be our friends? France? Italy? Argentina? Would anyone be so sanguine as to predict it?"

Now, in the matter of our foreign policy, so far as it has emerged in Asia, if the speech of Dean Rusk means anything, and I hope it does, perhaps some of the things have been made. But, that, too, should remain for discussion on another day.

What I want to talk about is the possibility of peace in Korea. How can we bring about an honorable termination of the shooting war in order to free ourselves and disperse our forces in accordance with our choice of strategy for the best defense of America rather than to continue to be pinned down defensively when and where the Soviets elect to keep us trapped? When, in other words, can we gain and maintain the initiative for the security of America and the free world? It seems to me the plan offered by Mr. Malik is one on which Russia cannot lose, because under that plan it would assure the Communist political
control of North Korea indefinitely and would ease the economic drain on Russia which the Korean war has imposed on her. And, for 10 years Russia would be in no hurry to discuss the issues raised by the Korean war, if the Russian proposal is simply for a cease-fire along the present battle line and for nothing else. Under these circumstances Russia can use the threat of resumption of hostilities in Korea as a lever to compel concessions on European issues. This is now apparent. The Russians now are aware that any such settlement as that proposed would have to go through the Security Council and be subject to the Soviet veto, if the Russians did not like it, so that the Soviets cannot fail to control whatever was done, and in that light it is easier to understand Mr. Malik’s proposal.

Perhaps also involved in the Malik proposal is the fact that Red China is being seriously injured. Perhaps also involved in the Malik proposal might be the possibility that the Chinese Red himself is in trouble with Red Russia, that they are long overdue on their promises to come in with tremendous air power and to strike the United States and United Nations with Soviet air forces thinly camouflaged as Red Chinese air power. Perhaps Mr. Malik has said to his Chinese leaders, Mao Tse-tung and others, “First we will try a peace proposal. It will give us the good will of all the people that we can propagandize, that we want to end the war, and the bloodthirsty American imperialists warmongers want to continue it.” Perhaps he has said to them, “If the peace proposal fails, then we will unleash this terrific air power against the United States in Korea.”

Bearing in mind these other considerations, I do not think the House of Representatives will in all likelihood support the Malik proposal. If it did, Mr. Malik would have to go to Red Russia and say to them, “You have long overdue on your promises, and we wish to make peace.” Perhaps he has said to them, “If you do not make peace, we will unleash our terrific air power against you.”

I had a letter from a Korean veteran today in which he said: “We still do not know what we are fighting for. We do not know what our objectives are. We do not know what we are here for.” When we fought the Germans we knew what we were fighting for. We knew what we were doing. When we are fighting, we know what we are doing. We know where we are going. We expect to win. We know the end. We know they are thinking that. I talked to a good many of them.

What can we do about it? I think, first of all, we are obligated to go on with a continued exploration of peace possibilities, possibilities of truce, cease-fire, possibilities of U.N. action. I think we ought to step up in the meanwhile our efforts to bring back in the field our allied nations and the nations in the United Nations to give more help against aggression. I think perhaps, remembering the failure of all previous efforts to bring Mussolini’s Ethiopia to order, which gave Mussolini the tip-off and the nerve to go into World War II, we ought to insist on an economic blockade which really works, and which is supported by the other members of the United Nations.

I think we ought to give consideration to the possibilities of a naval blockade, as testified to by Admiral Sherman, General Wedemeyer, Admiral Badger, and others, but while all these things are being done we ought also to concern ourselves with the possibility of peace.

I therefore propose that an American program of nudging peace might be along these general lines:

First, a general agreement for a cease-fire along the present battle line in Korea, subject to acceptance of the following conditions: 1. Withdrawal of troops from a 50-mile quarantine zone and the ceasing of all belligerent action, this to be followed in the third place by gradually withdrawing of all non-Korean forces from the entire Korean Peninsula, to be replaced coincidentally with a United Nations peace unification force composed of a membership drawn from all nations who are members of the United Nations. You will note that that would include the Russians and would not include the Red Chinese.

Fifth, that all Korean forces, north and south, thereafter—that is, after the entry of such a peace unification force—lay down their arms, and that that disarmament be supervised by the U.N. Korean Commissions.

Sixth, that this United Nations Korean Commission be authorized to recommend procedures for free elections to be held in all of Korea and for the establishment of that unified, independent Republic of Korea, which we promised them.

Seventh, I propose, most important of all, that all decisions governing the cease-fire, the withdrawal of present belligerent forces and substitution of a peace unification force, and the actions of the United Nations Commission, all be under the supervision of the United Nations Assembly, where no veto is required, rather than the United Nations Security Council, where of course any true effort to achieve unification or peace or security in the Orient could be blocked by the Soviet group.

I assume there are many other ways of seeking to find a peaceful solution of the Korean problem, of which we are obligated to think that this body and the other body will come up with some suggestions. Certainly we are probably going to end up by indicating that Mr. Malik’s proposal is mere propaganda. Unless we seek here for peace, unless the administration decides at last that its obligation as the Government of the United States in the executive branch requires it to do something about peace, unless the United States takes some lead in this, where will peace be found? In the United Nations?

To paraphrase Patrick Henry, gentlemen: "Is this the way of peace, or is this the way of war?" If it is no peace. Little is to be expected from the United Nations unless leadership is exerted by the United States, and that leadership is too long delayed.

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

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. I want to commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania for his leadership in bringing this subject before us and for the practical, stimulating suggestions he has made. Surely one of our gravest dangers is to continue in a sort of state of paralysis on this subject, so that what we do or what we do not do is largely according to signals cast by our enemies.

Would the gentleman care to comment on this: Does he himself believe that this Malik proposal is anything but a device to try to maneuver us into some position that will be advantageous to our enemies?

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Well hardly anything more than that, Mr. Malik would not have made the proposal unless he had felt there was some political or propaganda advantage to be gained from it. I do not believe the Russians are peacemakers. If they were, there were many previous instances when they might have made peace instead of limited war against us before this.

Mr. JUDD. Just because the gentleman believes, and I agree that this is not a sincere effort to get peace and freedom for the peoples of Korea, that conclusion does not permit us to wash our hands of the matter and allow the Communists to approach us as though they had been genuine seekers of peace, and we do not care about it, when as a matter of fact it is we and the free peoples of the world who are fighting only in defense of freedom who have most at stake by getting a genuine settlement that will end the ordeal of the people of Korea and of our own forces, and at the same time not put the Soviet Union in a position to begin her predatory activities in other areas which might be even more dangerous to us and to the world than is Korea.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Precisely, because the stupidity of our own State Department’s attempt to arrive at a foreign policy boils down to this: They have told the rest of the world and they have told our soldiers in Korea that we have no program for victory in war, that we have no plan or objective by which the war may end either with victory given a solution which may be somewhat less than total victory.

Now, if we reject the Malik proposal without coming up with a genuine suggestion as to how peace may be achieved ourselves, then we have rejected a pro-
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being a deflationary device it is inflationary. You may push people around in this country, as we are trying to do in this regulation W, and you may go to court to require every ounce of blood out of them, but they will bounce back somehow. That is what they are doing. Regulation W says to the lower income groups that they cannot buy certain household necessities, like their wealthier neighbors. So what do these people do? They go out and borrow the cash. They borrow from their savings, they cash their bonds, they borrow from their relatives. They pour new cash into the already dollar-bloated streams of finance. That is inflation in its worse form.

PEOPLE ARE CASHING THEIR WAR BONDS BY THE MILLIONS, PUMPING ADDITIONAL NEW MONEY INTO THE ALREADY DOLLAR BLOATED ECONOMIC STREAM.

Look at what happened to the cash situation in this country in the first 4 months of 1951:

In the first 4 months of 1951 the people withdrew $450,000,000 more cash from their accumulated savings deposits than in the same 4 months of 1950. They redeemed $329,000,000 more of series E Government bonds than they bought in these 4 months, while at the same time another group bought only $81,000,000 worth of E bonds, representing a net loss to the Treasury of $329,000,000.

They withdrew $90,000,000 net from the Postal savings in the first 4 months of this year.

These are not my figures or those taken from the research department of some labor or business or political organization. These are the Federal Reserve Board’s own figures. We have then the situation of the Government pushing down at one point in our economy and the money gusher breaking out at another point the economic damage far greater than if they left it alone.

As a result of regulation W, there are still those in this country who consider the things they need for decent living. Dammed-up inventories are rising at the rate of $1,000,000,000 a month. The stuff just cannot be moved through the ordinary channels of business. It is piled high in warehouses from coast to coast. The financing of these huge inventories requires new money, which adds further to the inflationary spiral. We have to regulate the relationship between buyer and seller is inherently evil and repugnant to the American’s love of liberty, the enforcement of this power is still more repugnant to them who labor under the delusion that we still have personal freedom in this country. The power to enforce regulation W has been turned over to the people. The plot to destroy installment credit was hatched there many years ago.

The Federal Reserve Board is not even a Government agency, although many people think it is. It is an independent group, subsidized by assessments against banks that support it. They have unlimited funds and they do not have to get honest permission to spend them. There is no Government audit on how these funds are spent or for what purposes.

Recently, for example, the Federal Reserve Board peddled $145,000,000 for a fake study designed to show us that regulation W is a good thing and should be continued. The study was made by the University of Michigan and it was peddled to the Board to the sponsors of regulation W. The university’s study made a good case against unlimited use of installment credit, which is exactly what the Federal Reserve Board knew it would do when they signed the contract for the study. It was a fraudulent study from beginning to end, using all sorts of phony statistics to bolster their case. But the right answer: Regulation W should be continued which is exactly what the Federal Reserve Board wanted them to say. Pursuing this study was money poured down a rat hole but, as I say, they have plenty of it.

FEDERAL RESERVE BOARD IS PUTTING OUT PHONY FIGURES ABOUT INSTALLMENT DEBT IN DESPERATE EFFORT TO GET CONGRESS TO CONTINUE REGULATION W.

Before going further with the enforcement features of regulation W I want to point out parenthetically that the Federal Reserve Board is committed to phony statistics, so that the Michigan fraud is nothing new to them. The Board itself uses fake figures and has peddled them all over the country. The Board, for instance, tells us that the amount of outstanding consumer debt totals $19,000,000,000. This is such a palpable falsehood that I wonder that anyone accepts it. Yet it is used in all of the arguments for cutting down the installment credit business. In this $19,000,000,000 figure is contained four billion of outstanding automobile debt. It is almost a third is for commercial purposes and has nothing to do with individual debt, or consumer debt, as they call it. As many as $500,000,000 of telephone bills are contained in this $19,000,000,000 figure, and this again cannot in all fairness be called consumer debt, or installment debt. Over $200,000,000 of utility bills are contained in the figure and what the connection is between a utility bill and installment credit is something I cannot understand.

In the $19,000,000,000 figure is also included $4,000,000,000 that the rich owe on their charge accounts, which are not regulated. Finally, to show you how dishonest and how ridiculous the Federal Reserve Board can get in an effort to fool the public, the 30-day credit a farmer receives at the feed store to buy his horse’s hay is included in the $19,000,000,000 of outstanding consumer debt.

FEDERAL RESERVE BOARD AGENTS ARE MENDING THE COURT OF LAW, BREAKING INTO HOMES IN SECRET SEARCH FOR VIOLATORS OF REGULATION W—JUST LIKE THE Ku KLUX KLAN.

While, as I say, regulation W violates our personal liberties and is contrary to everything we have fought for, its enforcement is down right sickening. Hundreds of Federal Reserve Board agents are roaming the country, hounding the people into confessions that they were in collusion with neighborhood merchants in violating regulation W. These Government night riders are raiding the homes of people to probe a secret search for violators of installment credit controls.

Innocent victims of these raids are shocked at the Government’s “Ku Klux Klan” tactics. They are breaking into homes and the Ku Klux Klan a white hood to spread terror. Federal Reserve Board agents use Government credentials as a moral black jack to strike terror into the hearts of their victims and to extract confessions of wrongdoing.

These legalized hoodlums violate every concept of American liberty by invading homes to determine exactly what down payments were made on the owner’s automobile, refrigerator, vacuum cleaner, television, of furniture. They can break into American homes at any time of day or night, use the day or night slips and to force terrified housewives into revealing where they got the cash for certain merchandise.

They spell American hood to guarantee liberty for oppressed Koreans, at the same time snatching liberty from our own people. How can we gain world respect when our own hypocrisy is so wantonly evident?

The Federal Reserve Board’s chief enforcer of regulation W is one Leonard Townsend, the attorney who has been after L. M. Giannini and his Trans-America Co. for almost a decade. This Townsend is plenty smart and he is one of those bureaucratic empire builders I mentioned a moment ago. He saw the Giannini case petering out some time ago. He jumped on the regulation W bandwagon. He knew he would have to have a new project to keep himself and his hundreds of snoopers on the payroll. Regulation W was his best break Townsend has had in years.

Townsend has been visiting the Federal Reserve district offices in an effort to inspire prosecutions. He made a speech in Los Angeles recently about regulation W. If one district does not have as many violations as another, Townsend gives them a nudge and tells them to get going. He wants complaints and prosecutions, because without them his job will fold up.

The Government night riders do not invade the homes of the middle classes, the upper middle classes, and the rich. They know that this group is not covered by regulation W. They know that individuals in this group can have three television sets in their homes. If they want them they will pay for in cash. It is the lower-income groups, the backbone of our Nation, who are being kicked around. They must buy their household necessities on the installment plan. They are the targets, therefore, by regulation W. It is here that the Federal night riders look for violations.

By turning over these vast and dangerous powers to the Federal Reserve Board, Congress tells the country that
the lower-income groups are to be deprived of refrigerators, furniture, and household appliances, but that the rich can have all they want. This is discrimination and this weakness alone in regulation W should be enough to have us abolish it.

Regulation W is repugnant to the American mind. To deprive the lower-income groups, is harming the small merchant who goes to bank for additional credit.

While we are here being called on to extend the Federal Reserve Board's authority over installment credit—in other words to pass a law which is inherently repulsive to the American mind and is unfair and discriminatory in effect—we are playing into the hands of big business, another feature of the regulation which its proponents forget to tell the Congress and the President of the United States.

Small merchants all over the country are hard hit by regulation W. They are being forced to carry large inventories and to obtain bank credit to hold on. In addition to the fact that this bank credit is highly inflationary, which I have already pointed out, it is expensive to the small-town merchant who depends on a quick turn-over of his goods to remain in business. But, if regulation W is continued much longer I am afraid that many of these merchants will be gobbled up by their big-time competitors.

The truth is that I see nothing good and everything bad in regulation W. It is not, as its sponsors say it is, a credit curb. It could not possibly, therefore, have any effect on inflation, except to force people to cash war bonds, which adds more fuel to the inflationary fires.

The regulation is an evil design conceived by our domestic enemies to upset democratic capitalism. Its enforcement is part of the reign of terror, strife and division of class which the conspirators envisioned many years ago when they first dreamed up this plot to destroy us. They did not want to destroy installment credit. They wanted to destroy America.

In view of this I shall move at the proper time to have regulation W ripped from the statute books. It has no place in a free America. Then I shall be anxious to see the votes of the great majority of this Congress who daily contend that they represent the common man—the little farmers, laborers, and small-business men.

The Speaker pro tempore (Mr. Haskell) under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. Lane) is recognized for 15 minutes.

The Voice of America

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, we are fighting against our own best weapon—the Voice of America. It cannot be the master of this program—a program which could turn the scales for peace, because the full cost is only a fraction of 1 percent of our expenses spending to halt Communist aggression.

When a supplemental appropriation of $897,000,000 was requested by the President on April 5, in order to expand freedom's campaign of truth to a total of $208,000,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, the request was slashed 90 percent by the Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate. The committees decided to paralyze the one weapon that would give us the initiative so that they could spite the State Department.

As a result, the men in the Kremlin are breathing easier.

They could not have done a much better job of sabotage themselves.

That is why I believe that the Voice of America should be merged into a new Department of Information, established as an agency of Cabinet level and reporting directly to the President. It should be the public-relations instrument of the Government in our dealings with other nations, patterned after the practice of all large corporations and organizations, an agency of prestige to co-operate with the State Department, the Army, Navy, Air Force, and other departments in the formulation of a consistent policy that will win congressional support.

George Washington, with an eye to the main chance, organized a propaganda bureau during the Revolutionary War. So important did he consider this effort that he picked men of the stature of Thomas Jefferson, John Adams, and Benjamin Franklin to provide it with winning ideas. They managed to get guerrilla pamphlets behind the British lines, and sold 6,000 Hessian troops on the advisability of deserting.

We need to be reminded that it was politics of prestige as forebearers of arms that won victory in World War I. We drove a wedge between the Kaiser and the German people by dropping leaflets from planes and balloons that reassured the people as to our intentions. "Germany," said General Ludendorff, "failed in the fight of intellects."

When World War II broke out, we did not try to minimize the value of psychological warfare. With encouraging realism, we set up a full-bodied agency under the name Office of War Information, and staffed it with the best minds we could get. That is why it is that the enemy's aggressive will is beyond question.

Why is it that in the present crisis that will go on for a long, long time, whether it be hot, cold, or expeditiously under wraps, that we let communism hold the initiative? Up to now we have not acted but reacted. We dance to their tune, under their urging call the play before we adopt counter-measures.

All the while we are missing our one big opportunity. By setting up an iron curtain around his vast heartland, Stalin has admitted his one great fear. It is that the truth reaching through to his own people will cause his people to drive a wedge between his men and their own hands and bring the prison wall of communism down into the dust. Why do we hesitate?

Is it that we are afraid to announce the Intelligence, and imagination against itself? Military, economic, and diplomatic measures do not round out the formula necessary for survival as long as we omit or neglect the compelling duty to contact the Russian people and convince them of the better life outside that is being withheld from them by their masters. It is our firm desire for mutual helpfulness, and of the hard fact that we are rearming only to defend ourselves from the very same tyranny that enslaves the Russian people.

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

Mr. LANE. I yield.

Mr. GATHINGS. The gentleman is making a very fine speech, and I commend him wholeheartedly, especially on that part of the speech in which he stated that we ought to go behind the iron curtain and bring our American ideals to those people who live back behind the curtain, even in Russia.

Mr. LANE. I thank the gentleman from Arkansas for his contribution.

The Voice of America needs money for material, facilities, and skilled personnel. More than that, it needs the status of an independent agency, with a voice of its own in the shaping of those policies that will win cooperation and friendship for us throughout the world.

Stalin is not scared by the sternest efforts being made by him and the United States to rearm itself and its allies. This fits in with his theory that we suffer an economic breakdown in the process. But it does give him the jitters to think of something built by his own efforts.

In the years from 1921 to 1941, there were more than 30 separate uprisings against the Soviet regime. Although they were poorly organized and soon crushed, they were symptoms of chronic discontent. Even today there are some 15,000,000 Russians in the concentration camps of their own government. It looks like Stalin fears a lot of his compatriots.

We cannot win the friendship of the Russian people, or the Chinese people, or any others unless we communicate with them, and the VOA is the one remaining lifeline by which we can reach through to them now and as far as we can see into the uncertain future.

But it does give him the jitters to think of something built by his own efforts. They can inspire and guide the anti-Communist underground because they speak for Russia and against the oppressors in the Kremlin.
The Voice of America is a light in the dark that beams news to the Russian people past every obstacle that is calculated to keep the people in ignorance. Hour after Mrs. Kasenkina jumped from a window of the Soviet consulate in New York, rather than return to the so-called Communist paradise, word-of-mouth communication to the story was spreading through Russia, thanks to the Voice of America. Expand this by a continuing stream of facts, and the day will come when the Communist tyranny will be overthrown by the Russian people themselves. We have the best product in the world to sell to the Russian people. It is the hope of help from the free world to liberate them and give them the opportunity to attain the kind of life that they want—with peace with themselves and their neighbors.

We have the potential apparatus to get this message across to them. We possess all the means and methods if we use them.

What is stopping us? The Voice of America is the victim by association of the suspicions which, rightly or wrongly, are directed against the State Department. It also suffers from its junior status because it is not consulted in the shaping of the high-level policy that it is supposed to implement.

Free the Voice of America by making it an independent agency. Give it an appropriation that will permit the use of highly competent personnel to win public support the world over, for the truths that will bring peace and dignity to man.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the Record, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted as follows to:

Mr. Grainger, to include an editorial from the Youngstown Vindicator.
Mr. Howell, to include a letter.
Mr. Gathings, in two instances, in each to include editorial.
Mr. Angel, and to include an article.
Mr. Wood of Idaho, and to include extraneous matter.
Mr. Abbenethy, and to include an editorial.
Mr. Reed of New York (at the request of Mr. Haleck), and to include extraneous matter.
Mr. Vursell, Mr. Van Zand, and to include two editorials.
Mr. Miller of Nebraska, in two instances.
Mr. Curtis of Nebraska, and to include a newspaper article, in two instances.
Mr. Fellows, and to include an editorial.
Mr. Javits, and to extend and include certain material on the New York rent-control law, notwithstanding the fact it exceeds the limit and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $184.50.
Mr. Javits, and include extraneous matter.

Other Rees of Kansas, and to include a newspaper article.

Mr. Widall, and to include a newspaper editorial.
Mr. Nicklos, and to include extraneous matter.
Mr. Da'Wart, and include a speech by General Eisenhower.
Mr. Jobb, in three instances, in each to include extraneous material.
Mr. Phibin.
Mr. Riehoff.
Mr. Muller, in four instances, in each to include extraneous matter.
Mr. Furcolo, and to include extraneous matter.
Mr. Madden, and include a letter from Elmer Bailey, an automobile dealer of Gary, Ind.
Mr. Jensen, and include extraneous material.
Mr. Tackett, in two instances, in each to include editorials.
Mr. Jones of Missouri, to revise and extend the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole and include extraneous matter.
Mr. Young, to revise and extend the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole and include extraneous matter.
Mr. Lucas, to revise and extend the remarks made in general debate on the Defense Production Act Amendments of 1951 and include certain lists.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted to Mr. Anfuso (at the request of the Speaker), to Mr. Javits, and to include extraneous matter.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker’s table and, under the rule, referred as follows:
S. 1226. An act to change the date for the beginning of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the United States, including the Territory of Alaska, from the 1st day of November, and to extend the time during which annual assessment work on such claims may be made for the year beginning July 1, 1951, to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. Stanley, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Bennett of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o’clock and 48 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, June 28, 1951, at 12 o’clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker’s table and referred as follows:

565. A letter from the Under Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a report of a proposed transfer to the city of Stamford, Conn., of one 30-foot fireboat for use in the protection of Stamford’s industrial waterfront. The adoption of which was ordered; to the Committee on Armed Services.

566. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the report on cooperation of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease, pursuant to Public Law 8, Eightieth Congress; to the Committee on Agriculture.

567. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting copies of orders of the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization suspending deportation as well as a list of 1,562 persons involved, pursuant to the act of Congress approved July 1, 1948 (Public Law 863), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

568. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled “A bill to amend or repeal certain laws relating to Government records, and for other purposes”; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

569. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed rescissions of amounts placed in reserve pursuant to section 1214 of the General Appropriation Act, 1951, in the amount of $173,228,000 (H. Doc. No. 152); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. Vinson: Committee of Conference. H. R. 3260. A bill to make certain revisions in titles I through IV of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, as amended, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 665). Ordered to be printed.
Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 287. Resolution for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 277 making appropriations for the fiscal year 1953, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 657). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. Sixth intermediate report, without amendment (Rept. No. 658). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. EEBERHARTER: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 3181. A bill to continue and severally referred as follows: to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. Sixth intermediate report, without amendment (Rept. No. 658). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. EEBERHARTER: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 3181. A bill to continue until the close of June 30, 1953, the suspension of duties and import taxes on metal scrap, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 659). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARING:
H. R. 4618. A bill to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 4620. A bill to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 4622. A bill to change penalties for the sale of narcotics; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SAYLOR:
H. R. 4623. A bill to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 4624. A bill to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 4625. A bill granting preference to certain quota immigrants who are the brothers and sisters of citizens of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLK of New York:

H. R. 4626. A bill to amend sections 1505 and 3436 of title 18 of the United States Code relating to congressional investigations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCORMACK:
H. R. 4627. A bill relating to the promotion of certain officers and former officers of the Army of the United States, or of the Air Force of the United States, or of any component thereof, retired for physical disability; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROGERS of Texas:
H. R. 4628. A bill granting the consent of Congress to a compact entered into by the States of Oklahoma, Texas, and New Mexico relating to the waters of the Canadian River; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. STAGGERS:
H. R. 4629. A bill granting the consent of Congress to a compact entered into by the States of Oklahoma, Texas, and New Mexico relating to the waters of the Canadian River; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SPENCE:

By Mr. MORANO:
H. Con. Res. 135. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that Greece, Turkey, and Spain should be invited to become parties to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. EARRETT:
H. Res. 288. Resolution favoring a protest in the United Nations against the arrest, confinement, and trial of Archbishop Josef Groes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts: Memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts, urging amendment of the Displaced Persons Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. KEARNEY:
H. R. 4620. A bill for the relief of Ayako Kimura; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:
H. R. 4631. A bill for the relief of Vincenzo Incorvia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATTON:
H. R. 4632. A bill to effect entry of a minor child adopted or to be adopted by United States citizens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SABATH:
H. R. 4633. A bill for the relief of Eugenia Marchetti Belluomini, Minea Belluomini, and Salvatore Belluomini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILSON of Texas:
H. R. 4634. A bill for the relief of Johann Komma; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

327. By Mr. HART: Petition of the State of New Jersey withdrawing the application, to the Congress of the United States, to call a convention to propose amendments to the Constitution of the United States to authorize the United States to join in a World Federal Government; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

328. By Mr. HESELTON: Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts memorialising Congress to amend the Displaced Persons Act, so-called; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

329. By Mr. SADLAK: Petition of the Bridgeport Indus trial Union Council, CIO, Bridgeport, Conn., containing some 400 signatures urging the Connecticut Members of Congress to work toward strengthening and extending the Defense Production Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.