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

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

RECESS TO MONDAY

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

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

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

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

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

SENATE

MONDAY, APRIL 30, 1951

(Legislative day of Tuesday, April 17, 1951)

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

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

Eternal God, Father of our spirits whose power is unsearchable, whose judgments are a great deep: We quiet our feverish hearts in Thy presence. We would be still and know that Thou art God. As amid the earthquake, wind and fire of this violent world we wait at the week's beginning for Thy still small voice, give us sensitive ears to listen, teachable minds to learn, humble wills to obey.

Here, today, in this Chamber of national deliberation let some revelation of Thy light fall on our darkness, some guidance from Thy wisdom save us in our bewilderment, some power from Thine infinite resource strengthen us in our need. Acknowledging our oneness with all humanity we come as patriots, believing that our America has come to the kingdom for such a time as this. Our Nation's welfare, dear to us, grateful for its best traditions, anxious for its present perilous state, prayerful for its sons who this very hour are fighting in Liberty's cause, we come crying for wisdom in our national leaders, that we may contribute worthily to mankind's abiding peace. We ask it in that name which is above every name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, April 27, 1951, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the agreement of Friday last, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is entitled to the floor.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, before the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] continues his address, I ask unanimous consent that Senators be permitted to present petitions and memorials, submit reports, introduce bills and joint resolutions, and transact other routine business, without debate, and without speeches, and without prejudicing the right of the Senator from New Mexico to the floor.

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

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, did I understand the distinguished majority leader to request unanimous consent that Senators be permitted to transact routine business before the Senator from New Mexico begins his address?

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes; I have asked that it be done, without prejudicing the right of the Senator from New Mexico to the floor.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is agreeable to me.

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

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, resolutions dealing with the necessity for reduction of nondefense spending and other vital matters affecting the administration of the Federal Government during these critical days were adopted by the board of directors of the Baltimore Association of Commerce last week.

Favorably considered on the recommendation of the association's committee on national affairs, of which Frank B. Ober is chairman, the resolutions voice the considered opinion of the representative body of the businessmen of the Baltimore area and will find support, I am sure, among businessmen from all sections of the country.

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

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

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

A resolution adopted by the board of directors of the Baltimore (Md.) Association of Commerce, favoring prompt action by the Congress on further recommendations of the Hoover Commission; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments;

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

A resolution adopted by the board of directors of the Baltimore (Md.) Association of Commerce, relating to the Wage Stabilization Board; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare; and

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

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Appropriations:

H. R. 3587. A bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 302).

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

S. 915. A bill for the relief of Betty Minoru Kawachi; with an amendment (Rept. No. 303);

S. 1113. A bill for the relief of Philip J. Hincks; with an amendment (Rept. No. 304);

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

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

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. HENDRICKSON:

S. 1412. A bill for the relief of Maija Sisko Erkkila (also known as Maija Sisko Leskinen); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG (for himself and Mr. LANGER):

S. 1413. A bill to permit the retention of oil, gas, and other mineral rights in lands condemned by the United States for waterway improvement purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. O'CONOR:

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

S. 1415. A bill to amend the War Claims Act of 1948; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON (for himself, Mr. LEHMAN, and Mr. NIXON):

S. 1416. A bill to amend the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, to provide compensation for unpaid compulsory labor and inhumane treatment of prisoners of war and for other enemy violations of the Geneva Convention respecting prisoners of war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AIKEN:

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

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1951—AMENDMENTS

Mr. GREEN (for himself and Mr. PASTORE) submitted amendments intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (H. R. 3842) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

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

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

By Mr. LODGE:

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

By Mr. WILEY:

Address on the subject Export of America's Freedoms, delivered by him and broadcast from Station WGN in Chicago on April 28, 1951.

By Mr. MARTIN:

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

By Mr. MARTIN:

Editorial entitled "Issues Are Global, MacArthur Insists," from the Washington (Pa.) Observer of April 20, 1951, with reference to General MacArthur's address to the Congress on April 19, 1951.

By Mr. MARTIN:

Editorial entitled "Alternatives in Korea," from the Oil City (Pa.) Derrick of April 11, 1951, discussing the pronouncements by General MacArthur on the Korean War.

By Mr. IVES:

Editorial entitled "Acheson and MacArthur," published in the Washington Post of April 28, 1951, dealing with the controversy regarding General MacArthur.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

Article entitled "War in Korea Profitable for United States 'Partners'," written by Larry Rue and published in the Chicago Sunday Tribune of April 22, 1951.

By Mr. THYE:

Letter addressed by Hon. Harold E. Stassen to the President suggesting reconciliation between the President and Gen. Douglas MacArthur, and an editorial from the New York Herald Tribune on the same subject.

By Mr. THYE:

An editorial under the caption "This business of farming—Washington is worried," discussing factors entering into a possible reduced agricultural production, written by Paul C. Johnson and published in the Prairie Farmer of April 21, 1951.

By Mr. BENTON:

Article by Joseph P. Lyford regarding the reaction in Italy to the MacArthur incident, published in the Hartford Times.

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

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the the body of the RECORD a letter I have received from the governing board of the Minnesota Livestock Breeders' Association. It is a very important letter in view of the order issued by the Price Stabilization Administrator, Mr. Michael DiSalle.

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

APRIL 18, 1951.

Mr. MICHAEL DISALLE,
Price Stabilization Administrator,
Office of Price Stabilization,
Washington, D. C.

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

Representatives of the livestock and meat industry do fear inflation. However, they know from experience gained in World War II that price controls do not cure the disease, but only hide its symptoms temporarily. They know that restrictions reduce the supply of meat and increase inflationary pressures. They fully realize that the principal domestic problem confronting the people of America today is that of defending the purchasing power of the dollar. They realize that if this is not done, their savings, savings bonds, and insurance contracts will not be worth much to them in the future.

The answer to this inflationary problem is increased production and a cut-back in purchasing power. The farm people believe that they can increase their production level to a point equal to, or above, that attained during World War II. This can be accomplished through improved cultural methods, increased use of commercial fertilizers, the employment of new varieties of seed, and efficient types of livestock, pasture improvement programs, and by other means. A cut-back in purchasing power can be realized if a sound monetary and fiscal policy is adopted by the Federal Government.

There are some people who evidently believe that price controls applied to the livestock and meat industry will tend to curb this vicious inflationary spiral. This is not a fact. The application of controls is definitely inflationary rather than deflationary, because it results in a cut-back in production. Even the threat of controls is resulting in decreased production at a time when we should have all-out production. The application of controls to the livestock and meat industry will also result in the development of "black markets" due, largely, to the fact that livestock cannot be controlled at its source. Whenever we depart from the functioning of the free market, through the application of price controls, the Government will have to assume the responsibility for doing those things that are normally done by price in the free market. The farm people fully believe that if prices are fixed, that move will soon be accompanied by rationing and subsidies.

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

Those enaged in the livestock business realize that those sections of the Defense Production Act of 1950 which provide for the imposition of controls will expire on June 30, 1951. Undoubtedly, hearings on this measure will be held sometime within the near future. The members of the Minnesota Livestock Breeders' Association are definitely of the opinion that the price control program that is now being developed can be, and should be, thrown out. They believe that if it were possible to apply effective controls clear across the board, including not only the prices of all commodities, but the wages and salaries of labor as well, it might be the thing to do at this particular time, but they think that we must be realistic and practical and recognize that this cannot be done. Wages have been pretty well "thawed out," as you know, through the recognition of escalator clauses, annual improvement factors, a 10 percent increase after January 15, 1950, and the exemption of Federal, State, and municipal employees.

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

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

Very truly yours,
MINNESOTA LIVESTOCK BREEDERS' ASSOCIATION,
J. S. JONES, *Secretary.*

THE RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION—STATEMENT BY HON. HERBERT HOOVER

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

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

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

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

1. I believe that the RFC should be liquidated.

2. It should be liquidated by its new Administrator.

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

Starvation for credit in this area cannot have been very great during the last 5 or 6 years. The 5-year average of the number of businesses operating is almost 4,000,000, and the new businesses started have averaged about 400,000 annually. From the number of loans under $100,000 made by the RFC—and assuming they were necessary—the relative figures indicate that probably 99 percent of small businesses managed to finance themselves otherwise.

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

4. I believe the collateral activities of the RFC should be transferred to appropriate departments where definite responsibility of a Cabinet officer or single-individual administrator can be established. For instance, the

rubber business should be transferred to the Department of Commerce; the tin smelting to the Bureau of Mines of the Department of Interior; the functions of providing emergency credit for defense activities should be transferred to the Defense Department or to the Director of Defense Mobilization, who already have such authorities.

REASONS FOR THESE RECOMMENDATIONS

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

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

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

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

(d) In my view when it enters the nonemergency area of loans in excess of $100,000, its social and economic purpose becomes submerged in support of risky business, and in bailing out creditors on a large scale. It would appear from the Fulbright hearings that the operation of the RFC for the past 4 or 5 years really shows a great loss. I see no reason why the taxpayers' money should be used to subsidize larger peacetime business.

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

(f) The wisdom of the management of the RFC in recent years is seriously challenged by that infallible test of results. These results have been exposed by the Fulbright committee. It is doubtful if wisdom can be maintained in such widespread Government action requiring the utmost good judgment. Under any new administration a large part of the decisions must be delegated. And delegation by bureaucracy cannot always find such skilled and honest men.

(g) It would appear that the test of public interest has been little applied. The public interest in several of the large loans has been questioned by the Fulbright committee. I append some lists of a few samples.

(1) Thirty-nine lesser-sized loans made for hotels, ranging from $9,000 to $1,500,000 in 23 States;

(2) Fourteen loans made to hard- and soft-drink manufacturing distributors;

(3) Eighteen loans to theaters, and bowling alleys, ranging from $17,000 to $1,200,000.

Another list could be made of loans to beauty parlors, pool rooms, and a snake farm.

What public interest there can be in operations of these types of business at the taxpayers' risk is difficult to see.

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

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

The reports and recommendations of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government on the RFC are no doubt familiar to you.

The task force recommendations

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

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

The Commission's recommendations

The Commission itself made a number of recommendations in respect to this agency.

The Commission did not agree upon liquidation, but the majority of the Commission agreed upon a condemnation of direct lending by the RFC to persons or enterprises, except in national emergencies, saying that it "Opens up dangerous possibilities of waste and favoritism * * * it invites political and private pressure or even corruption."

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

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

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

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

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

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

Selected loans to distillers, brewers, and bottlers, June 30, 1950

United Distillers of America, Inc.; United Distillers of America, Ltd.; New York, N. Y.: Unpaid loan balance	$331,500.00
James Distillery, Inc., Baltimore, Md.: Unpaid balance	315,000.00
Harvard Brewing Co., Lowell, Mass.: Undisbursed authorized balance	300,000.00
Old Rock Distilling Co., Joplin, Mo.:	
Undisbursed loan balance	29,936.48
Unpaid loan balance	210,063.52
	240,000.00
Morello Winery, Kerman, Calif.: Undisbursed loan balance	$200,000.00
Metz Brewing Co., Omaha, Nebr.: Unpaid loan balance (participating)	178,125.00
General Beverage Co., Inc., Oklahoma City, Okla.: Unpaid loan balance	145,000.00
Coast View Winery, Inc., Fresno, Calif.: Participating unpaid loan balance	117,750.00
Clinton Distilling Co., Clinton Iowa: Unpaid loan balance	114,000.00
Yakima Valley Brewing Co., Selah, Wash.: Unpaid loan balance (participating)	99,562.50
Scottish-American Distillers, Ltd., Peoria, Ill.: Unpaid participating loan balance	94,687.50
Coca-Cola Bottling Co. of Fargo, Fargo, N. Dak.: Unpaid loan balance	90,163.04
The Wooden Shoe Brewing Co., Minster, Ohio: Unpaid loan balance (participating)	65,040.00
Sheridan Brewing Co., Sheridan, Wyo.: Unpaid loan balance (participating)	60,000.00

Selected loans to theaters, bars, bowling alleys, and other recreational activities, June 30, 1950

Hal Roach Studios, Inc., California	$1,292,950.00
Gersonde Bros. Recreation, St. Joseph, Mich.: Authorized total	377,212.28
Hunt's Theatres, Inc., Wildwood, N. J.:	
Undisbursed loan balance	150,000.00
Unpaid loan balance	128,773.71
Total	278,773.71
Hollywood Stars, Inc., California	172,600.00
Coast Drive-In Theatres, California	164,669.22
Herndon Stadium, Inc., Atlanta, Ga.: Unpaid loan balance	164,038.46
Collier Enterprises, Inc., Lowell, Mich.: Authorization	147,500.00
Poulsen & Schock Theatres, Anchorage, Alaska: Undisbursed loan balance	100,000.00
Gold Front Bar, Gold Front Theatre, Gold Front Recreation, Cheboygan, Mich.: Undisbursed authorized balance	85,000.00
Varden Park Bowling Club, Jackson, Mich.: Authorized	78,000.00
Plymouth Rock Bar, Detroit, Mich.: Authorized	39,500.00
Plains Theatre, Lockney, Tex.: Authorized	27,500.00
Eloia Theatre, Calvert, Tex.: Amount authorized	25,000.00
Samuel E. Evans (rattlesnake farm), Colfax, Calif.: Authorized	25,000.00
Howes Lanes (bowling), Clarkston, Mich.: Authorized	20,212.28
Poormans Recreation, Buchanan, Mich.: Authorized	20,000.00
Bronson Theatre, Bronson, Mich.: Authorized	17,500.00
Montcalm Bowling Center, Pontiac, Mich.: Authorized	17,000.00

Selected loans to hotels and other hostelries, June 30, 1950

Sax Enterprises, Inc. (refinanced), Miami Beach, Fla., May 19, 1949	$1,500,000.00
Mapes Hotel (25 percent participation), Reno, Nev., Oct. 6, 1949	1,300,000.00

Simburg, Harry and Jennie (Hotel Sorrento), Miami Beach, Fla., Oct. 27, 1949	$1,000,000.00
Civic Hotel Corp. of Odessa, Odessa, Tex., Feb. 27, 1950	650,000.00
Jack Tar Court Hotel, Hot Springs, Ark.: Unpaid loan balance, June 30, 1950	565,000.00
Borger Hotel Corp., Borger, Tex., Jan. 30, 1950	413,429.00
The Virgin Isle Hotel, Inc., Thomas, V. I.: Undisbursed loan balance, June 30, 1950	400,000.00
Tahoe Biltmore Hotel, Inc., Crystal Bay, Mo.:	
SLP, RFC's portion	45,000.00
2 BPA loans	300,000.00
	345,000.00
The Balsams, Inc., Dixville Notch, N. H.: Unpaid loan balance, June 30, 1950	300,000.00
Community Hotel Co., Norman, Okla., approved	300,000.00
Knutson Hotel Corp., Minneapolis, Minn.:	
Undisbursed loan balance, June 30, 1950	25,000.00
Unpaid loan balance, June 30, 1950	270,000.00
	295,000.00
Grand Hotel Co., Billings, Mont.: Undisbursed loan balance (participating), June 30, 1950	270,000.00
Bluebeards Castle Hotel Corp., Thomas, V. I.: Undisbursed loan balance, June 30, 1950	250,000.00
Muscle Shoals Community Hotel Corp., Sheffield, Ala., Unpaid loan balance, June 30, 1950, rep	248,798.29
Hereford Community Hotel Corp., Hereford, Tex., July 14, 1949	210,000.00
Carlton Plaza Hotel Co., Detroit, Mich.: Undisbursed authorized loan balance June 30, 1950	200,000.00
Morningstar Hotels, Inc., Thomas, V. I.: Undisbursed loan balance, June 30, 1950	165,000.00
Shore Club Lodge, Inc., Boise, Idaho: Unpaid loan balance June 30, 1950	164,500.00
Tower Courts, Dallas, Tex.: Unpaid loan balance (participating), June 30, 1950	158,165.92
Bar Harbor Hotel, Bar Harbor, Maine, Dec. 27, 1949	150,000.00
Independence Community Hotel Co., Independence, Iowa: Unpaid loan balance, June 30, 1950	150,000.00
Kennett Hotel Co., Kennett, Mo.: Undisbursed loan balance, June 30, 1950	150,000.00
Clinton Community Hotel Corp., Clinton, Ohio: Undisbursed authorized balance (participating), June 30, 1950	125,000.00
Plymouth Hotel Corp., Fort Fairfield, Maine: Amount authorized	125,000.00
Saratoga Hotel Co., Saratoga, Wyo., undisbursed loan balance, June 30, 1950	125,000.00
Henning Hotel Co., Casper, Wyo.: Unpaid loan balance, June 30, 1950	122,914.16
Round-Up Lodge, Deming, N. Mex.: Authorized	95,000.00
Titusville Hotel Corp., Titusville, Pa.: Unpaid loan balance, June 30, 1950	90,000.00
Richard S. and Ellen H. Butler, trading as The Butlers' Canvasback Inn, Perryville, Md., Feb. 23, 1950	$74,000.00
South Parkway Hotel, Chicago, Ill.: Apr. 6, 1950	60,000.00
Island View Camp, Inc., Pottsboro, Tex	56,000.00
Woolsey C. Coombs, doing business as Casa Blanca Hotel, Apr. 3, 1950	35,000.00
Tower Trailer Park, Inc., Dallas, Tex.: Authorized	35,000.00
Charles Fink Fischer and Vera Fischer, doing business as Sandpaper Inn, Fort Walton, Fla., Jan. 26, 1950	32,000.00
Frontier Motel, Willcox, Ariz.: Amount authorized	26,000.00
Remora Lodge, Inc., Lyndon, Vt.: Amount authorized	16,000.00
Cactus Courts, Carlsbad, N. Mex.:	
Gross amount	22,893.00
RFC share	11,446.00
Mission Trailer Park, Tucson, Ariz.: Amount authorized	10,000.00
Rock Creek Camp, Whitesboro, Tex.: Authorized	9,000.00

THE RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION—STATEMENT BY HON. MARRINER S. ECCLES

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

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

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

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

INFLATION AND ITS CONTROL

Throughout the postwar period, and particularly since the Korean invasion, the country has experienced a most serious inflationary development. This was brought about by too much money and credit in the hands of the public relative to the goods and services available in the market. The RFC, instead of liquidating its outstanding credits during this period, added to inflationary pressures by extending its lending activities and those of its affiliate, FNMA. Inflation has greatly depreciated the purchasing power of the dollar, and as a result the cost of living has increased approximately 45 percent since the end of the war. This has been a most serious and unjustified development, and should not have been permitted; this inflation has worked a grave injustice upon large numbers of our people; it has injured most the aged, the pensioners, the widows, and the disabled—the most helpless members of our society. Inflation diminishes our incentives to work, to save, and to plan for the future, and in so doing undermines the very foundations of our free democratic society.

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

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

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

GOVERNMENT LENDING INCONSISTENT WITH ANTI-INFLATIONARY PROGRAM

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

We must recognize that the conditions under which the RFC came into existence were very different from those prevailing at the present time. It was established in the depths of the greatest economic depression in our history for the purpose of providing

emergency financial assistance to banks and other financial institutions. Subsequently, its authority was broadened to include loans to nonfinancial business concerns under certain conditions. Because there were many weaknesses in our economic system in the early thirties, no one seriously questioned the need for a temporary Government agency designed to assist the country in an economic emergency which was forcing all financial institutions, as a matter of self-preservation, to liquidate all outstanding credits.

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

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

NO NEED FOR DIRECT GOVERNMENT FINANCING

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

There are located throughout the United States more than 14,000 commercial banks, over 600 life-insurance companies, more than 500 mutual savings banks, and nearly 6,000 savings and loan associations. In addition, there are numerous mortgage companies, sales finance companies, industrial loan associations, and other financing institutions. Each and every one of them, operating with funds obtained from private sources and in competition with numerous other institutions, is engaged in extending credit, in accordance with self-surviving and profit motive lending and investment policies, to meet all of the legitimate needs of a private enterprise economy. The very fact that these financing institutions are competitive and derive their earnings from the loans and investments which they make is in itself an assurance that the necessary credit requirements of the economy are being, and will continue to be, met. The combined resources at the disposal of these institutions are enormous; as of December 31, 1950, the commercial banks, life-insurance companies, mutual savings banks, and savings and loan associations alone held over $290,000,000,000 of loans, investments, and other assets, and they are adding billions of dollars to these assets every year.

To continue the existence of the RFC in competition with our private financing institutions is completely indefensible if we really believe in our private-enterprise economy. This is because the RFC's only source of funds is the Federal Treasury, while the Treasury's only source of funds is the private economy through tax collections or by borrowing to meet a budgetary deficit. Using these funds to make loans that cannot be secured in a free market means in effect that the RFC is employing funds obtained from the entire public in making questionable loans for the benefit of a select few. It is obviously unfair for the Government to subsidize with credit those business concerns which cannot stand on their own feet, but, nevertheless, are competing for sales and profits with concerns that have to obtain the funds they use in the private market. In other words, privately financed business concerns are called upon to provide indirectly through the Government part of the funds used by their competitors who receive RFC loans.

As the Government does not own the business enterprises which it finances by means of direct or guaranteed loans, any profits from their operations accrue to the private owners. But if the loan eventually proves to be a loss, either in part or in whole, the Government, and ultimately the taxpayer, suffers the amount of such loss. There have been conspicuous examples of borrowers from RFC who made great profits through the use of the taxpayers' money, as well as of borrowers who incurred substantial losses at the expense of the taxpayers. If we are going to be socialistic in some of our economic activities, it had better be by going into business directly where the profits, as well as the losses, accrue to the taxpayer, instead of indirectly through providing unjustified credit where only the losses accrue to the taxpayer. I am vigorously opposed to either form of socialization.

The RFC obtains its funds without cost from the taxpayer and pays no taxes of any kind on its operations, while privately owned and operated financing institutions must raise their capital in the private market and pay in interest and dividends whatever is required. They must also pay their share of local as well as Federal taxes. Quite obviously, a company operating with an abundance of free capital on a tax-free basis during a period of inflation can make its earnings appear to be much better than a careful analysis of the facts would warrant.

Perhaps the argument most frequently heard in support of the RFC's continuance is the aid which it provides to small businesses, which presumably are unable to obtain financial assistance from any other source. However, if we examine the reports of the RFC, we find that, while the number of loans made to small business is large, the dollar volume of such loans is small relative to the total amount of loans granted or outstanding. In other words, the bulk of the funds loaned by RFC have gone to large rather than small businesses. Moreover, it is the considered opinion of experts in the field of small-business financing that what small businesses need primarily is managerial and technical assistance rather than more money. To encourage inefficient utilization of financial resources by small business is wasteful, extravagant, and in the end unproductive. The RFC does not have the specialized facilities required to provide adequate managerial and technical assistance to small business, and it should be left to private enterprise to develop them, as well as to supply whatever capital and credit are needed, especially under present conditions.

RFC LENDING SUBJECT TO POLITICAL PRESSURE

One of the most striking facts brought to light during the recent investigation of the RFC is the extent to which its lending activities have been subject to political influence. The RFC is designated to make or guarantee loans to credit-worthy borrowers who cannot secure credit on reasonable terms from customary sources. Under this arrangement heavy political pressures have been brought to bear by and on behalf of borrowers who expect to benefit from the credit. The problems of a public lending agency, as compared with a private one, are immeasurably increased by such pressures. If only sound and justifiable loans were granted, there would be great criticisms of the RFC by the would-be borrowers and their political representatives. If it does grant questionable loans in response to political requirements, then, as the recent investigation has shown, it will be bitterly criticized by the public. So long as there is a Government lending agency like the RFC there will be great and undeniable demand for unsound and unjustified credit. This will put all Members of Congress under more or less political pressure to assist applicants in receiving such credit. I should think in these circumstances Members of Congress would be the first ones to want to liquidate the RFC and be relieved of the pressures which only add to their responsibilities and can serve no useful public purpose.

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

CREDIT FOR DEFENSE PURPOSES

In letting defense contracts, priority should be given to those prime contractors or subcontractors who have the necessary skill, productive facilities, and financial resources. However, it may be found necessary, as in World War II, to facilitate defense production by giving some contracts to those who do not have adequate financial resources and cannot obtain them from private financing institutions. In such cases, some Government help may be essential, but it should be provided in the form of a Government guaranty of private credit and not by a direct Government loan. Such guaranties would be most effectively handled under a single program, such as that authorized by the Defense Production Act of 1950. This provides for guaranty of loans by eight agencies engaged in defense activities, using the Federal Reserve banks as fiscal agencies in arranging the guaranties. This is the same as the Regulation V program which was used so effectively in World War II. Under this regulation the Federal Reserve banks and their branches throughout the country gained extensive experience in authorizing guaranties on 8,800 loans, amounting to over $10,000,000,000. The net result of the V-loan operation was a net profit of $24,000,000,000 from the loan guaranty fees charged, after deducting all expenses and losses.

Under the V-loan program, a defense contractor or subcontractor engaged in defense production who is unable to obtain the necessary credit may apply for a guaranteed loan to his local bank or other private financing institution. The local Federal Reserve banks, acting as fiscal agents for those Government agencies which are loan guarantors, review and recommend action to be taken on loan

applications. Upon approval by the guaranteeing agency, the private banks advance the full amount of the loan and a fee is paid covering the guaranteed portion of the loan. The guarantee fee ranges from 10 to 40 percent of the interest rate on the loan, depending upon the percentage of the loan guaranteed. In practically every case the banks carry 10 percent or more of the loan without a guarantee. Not only is the financing decentralized, but the local banks have a real interest in the loan and can be depended upon to give it necessary supervision. The requirement of approval by the guaranteeing agency assures that credit extension is being concentrated in those industries essential to the defense effort.

The existence of the V-loan program to provide esential defense credit makes unnecessary the continued existence of the RFC for this purpose. This is particularly true at a time when heavy inflationary pressures require the diversion of working capital and credit from non-denfense to defense purposes as goods and labor are transferred, rather than try to super-impose defense credit on top of the existing volume of outstanding credit.

In conclusion, I should like to say that the evidence, both from an economic and a political standpoint, strongly supports the view that the liquidation of the RFC is long overdue.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE SENATOR VANDENBERG BY REV. EDWARD A. THOMPSON

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD the eloquent tribute paid to the late great senior Senator from Michigan, Arthur H. Vandenberg, at his funeral services by his pastor and close friend of many years, the Reverend Edward Archibald Thompson, D. D. Dr. Thompson was speaking from the pulpit given by Senator Vandenberg in honor of his mother to the church he and his family had attended for more than 50 years, the First Congregational Church in Grand Rapids.

This was a remarkable appraisal of a remarkable man, Mr. President, and I ask that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the tribute was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We have gathered today to pay tribute to one to whom tribute is due. It is not my purpose to eulogize our beloved fellow citizen. That has already been superbly done. I shall speak more specifically about his interests in the things of the spirit.

The text from which I shall speak contains the words of a motto which stood upon Senator Vandenberg's desk even before he entered into public life and has remained there ever since. "This, too, shall pass." The words are taken from an ancient Arabic or Persian saying, "This, too, shall pass away," which was used through the centuries to remind people that neither great moments of triumph nor sorrow are lasting.

"This, too, shall pass" was a comforting thought to Senator Vandenberg in time of affliction or disappointment. It gave him faith to meet buoyantly the discouraging experiences of life. Again, when he was on the mountain peak of success, victory, and power (as often he was) a glance at this motto had a sobering influence and a leveling effect. Senator Vandenberg was not a fatalist. He lived triumphantly in the unfailing belief that there are eternal values in the spiritual things of life.

In a letter written to a friend 2 months ago he said: "The spiritual values of life come surging to the fore. I have a little prayer meeting all by myself each night. What the whole world needs is more confidence and faith."

This pulpit from which I now speak was the gift of Senator Vandenberg in memory of his mother. The altar and furnishings for the new and yet incomplete chapel were also given by Senator Vandenberg in memory of his mother. This gift represents the financial portion of his second Collier award for distinguished service in the Senate of the United States. In presenting this memorial he said: "I get a great deal of prideful happiness out of this gift to Park Church. It is a source of continuing joy to me that I have been able to make my contribution to the new facilities of this grand old church, which has been so close to my life and to that of my family."

When asked to participate in the service of dedication for our new chapel, he replied on February 8: "I certainly shall be delighted to send you a message for the dedication which will underscore my deep feeling that our America must turn to its spiritual values in greater degree than ever before as we surmount the crisis which surrounds us."

We are greatly saddened in the fact that he will be unable to be with us in person for that dedication 2 weeks hence, but it is sadly fitting that we were able to use the chapel for the first time this morning in his honor.

Senator Vandenberg had a profound belief in immortality. "This, too, shall pass." This body has passed. If this were the final chapter, it would indeed be a dismal day. But death is not an end. It is but a turn in the road of life when we are free from the shackles of the physical—free to grow and to be that which we yearn to be at our best. "Be ye perfect even as your Father in heaven is perfect" is no idle command. Somehow, somewhere we shall attain unto our highest ideals and noblest aspirations.

There was a time when I wondered why the Great Creator didn't reestablish the life of a great soul like that of our good friend in a young and vigorous body, where the value of accumulated knowledge and vital experiences could be used to great advantage in the progress of mankind. I do not feel that way now. The physical shall pass away. The temporal is seen, but the eternal is unseen. The great God who will not allow any energy to be lost certainly will not allow the crown of His creation to pass into oblivion.

We have faith that this ripe and powerful life shall have a vehicle of expression far more effective and more capable of growth into perfect fellowship with God and with his fellowmen, which is clearly the purpose of life. We mourn the passing of our great leader and friend but we rejoice in the new and greater realm into which he has now entered.

Our Lord's body passed away when He was but a young man, yet He lives today in the lives of millions of men and women the world over who have found life through Him.

Senator Vandenberg was more concerned about the principles of peace and understanding for which he was fighting than he was about his own health. He knew that those principles could not die and he will continue to live increasingly as the truth of his teachings becomes more clear. Let us pay worthy tribute to him today by rededicating our lives to those principles of peace for which he sacrificed so much. May God raise up men of his high vision, broad understanding, and sturdy character to carry forward the work in which he gave his life.

We are asking the choir to sing "Onward, Christian Soldiers" at the conclusion of this service. That triumphant, courageous, marching hymn was one of the Senator's favorites and is so typical of his spirit.

We here give hearty thanks to Almighty God that we have been permitted to have in our midst as a guiding light and an inspiring spirit, this matchless statesman, this wise counselor, this mighty crusader for peace, this patriotic citizen, this loving husband and father, this unfailing friend, this prince among men, Arthur Hendrick Vandenberg.

WELCOME TO REPRESENTATIVES OF THE WORLD ASSEMBLY FOR MORAL REARMAMENT

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, on the day before my appointment to the Senate, the Members of the Michigan delegation in Congress issued a statement of welcome to the nations of the world which are sending representatives to the World Assembly for the Moral Rearmament of the Nations to be held at the Grand Hotel, Mackinac Island, June 1–12, 1951.

I am delighted to make it unanimous by adding my own warm support to this welcome.

SUPPLYING OF AGRICULTURAL WORKERS FROM MEXICO

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there is no further routine business, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

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

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

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

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield for a question.

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

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

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, without prejudicing the rights of the Senator from New Mexico, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Capehart	Ecton
Anderson	Carlson	Ellender
Bennett	Case	Ferguson
Benton	Chavez	Frear
Brewster	Clements	Fulbright
Bricker	Connally	Gillette
Bridges	Cordon	Green
Butler, Md.	Dirksen	Hayden
Butler, Nebr.	Douglas	Hendrickson
Byrd	Duff	Hennings
Cain	Dworshak	Hickenlooper

Hill	McFarland	Saltonstall
Hoey	McKellar	Schoeppel
Holland	McMahon	Smathers
Humphrey	Malone	Smith, Maine
Hunt	Martin	Smith, N. J.
Ives	Maybank	Smith, N. C.
Jenner	Millikin	Sparkman
Johnson, Colo.	Monroney	Stennis
Johnson, Tex.	Moody	Taft
Johnston, S. C.	Morse	Thye
Kefauver	Mundt	Tobey
Kem	Murray	Underwood
Kerr	Neely	Watkins
Kilgore	Nixon	Wherry
Knowland	O'Conor	Wiley
Lodge	O'Mahoney	Williams
Long	Pastore	Young
McCarran	Robertson	
McClellan	Russell	

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a member of the United States delegation to the World Health Organization, which will meet in Geneva, Switzerland.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is absent by leave of the Senate on official committee business.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] is absent by leave of the Senate on official committee business.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. A quorum is present.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield to me for 1 minute?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, reserving the right to yield or not to yield, I should like to make a short statement before I proceed. I should like to accommodate all my friends in the Senate. I should like to accommodate each and every Senator who asks me to yield. But in my opinion the bill we are now considering affects basic rights of the American people, and I think we should proceed with it, obtain as much enlightenment on it as possible, and have the Senate pass judgment on the amendments and on the bill itself. Hence, it is my purpose to try to conclude as early as possible. I will, however, yield to any Senator provided he limits himself, as my good friend the Senator from Oklahoma suggests he will, to 1 minute. I shall not yield for speeches of 3 minutes, 5 minutes, or 6 minutes. I shall yield to Senators for insertions in the RECORD with the understanding that I do not thereby lose the floor. I shall yield for any reasonable purpose. I do not think there is anything this body can discuss which is of more importance than the pending bill. Therefore, I do not intend to yield to any Senator to make a speech or to discuss other questions.

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

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes.

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

Mr. President, I made a statement to a colleague of mine that I would do everything I could to see that he obtained 10 minutes of time before the bill was taken up today. At the time I made that statement I had completely forgotten that the distinguished senior Senator from New Mexico retained the floor when the Senate recessed until today. I helped the Senator from New Mexico obtain the floor, and I wonder if he can possibly make one exception, to permit the Senator to whom I am referring to speak for 10 minutes?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I should like to comply with the request of the good Senator from Nebraska, but I remind him that the other day a Senator also requested 10 minutes to speak, and he spoke for 1 hour and 45 minutes.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator I have in mind would not do anything like that.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I will guarantee that such a thing will not happen.

Mr. President, I wish to thank my good friend, the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], who now is leaving the Chamber. On Friday, at the time when the Senate took a recess until today, the Senator from Michigan was presiding, and at that time he recognized me, so that I might have the floor and be able to continue with my presentation of the pending bill when the Senate convened today.

THE MACARTHUR OUSTER

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for 1 minute.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield for 1 minute to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. KERR. I thank the Senator from New Mexico very much.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield for that length of time, provided it is understood that I shall not lose the floor by so doing.

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

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, one of the great, historic, and most cherished documents in our language is the Declaration of Independence. In justification of their determination to create a new government to protect their liberty and freedom, its authors listed their bill of particulars and complaints against the cruel dictatorship of King George III.

One of their complaints reads as follows:

> He has affected to render the military independent of and superior to the civil power.

The authors of that declaration, Mr. President, were keenly aware that their liberties could never be secure except as the civil authority, elected by the people, had complete control over the military. Today it is just as important to preserve that principle as it was then to establish it.

Mr. President, at this point I request unanimous consent that there may appear as a part of my remarks an editorial entitled "The MacArthur Ouster," which appeared in the April 21, 1951, issue of the magazine America, the National Catholic Weekly Review.

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

THE MACARTHUR OUSTER

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

3. Our big strategic bombers, on which we now rely to deter Russia in the west, will be relatively ineffective in China. If we contemplate using them for atomic bombing, let us reflect that such bombing would have little military value, would infuriate all Asia and might invite Russian retaliation. Thus there is no hope of a short and cheap war.

4. Our long-neglected tactical Air Force is still woefully unready for a major conflict.

5. Even if Russia did not intervene in China, she would be powerfully tempted to take over an almost defenseless Europe, including Britain, acquiring thereby tremendous war-making potential.

6. If we tempt Russia into a war for which we are still unprepared offensively, we shall expose our people to destruction, since our home defense system, both military and civil, is pitifully incomplete.

7. As the President emphasized in his address to the Nation on April 11, our present policy is designed to avoid world war III. Though it may fail, it furnishes a hope lacking in the MacArthur approach.

If these considerations are put forcibly to the American people, we believe that the last Great Debate will not be prolonged as its predecessor was, and that our people, finally satisfied that we are on the only course open to us, will then settle down to the supreme task of insuring their security.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from New Mexico very much for yielding the minute to me.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I have been glad to do so. I hope the Senator from Oklahoma will remain in the Chamber for a minute or so longer, before he leaves.

Mr. KERR. I will.

GRAIN FOR INDIA

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield long enough to permit me to read into the RECORD a passage from a letter which I have received? It will not take me more than 1 minute to do so.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Very well; I yield for that purpose, provided it is understood that I shall not thereby lose the floor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered; and the Senator from Minnesota is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I have in my possession a letter which arrived at my desk recently. The letter is dated April 18, 1951, and comes from Delhi, India, from Bishop J. Waskom Pickett. I wish to read only one paragraph of the letter:

The effect of the long delay in dealing with the wheat bill is really serious. The original proposal evoked gratitude in every Indian heart, and had action been taken immediately it would have blunted all the efforts the Communists are making to create prejudice and hostility against the United States of America. But we have given the Communists opportunity to organize and to hurt us, and they have used it rather cleverly.

Mr. President, I merely say that the delay in congressional action on the bill to aid the Indian people is playing directly into the hands of the Soviet aggressive system of imperialism. I call upon those who are responsible for the progress of the bill for the aid of the people of India to get it quickly on the floor of both Houses of the Congress, so that it may be acted on very soon. I also call upon the people of the United States, in view of the delay which has occurred in the Congress, to take this matter upon themselves. A short time ago we had something called The Friendship Train to take gifts to Western Europe. I call upon the people of this country to take it into their own hands to have friendship grain—g-r-a-i-n—sent to those who are dying of starvation.

Mr. President, it would be well for Congress to stop dealing with military tactics for a moment and to legislate in the field of humanitarian relationships, the field in which the Congress is properly organized to take action.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

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

SUPPLYING OF AGRICULTURAL WORKERS FROM MEXICO

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

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

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

When in the course of human events—

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

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

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

Mr. President, that was in 1776, but we should remember that the political revolution did not begin in that year. So far as the American colonists were concerned, the political revolution began in 1750 or 1760, at least 15 years before the Declaration of Independence was drawn up. Of course, the fighting occurred afterward; but the thinking of John Adams, Samuel Adams, Franklin, Washington, and Jefferson began and continued for a long, long time before the fighting commenced and the Declaration of Independence was drawn up. Mr. President, I love the Declaration of Independence. As a result of that declaration and as a result of the fighting in the Revolutionary War—the actual military operations, which involved considerable loss of life on the part of the American colonists—they formed a new Government and established the Constitution, which today is the law of our land.

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

We, the people of the United States—

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

in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice—

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

Another purpose of the Constitution is to "insure domestic tranquillity." There are millions of Americans throughout the United States who are in need of work; yet some employers are so selfish and greedy that they prefer to employ a starving foreigner to employing an American who may have lost a son fighting for his country in Korea or elsewhere.

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

A further purpose of the Constitution is to "promote the general welfare." I ask Senators who have been kind enough to listen to my remarks, and our guests in the galleries who are listening to me now, how is the general welfare of the United States to be promoted if slave

labor, peon labor from another country, is preferred over that of our own citizens?

Another purpose of the Constitution is to "secure the blessings of liberty."

When I began my speech last Friday, I stated that peonage had been nonexistent in my State since 1868. We do not want it to return. The blessings of liberty cannot be secured on the basis of cheap wages paid to slave labor of the type contemplated by the bill.

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

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

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

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

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

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

> Successful international negotiations must begin with the representatives of each nation having uppermost in mind the interest of their own nations. Along with that there must be the determination to adjust those interests to the common good of all.

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

Mr. CHAVEZ. I thank the Senator. I think that proposition is basic. What citizens are intended to be protected by the oath which we take under the Constitution when we assume office? What citizen is the Constitution designed to protect? It is the American citizen. Last Friday it was stated on the floor of the Senate that we have spent $120,000,000 in the Republic of Mexico to keep the hoof-and-mouth disease away from our border, for the purpose of protecting our cattle industry. We do not buy beef from the Argentine, though by doing so we might provide 40-cent steaks. Why is that? We abstain from the purchase of Argentine beef in order to protect American commerce. Yet, the pending bill would permit the importation of foreign labor, to be used in preference to American labor.

I referred a few moments ago to the Indians. To me, they are Americans. They are good enough to be allowed to die in Korea while wearing the uniform of the United States; they are good enough to serve as soldiers of the Republic and to be buried in France, Belgium, and Italy, but, under the provisions of the pending bill, even though they might want to work as agricultural laborers, they would be prevented from doing so.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The telegram is from American GI Forum of Texas Independent Veterans' Organization, by Hector P. Garcia, medical doctor, chairman. I am sure my good friend from Texas knows him.

Mr. President, one member of the President's committee was Archbishop Lucey, from the heart of Texas. This is what he says:

> SAN ANTONIO, N. MEX., *April 26, 1951.*
> Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
> *Senate Office Building:*
>
> May I sincerely commend your efforts to amend the farm-labor measure now under Senate consideration so that it will contain at least some standards of decent working conditions and will not encourage a further influx across the border of large numbers of Mexican workers who are not needed. Having long studied the farm-labor situation in this area at first hand and in recent months as a member of the President's Commission on Migratory Labor in its Nationwide investigation I firmly believe that the demand for further Mexican workers is not justified. If a small number of alien workers are required immediate steps should be taken to organize our farm-labor force which in itself should be adequate for our needs. I wish you success in your noble undertaking.
>
> ARCHBISHOP LUCEY.

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

> WASHINGTON, D. C., *April 27, 1951.*
> Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
> *Senate Office Building,*
> *Washington, D. C.:*
>
> We applaud your leadership in seeking to amend the farm-labor bill now before the Senate so that it will contain at least some minimum working standards and so that Mexican workers will not be encouraged to cross the border. We call your attention to the wire we sent to the majority leader, Senator MCFARLAND.
>
> G. E. LEIGHTY,
> *Chairman, Railway Labor Executives Association.*

I read a telegram into the RECORD last Friday which came from my State, in which the writer, Mr. Roberts, stated

that his association, the Farm Bureau Federation, represented 8,000 persons. I believe that is correct. But listen to this telegram:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *April 27, 1951.*
DENNIS CHAVEZ,
United States Senate:

National Congress of American Indians heartily commend you for your staunch efforts to amend S. 984 so that it will contain guaranties of decent standards and working conditions for domestic farm workers as well as imported. We particularly appreciate your championing the cause of the American Indians in this legislation and hope that you will succeed in getting genuine consideration for them.

JOHN C. RAINER,
Executive Secretary.

Why not, Mr. President? The same Constitution protects the Indian as it does all other Americans. He has earned that protection. Our record and our history indicate our treatment of the Indian from the time he was driven from North Carolina to the South, from the time he was driven from Mississippi and Alabama to Oklahoma, from directly after the gold rush, when, with whip, rifle, and gun, he was sent to what was then supposed to be the desert of southern California, now known as Palm Springs. That was considered to be the worst possible place. It has now been found to be good, and we want to take it away from the Indians.

Approximately 400,000 Indians might be affected by the bill. In my State there is one county which contains a vast number of Navajo Indians, God's people, who are trying to get along under the most terrific handicaps. If aliens are brought into our country as a result of the enactment of the pending bill, the poor Navajo whose son may have helped to raise the flag at Iwo Jima or Okinawa will not have a chance against the imported labor. Is that fair, is it right, is it American? The poor Indians of Oklahoma, New Mexico, Arizona, Colorado, Utah, California, the Klamath Indians and other Indians of Oregon, Washington, Montana, North Dakota, and South Dakota, who are having a hard time, would not have a chance if this bill should pass.

I have here a telegram from William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, opposing Senate bill 984. There is also a telegram from Mgsr. L. G. Ligutti, director, National Catholic Rural Life Conference, Des Moines, Iowa; also a telegram reading, in part, as follows:

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

I thank the writer for the compliment. Then follows a long list of names.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all these telegrams be inserted in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

WASHINGTON, D. C., *April 27, 1951.*
Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Senate Office Building:

The A. F. of L. sincerely appreciates the excellent effort that you are making in the Senate to protect the interests of American workers.

S. 984, to provide for the recruitment and importation of Mexican workers for agricultural labor, represents a dangerous threat to our economy. It is a movement to open wide the doors for wholesale importation of Mexican workers at the expense of American farm workers who have traditionally been the most neglected group in our country.

You can depend on the solid support of our free trade-union movement in your gallant effort to defeat the enactment of this vicious legislation.

WILLIAM GREEN,
President, American Federation of Labor.

DES MOINES, IOWA, *April 27, 1951.*
Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
United States Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

National Catholic Rural Life Conference appreciates very highly your Christian efforts to amend S. 984. We must be mindful that human values come first. Taking advantage of needy poor, whether Americans or foreigners, will not sell democracy at home or abroad and will not bring lasting gains to anyone. Justice, charity, fairness always pays.

Msgr. L. G. LIGUTTI,
Director, National Catholic Rural Life Conference.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *April 27, 1951.*
Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

CIO strongly backs your vigorous and well-considered fight to amend the farm labor bill in order to provide minimum standards of decency for both domestic and imported farm workers.

NATHAN E. COWAN,
Director, CIO Legislative Department.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *April 26, 1951.*
Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

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

Ralph W. Amerson, Philadelphia, Pa.; Shirley E. Green, Agricultural Relations Secretary, Council for Social Action of the Congregational Christian Churches; Elizabeth Christman, Amalgamated Clothing Workers, CIO; Dr. Ira Dereid, Haverford, Pa.; Lee F. Johnson, Executive Vice President, National Housing Conference; Benton J. Stong, National Farmers Union; David C. Williams, Americans for Democratic Action; Gertrude Folks, Zimans National Child Labor Committee; Hoyt S. Haddock, CIO Maritime Committee; H. L. Mitchell, President, National Farm Labor Union, AFL; Paul Sifton, National Legislative Representative, United Automobile Workers, CIO; C. Emerson Smith, Virvinia; Leon B. Schachter, President, Cannery and Farm Workers Union; Richard K. Bennett, New Jersey; Theodore A. Rath, New Jersey; E. A. Mueller, Chicago, Ill.; Marjorie C. Thayer, Virginia; Marjorie Cabot Ware, Massachusetts; Elizabeth S. Magee, General Secretary, National Consumers League; Marion Dornton, Michigan Consumers League; Ambur Arthun Warburton, McLean, Va.; Veniette C. Weil, Massachusetts; Virginia Neel, Washington, D. C.; Alfred C. Bartholomew, Pennsylvania; Elizabeth B. Herring, New York, National Board, YWCA; Cameron P. Hall, New York; Albert H. Cotton, North Carolina, William J. Gibbons.

DENVER, COLO., *April 30, 1951.*
Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Compliments on your fight re Ellender Mexican labor bill. Wrong to subsidize a few large farm operations in limited area. Family farmers eventually are forced to compete with low-income laborers thus brought in.

HARVEY R. SOLBERG,
President, Rocky Mountain Farmers Union.

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

YUMA, ARIZ., *April 29, 1951.*
Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Following telegram has been sent to Senators CARL HAYDEN and ERNEST MCFARLAND: "Urge all-out fight against Senate bill 984 introduced by Senator Ellender. For sake of entire country please support Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ in his fight against indiscriminate and unlimited importation of Mexican farm labor."

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

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

PHOENIX, ARIZ., *April 27, 1951.*
Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Senator from New Mexico,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Following telegrams have been sent to Senators HAYDEN and MCFARLAND, of Arizona: "We strenuously oppose S. 984 and respectfully request your support of our stand."

ARIZONA STATE FEDERATION OF LABOR,
E. F. VICKERS, *Secretary-Treasurer.*

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

NORMAN, OKLA., *April 29, 1951.*
Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Urge passage your amendment Senate bill 984 requiring minimum wage and hiring available local labor.

CLAY L. COCHRAN.
W. N. PEACH.
D. M. OWINGS.
W. H. LECKIE.
PAUL E. NELSON.

The signers of the telegram are professors at the University of Oklahoma. As I said before, I want to do what is fair, and I respect the views of my colleagues who differ with me on the subject.

I will not read what the labor groups have said. I merely wish to invite the attention of Senators to 22 telegrams which I received from labor groups in my State, who are opposed to the bill. I ask unanimous consent that the telegrams be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

SANTA FE, N. MEX., *April 28, 1951.*
Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The New Mexico State Federation of Labor and affiliate membership is opposed to Senate bill 984, importation of Mexican national laborers. Laborers available in State if fair standard of wages paid. In past years importation of Mexican nationals for farm work has displaced laborers and at a lower wage scale. Supply of laborers in State should be exhausted before any importations take place.

W. S. ROBERTS,
Secretary, New Mexico State Federation of Labor.

ROSWELL, N. MEX., *April 28, 1951.*
Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

The working people of Chaves County are opposed to Senate bill No. 984 which would bring Mexican nationals into the Pecos Valley for cotton harvest at a lower rate of pay than prevailing scale in 1950. Mexicans were brought in and our people walked the streets looking for work. Prevailing rate here was $3 to $4 per hundred. Mexican nationals worked for $1.75 per hundred. We ask that you vote and work against this shameful situation reocurring this year.

JAMES A. PRICE,
President, New Mexico State Federation of Labor.

ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX., *April 28, 1951.*
Senator CHAVEZ,
United States Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

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

THOMAS HILL.

HOBBS, N. MEX., *April 28, 1951.*
Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
United States Senator from New Mexico,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The New Mexico State Council of Carpenters with a membership of over 2,000, wish to express our opposition to Senate bill 984 which would allow Mexican nationals to be brought in at a low scale of wages to compete with our American citizens in doing farm work. Last year our citizens who pick cotton at $2 to $3 per hundred had to stand on the sidewalks in town while Mexican nationals got the work for $1.75 per hundred. Your help in behalf of the people of our communities of New Mexico in defeating this legislation will be appreciated. Sincerely yours.

VERNON C. ROBERTS,
Secretary-Treasurer, New Mexico State Council of Carpenters.

ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX., *April 28, 1951.*
Senator CHAVEZ,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The Central Labor Union of Albuquerque representing 8,000 members urges you to vote no on Senate bill No. 984. This bill is detrimental to all working people in this State.

J. E. HANDLEY,
Secretary, Central Labor Union.

SANTA FE, N. MEX., *April 27, 1951.*
Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

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

Respectfully,

J. W. GARCIA,
President, Santa Fe Central Labor Union.

SANTA FE, N. MEX., *April 30, 1951.*
SENATOR DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

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

T. L. LOPEZ,
Financial Secretary, Carpenters Local No. 1353.

ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX., *April 27, 1951.*
Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Urgently request you help in defeating Senate bill 984. Surplus of farm labor available when wages are adequate.

J. B. MCCOY.

SANTA FE, N. MEX., *April 29, 1951.*
Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

We urge you defeat Senate bill No. 984 Mexican importation. 1,500 organized laborers represented.

LENO MARTINEZ,
Agent AFL Local 16.

SANTA FE, N. MEX., *April 28, 1951.*
DENNIS CHAVEZ,
United States Senator:

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

A. M. ESPINOZA,
Painters Local 869.

ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX., *April 28, 1951.*
Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Senate Office Building:

Painters Local 823 urge the defeat of S. 984.

F. T. KINSELLA,
Recording and Financial Secretary, Local 823.

ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX., *April 28, 1951.*
United States Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
United States Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Senate bill 984 will flood this country with unneeded workers. Our American standard of living will suffer. Electrical Workers Local 611 urges defeat of this bill.

ELMER ZEMKE.

ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX., *April 28, 1951.*
Senator CHAVEZ,
United States Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Importation of cheap foreign labor will help to further depress inadequate wage scales in hotel-restaurant crafts. Urge you vote "no" on Senate bill No. 984.

JAMES GIACHELLO,
Business Representative.

HOBBS, N. MEX., *April 28, 1951.*
Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
United States Senator for New Mexico,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Common Laborers Local No. 1044, Hobbs, N. Mex., would like to go on record as being opposed to Senate bill 984 which will allow Mexican nationals to be brought in to take the work of our citizens in the cotton-picking season.

We have a membership of some 300 members, many of whom work with their wives and children in picking cotton in the fall of the year. These Mexican people are brought here to work for low wages and destroy our working conditions. They are paid about half what our citizens can work for and we cannot compete with them. Your help in defeating this bill will certainly be appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

LEWIS F. MCDOWELL,
President, Local No. 1044, Hod Carriers and Common Laborers Union.

ROSWELL, N. MEX., *April 28, 1951.*
Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

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

FRANK MORGAN,
Business Manager, Carpenters Local Union.

CARLSBAD, N. MEX., *April 29, 1951.*
Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, Local 1245, Eddy County, N. Mex., membership approximately 600, strongly oppose Senate bill 984 relating to the Mexican nationals entering our country to do our farm work. Last fall Mexican nationals gathered our cotton for $1.75 per hundred, whereas our scale was from $3 to $4 a hundred, which brought hardships upon our laborers. You can readily see why we are strongly opposed to this bill.

D. S. SIKES,
Financial Secretary and Business Agent, Carpenters Local 1245.

CARLSBAD, N. MEX., *April 29, 1951.*
Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Construction and General Laborers Union, Local 1385, of Eddy County, N. Mex., of approximately 978 members would like to go on record to strongly oppose Senate bill 984 relating to the Mexican nationals entering our country to do farm labor. Last fall Mexican nationals were brought into New Mexico

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

RONALD E. BATEMAN,
Secretary-Treasurer, Local 1385.

CARLSBAD, N. MEX., *April 29, 1951.*
Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

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

RONALD E. BATEMAN,
Business Agent.

CARLSBAD, N. MEX., *April 28, 1951.*
Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Plasterers and cement finishers of local 835 of Eddy County, N. Mex., with approximately 84 members would like to go on record to strongly oppose Senate bill 984 relating to the Mexican nationals entering our country to do farm labor. Last fall Mexican nationals were brought into New Mexico to pick cotton and were paid $1.75 per hundred, whereas our own people's scale is from $3 to $4 per hundred. You can readily see why we are opposed to such policies.

L. L. CADELL,
Secretary, Local Union 835.

ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX., *April 29, 1951.*
SENATOR DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Washington, D. C.:

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

A. G. PUGH,
State Legislative Chairman, Brotherhood Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen.

ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX., *April 29, 1951.*
HON. SENATOR DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Washington, D. C.:

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

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

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

SANTA FE, N. MEX., *April 29, 1951.*
SENATOR DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

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

Mrs. KENNETH S. CLARK,
State Legislative Chairman.

I have another telegram, which reads:

ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX., *April 28, 1951.*
SENATOR DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Washington, D. C.:

We are opposed to original Senate bill 984 but are in favor of your amendments thereto.

L. G. BOYSE,
Commander, Department of New Mexico, Disabled American Veterans.

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

I have another telegram:

ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX., *April 29, 1951.*
United States Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Washington, D. C.:

Thank you for your gallant fight for your amendment on Senate bill 984. We are opposed to the Ellender bill as reported to the Senate.

CELINE DAVIS RAFF,
President, American Legion Auxiliary, No. 82, Benavides Grande.

I have a telegram from Albuquerque:

ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX., *April 30, 1951.*
Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

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

STUART W. ADLER.

I wish the Senator from Illinois had not left the Chamber. I would have liked to tell him how the New Mexico Health Foundation was started and who financed it. Some years ago a great woman served in the House of Representatives. She was Mrs. Ruth Hanna McCormick. She married a Representative, the one whom I succeeded in 1920. During the last years of her life she lived in my State. She was the one whose funds made the foundation possible, so that people living in the country, 150 or 200 miles from a railroad, completely isolated by nature and in every other way, might at least have a nurse in attendance in critical times, such as when a mother was in the throes of childbirth. I wish to pay my respects to the New Mexico Health Foundation and to the great lady who was responsible for organizing it. The telegram is signed by Dr. Adler, the managing director of the foundation.

I have already read a telegram from Archbishop Lucey.

I have another telegram from Albuquerque, N. Mex. It reads:

ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX., *April 30, 1951.*
Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We oppose the original Ellender bill S. 984 but we do support your amendments to this bill.

Mrs. O. I. LANGSETH, *Chairman,*
Rev. CLARENCE C. PARR, *Pastor,*
Social Action Committee, First Congregational Church.

I am not a member of the Reverend Mr. Parr's church; but he is an American and a fine citizen, who is carrying out the Christian belief in furthering the cause of humanity. That is why he sent the telegram.

I have another telegram, which reads:

CLOVIS, N. MEX., *April 29, 1951.*
Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Senate Office Building:

Let me endorse your amendments to Senate bill No. 984.

THOMAS H. RAPER,
Pastor, First Methodist Church, Clovis.

I have another telegram:

CLOVIS, N. MEX., *April 29, 1951.*
Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

I approve your amendments to Senate bill 984.

Rev. H. H. ALLEN,
Pastor, Trinity Methodist Church.

Rev. W. Carl Clement sends the following telegram:

CLOVIS, N. MEX., *April 28, 1951.*
Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

I endorse your amendments to Senate bill No. 984.

Rev. W. CARL CLEMENT.

I have another telegram, which reads:

ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX., *April 27, 1951.*
Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

New Mexico Chapter, American Association Social Workers, believes passage Senate bill 984 would stifle promotion healthy wage scales this area. Urge you protest passage.

HARRIET HALLETT,
Chairman.

Here is another telegram:

ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX., *April 27, 1951.*
Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Defeat Senate bill 984; promote New Mexico labor.

MARGARUETE I. CLOSE,
Catholic Charities.

That is the point, Mr. President. Regardless of what may be said in support of this bill, I still prefer American labor. It might be treason to say so, but I still prefer American labor to labor from elsewhere, unless American labor is not available.

I have another telegram, which reads:

ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX., *April 27, 1951.*
Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ:

Please protest Senate bill 984; Ellender bill is vital concern in this area.

VIRGIL HAWTHORNE,
Executive Secretary, Bernalillo County Tuberculosis Association.

Do Senators know of that group? In my State there are citizens, men, and

women from every State of the Union. One of our largest industries is rehabilitating people who are afflicted with tuberculosis. They have come there from Kokomo, Ind., from Maine, and from New York. They come from Sparta, New Market, and Fayetteville. They come from Batesville. They come from Baton Rouge and Shreveport, La. That is the kind of group it is. Do Senators think that they would want to have anything done which would handicap them in their efforts to regain their health, by making it easy to import unhealthy aliens?

I have some telegrams from local lodges, and I ask that they be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX., *April 29, 1951.*
Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Being much interested in Senate bill No. 984, we wish to express our sincere thanks in behalf of Alianza Hispano-Americana for having opposed the Ellender bill as reported to the Senate and are much in favor of your amendments to said bill.

ALIANZA HISPANO-AMERICAN LODGE 37,
CARPIO M. CHAVEZ, *President.*

ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX., *April 29, 1951.*
United States Senator CHAVEZ,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The Alianza Club, Inc., resolved the endorsement to Senate bill 984 of the amendments of Senator CHAVEZ to said bill. We oppose Senator ELLENDER bil' as reported and for a stand in decency and equality the membership of said club endorse the amendment of Senator CHAVEZ.

ALIANZA CLUB,
PAUL SANCHEZ,
President.

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

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

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

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

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

Another telegram reads:

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

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

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

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

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

Those farmers operate family-sized farms. The messages which I read last Friday were from other types of farmers.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, at this point, as a part of my remarks, the group of telegrams to which I have referred.

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

MOUNTAINAIR, N. MEX., *April 30, 1951.*
Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Washington, D. C.

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

C. A. NEELEY,
President, Mountainair Farm Bureau.

MOUNTAINAIR, N. MEX., *April 30, 1951.*
Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Washington, D. C.

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

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

MOUNTAINAIR, N. MEX., *April 30, 1951.*
Hon. Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Washington, D. C.

Honorable Senator CHAVEZ: Your opposition to the Ellender bill will receive full support of the people of this community.

HERMAN DINKLE,
President, Stanley Farmers Union.

MOUNTAINAIR, N. MEX., *April 30, 1951.*
Senator CHAVEZ,
Washington, D. C.

Honorable SENATOR: We are glad to know you are opposing Senate bill No. 984. We are against the provision of this bill and hope you continue to oppose it.

L. C. TIMMONS,
Legislative Director, Moriarity Farmers Union.

MOUNTAINAIR, N. MEX., *April 30, 1951.*
SENATOR DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Continue your opposition to the Ellender bill.

E. C. GREEN,
Member of Mountainair Farmers Union.

MOUNTAINAIR, N. MEX., *April 30, 1951.*
SENATOR DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Washington. D. C.

HONORABLE SENATOR: I am opposed to the provisions of the Ellender bill. Please continue your opposition to this bill.

WAYNE SMITH.

CORONA, N. MEX., *April 30, 1951.*
HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I feel the Ellender bill, No. 984, will be a detriment to our laborers in the State of New Mexico. Please continue with every effort to defeat same.

Sincerely,

B. C. BERRYMAN.

MOUNTAINAIR, N. MEX., *April 30, 1951.*
SENATOR DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: This is to advise you that we are definitely opposed to Senate bill No. 984. We hope you will continue your fight against this bill.

SAM KENDRICKS,
Legislative Director, Stanley Farmers Union.

MOUNTAINAIR, N. MEX., *April 30, 1951.*
SENATOR DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I am opposed to Senate bill No. 984 as feel we should use what labor we

have in our own country before bringing in others.

W. A. THOMAS.

ESTANCIA, N. MEX.

MOUNTAINAIR, N. MEX., *April 29, 1951.*
SENATOR DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.
DEAR SENATOR: Thank you for your stand on Senate bill 984. We are opposed to the entire Ellender bill. May we encourage you to vigorously oppose this type of legislation.

HERBERT R. PARSONS.

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

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

LOVINGTON, N. MEX., *April 27, 1951.*
Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Washington, D. C.:
Please support the Ellender bill on farm labor without amendments, otherwise the farmers in this section will be seriously crippled.

H. A. DUKE.

LOVINGTON, N. MEX., *April 27, 1951.*
Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Washington, D. C.:
Support Ellender bill, No. 984, without amendments. We need labor badly.

H. E. MATHER.

MCDONALD, N. MEX.

LOVINGTON, N. MEX., *April 27, 1951.*
Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Washington, D. C.:
Cooperate with Ellender bill without amendments. Situation will be critical concerning labor otherwise.

N. G. HOWRY.

HUMBLE CITY, N. MEX.

DEMING, N. MEX., *April 27, 1951.*
Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Washington, D. C.:
We are firmly behind Ellender farm labor bill, S 984, regarding importation of labor. Request your support without amendment or change. It is to New Mexico's benefit just as it is written. We expect your support of this bill.

LUNA COUNTY FARM AND LIVESTOCK BUREAU,
FRANK A. BREDECKO, *President.*

LOVINGTON, N. MEX., *April 27, 1951.*
Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Washington, D. C.:
I think you should support the Ellender bill without amendments.

BRADY LOWE.

LUBBOCK, TEX.

LOVINGTON, N. MEX., *April 27, 1951.*
Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Washington, D. C.:
Do not add amendments to Ellender bill. Help pass it as is.

ERNEST MAHON.

LOVINGTON, N. MEX., *April 27, 1951.*
Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Washington, D. C.:
I personally think you should not attach amendments to Ellender bill. Leave as is. We find that we get good service through Mexican nationals.

J. R. HALE.

LOVINGTON, N. MEX., *April 27, 1951.*
Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Washington, D. C.:
I need extra seasonable help on my farm. Have used Mexican nationals satisfactorily. Support Ellender bill as now written without amendments.

L. G. CAUDILL.

LOVINGTON, N. MEX., *April 27, 1951.*
Hon. Senator DENNIS CHAVIZ,
Washington, D. C.:
I have had 3 years' experience in using Mexican nationals. I find it practical and would like to continue as in the past. Please support Ellender bill without amendments.

COMER HUDGENS,
President, Lea County Farm and Labor Bureau.

LOVINGTON, N. MEX., *April 27, 1951.*
Hon. Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Washington, D. C.:
I firmly believe that this section of the country should be permitted to contract Mexican nationals as now provided by law. The Ellender bill without amendments is suitable.

SUN ACRE FARMS, INC.,
ROLF A. MOE, *President.*

LOVINGTON, N. MEX., *April 27, 1951.*
Hon. Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Washington, D. C.:
I am well pleased with the contract for Mexican nationals as it is. But the Ellender bill, without amendments, is acceptable.

R. E. WILLINGHAM.

MCDONALD, N. MEX.

LOVINGTON, N. MEX., *April 27, 1951.*
Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Washington, D. C.:
We need Ellender bill without any amendments. Mexican labor is nearest available extra help we can get; less expensive transportation.

R. L. SEBRING.

LOVINGTON, N. MEX., *April 27, 1951.*
Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Washington, D. C.:
Labor condition critical here. Do not amend Ellender bill. Mexican labor more practical.

L. C. GREEN.

LOVINGTON, N. MEX., *April 27, 1951.*
Senator CHAVEZ,
Washington, D. C.:
We would like to have Ellender bill 984 without amendments. National labor made satisfactory and closer.

H. L. WADE.

LAS CRUCES, N. MEX., *April 26, 1951.*
Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Washington, D. C.:
Farmers and ranchers in New Mexico vitally interested in passage, without amendments, of Ellender and Poage labor bills for providing Mexican nationals for farm labor. Am advised you have introduced amendments which will emasculate the provisions of this legislation. Urgently request you reconsider these amendments and push passage of bills as now written. These bills represent many months of work by producers who foot the bill, cast the votes, and carry the load of getting production and therefore are entitled to your cooperation. Our entire organization of 6,000 members strongly behind this legislation which is of vital interest in view of huge cotton acreage planted as requested by our defense officials.

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

PORTALES, N. MEX., *April 26, 1951.*
Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Farmers of New Mexico want the Ellender labor bill without your amendments. Urge your support of Ellender labor bill.

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

ARTESIA, N. MEX., *April 26, 1951.*
Hon. Senator CHAVEZ,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
In interest of farmers of New Mexico we desire Senate bill 984 passed without any amendments attached. We do not have adequate labor to harvest our crops. With personal regards. Would appreciate your reply.

J. W. BERRY.

ALAMOGORDO, N. MEX., *April 26, 1951.*
Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Washington, D. C.:
The farmers in this area are requesting that you support the Ellender bill without your 10 amendments. The farmers are really agitated in this district.

VERNER CLAYTON.

CARLSBAD, N. MEX., *April 26, 1951.*
Senator CHAVEZ,
United States Senate Building,
Washington, D. C.
DEAR SENATOR: Sincerely request your support of original Ellender bill without any amendments. It's practical to use Mexican nationals to harvest our crops the season of 1951. Believing that you will rely on information of your constituents as to labor bills, thanking you for your support, your friend,

BOB JAMES.

MALAGA, N. MEX.

ROSWELL, N. MEX., *April 26, 1951.*
United States Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:
Strongly urge you to support the Ellender bill regarding the use of Mexican nationals for farm labor upon contract basis. There is an inadequate supply of local labor this area. The use of national in the past has saved millions of dollars in crops in this area. Migratory and transit labor has never within the past decade been adequate in this area due to extensive development. This same condition exists in Lea County due to extensive irrigation development there within last 4 years.

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

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

CARLSBAD, N. MEX., *April 26, 1951.*
Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Washington, D. C.:
Otis Farm and Livestock Bureau requests your support of the original Ellender bill. Farmers of this association will be seriously

hampered in production goal if it is not passed as is.

ORAL NICHOLS,
President, Otis Farm Bureau.

CARLSBAD, N. MEX., *April 26, 1951.*
Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Washington, D. C.:

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

J. C. OGDEN.

CARLSBAD, N. MEX., *April 26, 1951.*
Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
United States Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We deem it best for us that the Ellender bill, Senate bill No. 984, be passed without amendment and will appreciate your support and withdrawal of the amendments that hamper the importation of Mexican labor. This labor is necessary for us and is one of the best good-will promotions that we have in educating the Mexican labor to better use of our equipment and our method of farming. I have 20 under contract and have found them all to be excellent labor.

R. T. SPENSE.

CARLSBAD, N. MEX., *April 26, 1951.*
Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

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

C. F. BEEMAN.

ALAMOGORDO, N. MEX., *April 26, 1951.*
Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Washington, D. C.:

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

W. ADD PAINTER,
President, Otero County Farm Bureau.

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Carlsbad, N. Mex., April 25, 1951.
Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Senate Office Building.
Hon. CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
Hon. ANTONIO M. FERNANDEZ,
House Office Building.
Hon. JOHN J. DEMPSEY,
Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: The directors of Carlsbad Chamber of Commerce and numerous farmer-businessmen of the area definitely protest the President's Migratory Labor Commission's recommendation against the importation of labor from Mexico at the important cotton-picking season in the area of southeastern New Mexico and especially Carlsbad. So far as known, the Commission did not meet in New Mexico and did not have opportunity to learn of agricultural conditions on the ground.

Officials of the employment service tell us that there will be insufficient labor even for cotton chopping, to say naught of labor for later cotton picking; hence, we are definitely concerned that should labor from Mexico be stopped that we would be without sufficient physical help to gather the cotton crop when ready for picking.

While Mexican labor brought into the Carlsbad area would be engaged for the several months required for picking cotton, yet there is the decided advantage of moving the labor groups from one area to the other to assist with the needs therefor.

The Mexican labor is brought into this country on contract with the Mexican Government; the labor is screened against undesirable physical and other conditions; the immigration officials exercise jurisdiction over the imported workers and, too, the Mexicans receive the same wage for cotton picking and other farm work as do other persons.

Carlsbad will need imported labor from Mexico and we definitely disagree with the President's Migratory Labor Commission, and trust that the Commission's report will be unacceptable and be disapproved.

Very truly yours,
CARLSBAD CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
By VICTOR L. MINTER, *Secretary.*

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

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

NEW MEXICO COTTON
GINNERS ASSOCIATION,
Loving, N. Mex., April 14, 1951.
Senator DENNIS A. CHAVEZ,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

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

We believe that it is nearly a question of life and death as far as gathering our cotton crop next fall is concerned, to get Braceros another year. We feel sure you will agree with us in this and hope you will do all that you possibly can to push the passage of the bill now before Congress authorizing the importation of Mexican farm laborers.

Thanking you kindly for this and past considerations, I am,

Yours very truly,
WINSTON LOVELACE,
President.

NEW MEXICO COTTON
GINNERS ASSOCIATION,
Loving, N. Mex., April 13, 1951.
Mr. W. J. HOOTEN,
Editor, El Paso Times,
El Paso, Tex.

DEAR MR. HOOTEN: In your issue of April 10 you carried report of an interview with the Most Reverend Robert E. Lucey, archbishop of San Antonio, who is a member of the Migratory Labor Commission. This report was headed "Braceros not needed, prelate says."

As is so often the case when such a Commission makes an investigation, the extremes are played up and apparently the report of this Commission was based on the low extremes rather than on the preponderant average of conditions and is, therefore, of very little value. Actually, there is a great need in New Mexico and elsewhere for more farm labor and especially at harvest time in the cotton fields. Many people say we would still be picking cotton from last year's crop if we had depended on local and migrant United States labor. To make matters worse for the farmer and also for the migrant laborers, a law was passed prohibiting children under 16 years of age to work in the fields during school sessions. This is a good law, but it does deny most migrant families the chance to make money during comparatively short harvesting seasons as they have been accustomed to do. The same conditions kept a lot of local labor out of the fields the past harvest season.

As a consequence, had it not been for the Braceros, the western cotton farmer would have been in a sad shape. Braceros picked about 50 percent of the cotton crop in the Lovington area this past season at wages ranging from $1.25 to $2.25 per hundredweight for snapping and earned $8 to $10 per day. In the Pecos Valley Braceros picked about 60 percent of the crop at wages of $2 to $3 for picking and also for snapping cotton for about the same daily wage and in the Mesilla Valley rates were from $1.75 to $2.50 per hundredweight. Wages in Arizona and California were higher still.

Can anyone say these farm wages are not fair and do not give a living wage? We do not think so, especially in view of the class of labor used. Some local labor is not willing to work for a fair wage. We had a report of one group of pickers leaving a field during the past winter. They were making an average hourly wage of 80 cents, but quit because they didn't like the picking. If that isn't a fair wage, we don't see how the cotton farmer can pay one.

Cotton is not perishable in the sense that fruits and vegetables are, but it will certainly deteriorate if not gathered within a reasonable time after it has opened; otherwise there will be a loss of staple length and a lowering of the grade. There is an economic loss to the whole country when this occurs.

The farmer as a class is being very much maligned from all sides and very unjustly. He is being blamed for the high cost of food and clothing, while the truth of the matter is that the farmer receives only a small part of the retail price, not exceeding 15 percent, for the raw product he markets.

Labor pulled out of the stabilization set-up because they were to be limited to a wage increase of 10 percent. The cotton farmer made a direct contribution of $100 to $150 on every bale of cotton that was produced this year in furtherance of the defense effort. Foreign cotton sold that much higher than our cotton because of actions of our Government. There was a lot of grumbling, to be sure, but the farmer kept right on working and this year is heeding the pleas of the same Government for a big increase in production of cotton that can only result in lower prices for his produce. At the same time they are asking the farmer to produce more, the Government, through lack of planning to get the farmer machinery, fertilizer, insecticides, etc., and hamstringing him on labor by such reports as issued by the Migratory Labor Commission, is certainly not helping much to produce the cotton which is urgently needed. However, the farmer is meeting all these obstacles as he comes to them and is not shirking his duty in production.

The cotton farmer should know what he will need to produce a big crop. He says more labor is one of the things that will be needed. We do not think a commission can travel through the country and hold a few meetings at scattered spots and be qualified to come up with the answers. It seems to us the time is here for everyone to work together to get a job done and to quit sniping at each other. We think the whole cotton industry, from the farmer through the gins,

cottonseed-oil mills, and spinning mills, is more than willing to do this, but they will need the help of more labor, more machinery, more fertilizer, and more insecticides and support of the entire public.

Yours very truly,

NEW MEXICO COTTON GINNERS' ASSOCIATION,
WINSTON LOVELACE, *President*.

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

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

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

The editorial concluded:

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

What is wrong with that? Let me say to my good friend from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] that I inquired from Mr. Goodwin, of the Employment Service, as to the situation in this field. The Employment Service has not even scratched the surface. We appropriated millions of dollars for that particular service. It has not scratched the surface of the resources of American labor. But still they are willing to employ labor from outside, and are anxious to come before the subcommittee which I happen to head, a subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, for money to investigate foreign labor. It is about time that they investigated domestic labor.

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

Mr. CHAVEZ. Certainly.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not desire to interfere with the continuity of thought of the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, but after the colloquy I had with him on Friday I checked very carefully into the question of wetbacks as well as those who have entered the country legally, but have not departed from Mexico. Therefore it seems to me that they are in this country illegally.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. They are exploited, too. On Friday the Senator said that it was his judgment that there are 500,000 wetbacks illegally within the country. Is that correct?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I admit that is a very conservative statement.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator means for a liberal Democrat, a New Deal Democrat.

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

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

Mr. CHAVEZ. I could not give the exact figures.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator have some idea?

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

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

Mr. CHAVEZ. There is no question about that.

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

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

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

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Will the Senator from New Mexico permit me to make a statement?

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

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. I desire to state to my distinguished friend from Nebraska that during the hearings we held in Mexico City a statement was made by officials of the Immigration Service, as I recall, that there were an estimated 1,000,000 Mexicans who entered this country illegally in 1950 and——

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator will find on page 2 of the bill the following language:

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

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

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

Mr. WHERRY. I understood the Senator from Louisiana to make the statement that it did.

Mr. ELLENDER. It provides that Mexican labor can be employed in this country provided it comes here legally.

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

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

Mr. CHAVEZ. But they come here anyway.

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

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

Mr. ELLENDER. As I have previously stated, those who attempt to enter the United States illegally are apprehended

as they try to come across the border. Some five hundred thousand who attempted to cross the border were caught and sent back to Mexico last year. Not a day passes that the immigration authorities do not catch many Mexicans attempting to cross illegally.

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

Mr. WHERRY. That is the point. I understand the situation with respect to legal entry of Mexican labor, but I can find no clarification in the bill with respect to Mexican labor which is illegally within the country. It is admitted that more and more of them are coming into the United States; that wetbacks will continue to make the crossing because the enforcement of the immigration laws has completely broken down.

Mr. ELLENDER. No; it has not.

Mr. WHERRY. I did not mean completely, but it has broken down to such a point that there are 500,000 Mexicans illegally in this country.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is the estimate of the number who were not apprehended last year.

Mr. WHERRY. That is a great number of persons. It is however, only an estimate.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes. And such persons are being apprehended every day.

Mr. WHERRY. But probably more are coming in than are being deported.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is possible. But such entry is against the law. It is illegal for persons to enter the United States without complying with the provisions of the law as the wetbacks are doing.

Mr. WHERRY. Of what benefit will it be to prescribe legal requirements with respect to Mexican laborers, and to deport a few who have entered illegally, if wetbacks will continue to come into the United States by the thousands, with respect to whom no provision is being made?

Mr. CHAVEZ. It was my purpose to take care of the problem the Senator from Nebraska has in mind by an amendment I have offered to the bill. It was submitted and has been printed over the week end.

Mr. WHERRY. Is the amendment printed and lying on the desk now?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. How is it designated?

Mr. CHAVEZ. It is designated "4-27-51—A." It reads as follows:

SEC. —. Any person, including the owner, operator, pilot, master, commanding officer, agent, or consignee of any means of transportation, who—

(1) brings into or lands in the United States, by any means of transportation or otherwise, or attempts, by himself or through another, to bring into or land in the United States, by any means of transportation or otherwise; or

(2) conceals or harbors, or attempts to conceal or harbor in any place, including any building, or any means of transportation, any alien, including an alien crewman, not duly admitted by an immigration officer or not lawfully entitled to enter or to reside within the United States under the terms of this act or any other law relating to the immigration or expulsion of aliens,

shall be guilty of a felony—

That may be a little too severe, but it is necessary to reach them.

Mr. WHERRY. That is a pretty stiff penalty.

Mr. CHAVEZ. We must stop the hiring of wetbacks. I continue to read the amendment—

and upon conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine not exceeding $2,000 and by imprisonment for a term not exceeding 5 years for each alien in respect to whom any violation of this section occurs.

Of course, it must be done knowingly.

Mr. ELLENDER. May I ask the Senator from New Mexico if it is not a fact that the amendment he has just read is almost a verbatim copy of the Senate bill I introduced on April 26, numbered S. 1391?

Mr. CHAVEZ. No. I think the Senator from Louisiana had in mind to do exactly what I have in mind to do with my amendment, but I do not believe the Senator's bill does that.

Mr. ELLENDER. I heard it read. I did not check it, but it sounds as if it were the same as the bill I introduced.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, if the Senator from New Mexico will yield, let me say that I did not know that amendment had been submitted, but it seems to me we cannot separate the question of imposing penalties upon those who employ this type of labor and exploit them from the question as to the agreement by means of which more Mexican laborers will be brought into the United States. I do not see why in the agreement that is proposed to be made there is no provision for the imposition of some sort of penalty on the employer who not only hires the labor, but who may also exploit the labor which is in the United States illegally. It seems to me that the purpose of the bill is to deal with the entire subject.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, if the Senator from New Mexico will yield, let me say that I am in entire agreement with the Senator from Nebraska. The reason why the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry did not go into that matter was that in doing so the committee would invade the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary. The Senator has just said that in order to make sure that the proper penalty is imposed, we should make such action a felony.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I am not sure what the penalty should be; but it seems to me that if in connection with the proposed legislation we deal only with laborers who are legally in this country, we do not strike at the root of the problem. It seems to me that we must also take action in regard to those who are here illegally.

Of course I wish it understood that I am in favor of the imported labor if it is needed.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, let me inquire at this point whether I correctly understand the Senator from Nebraska to say that he prefers the imported labor to American labor.

Mr. WHERRY. No; I favor the American agricultural labor if it is available in the United States; but if the need for Mexican labor can be established, I am in favor of importing it. However, I say that in this measure there is nothing which would correct the problem which is at the root of the entire difficulty. It seems to me that unless we take action to prevent the continued exploitation of the so-called wetbacks and others who are illegally in the United States, we are not striking at the real problem which we are trying to solve by means of this measure. Does the Senator agree with me as to that?

Mr. ELLENDER. There is no doubt about that, so far as the wetbacks are concerned.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, let me state what will happen. If probably millions of such laborers enter this country illegally, the result will be to saturate the labor market or to overload it worse than ever; and in that case the problem the committee is trying to solve will not be solved.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, let me say that unless this bill is enacted into law, it will be impossible for farmers in Arkansas or in Nebraska, let us say, to contract for any of this labor legally.

Mr. WHERRY. That is because the present agreement terminates in June; does it not?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; it terminates on June 30.

In other words, unless this measure is enacted into law, after June 30 there will be no possibility for the farmers in Mississippi, as an example, to obtain labor that is so badly needed for the harvesting of their cotton crop, for it will be impossible for those farmers to make contracts with Mexican laborers.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, this bill can be passed in 10 minutes. I want it to be passed, but I want it to be passed with dignity. I want it to be passed in such a form that, first, we shall insure that American labor will be protected. If American labor is not available for the agricultural purposes the authors of the bill have in mind, then I shall be perfectly willing to have foreign labor imported. However, if the bill is passed, we wish to be certain that it will solve the problem, at least in part, rather than make it worse. After all, there will be so many Mexican laborers legally in the United States and so many Mexican laborers illegally in the United States; they go together. In acting on this measure, we have to deal both with those who are legally in the United States and those who are illegally in the United States, as migrating Mexican agricultural workers.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, if the distinguished Senator from New Mexico will yield further, let me say that I know he does not wish to be unfair. I did not interrupt him when he read many of the telegrams which he has received from those who oppose this bill.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Of course, I have had the floor.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; but I did not interrupt the Senator in order to correct him every time he read a letter which

incorrectly interpreted provisions of the bill.

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

No workers recruited under this title shall be available for employment in any area unless the Director of State Employment Security—

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

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

Mr. ELLENDER. The section continues—

for such area has determined and certified that (1) sufficient domestic workers who are able, willing, and qualified are not available at the time and place needed to perform the work for which such workers are to be employed, and (2) the employment of such workers will not adversely affect the wages and working conditions of domestic agricultural workers similarly employed.

Surely, Mr. President, if the administrator of this measure does his duty American farm workers will be protected.

Mr. WHERRY. If this bill should be enacted would any penalty be imposed upon an employer in case such Mexican laborers who enter this country fail to return to Mexico when their contract of employment is terminated?

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

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

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

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

Mr. ELLENDER. Oh, yes; it is.

Mr. WHERRY. I mean to say that it is not done as to many of them.

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

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

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

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

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

Does the Senator agree with me that if we are to enter into a new treaty or agreement with Mexico in connection with this question, not only should some provision be made with regard to the return to Mexico of those who are legally in the United States, but also some provision should be made in the way of protection against the exploitation of those who are illegally in our country?

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

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

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

My distinguished friend from Nebraska has referred to the question of penalties. Mr. President, if the employer were in a position to hold a Mexican laborer it would be an easy matter for the employer to control him. However, there is nothing to stop a Mexican from leaving his employment a day or so after he begins it. He cannot be held in bondage by his employer.

Mr. WHERRY. Of course, that is true.

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

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, so that I may propound another question?

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

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. On page 5 of the bill, beginning in line 1, after the word "but," the following words appear: "notwithstanding any other provision of law or regulation, no penalty bond shall be required which imposes liability upon any person for the failure of any such worker to depart from the United States upon termination of employment."

I remember that it was the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], I believe, who introduced proposed legislation, which I supported, which I think probably was in line with the provision of the bill I have just read.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. At that time I was not acquainted with the fact that there were 500,000 wetbacks in this country. From statements which have been made on the floor of the Senate today, perhaps we had as well used the figure of 1,000,000, because the Senator did not know the number of them.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. There are also Mexican laborers who are in the country illegally, who were brought in originally under contract, perhaps. I realize it is impossible physically to hold someone who comes in under contract to work, if he does not want to stay. But somewhere there ought to be authority on the part of the Immigration Service to check on those who are in the United States illegally, including persons who were brought in legally, who have not returned to Mexico, and who are therefore in the country illegally. There ought to be some restraint put upon those persons. There ought to be some restriction placed on the wetbacks who are in the United States, and who now number hundreds of thousands. That is the point about which I am asking.

Mr. ELLENDER. It is merely a matter of enforcing our present laws.

Mr. WHERRY. The legislation is already on the books, is it?

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

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

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; it is being enforced.

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. ELLENDER. The evidence produced at the conference held in Mexico City showed there were approximately

30,000 Mexicans in this country at that time who had entered legally, but whose contracts had expired.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator know how many of those contract laborers returned to Mexico? Is there not some way by which the number can be checked? It seems to be very simple.

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

Mr. WHERRY. That is, illegally?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

> The employer shall, after the expiration of the contract, return the worker to the point of contracting in Mexico, as promptly as possible, except as otherwise provided in article 30 of the International Executive Agreement, but in no event later than 15 days. While waiting for return transportation, the worker shall be furnished subsistence at the expense of the employer.

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

Mr. WHERRY. But do the employers return them?

Mr. ELLENDER. Certainly.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. CHAVEZ. Probably that is why they leave.

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

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I may say to my good friend from Nebraska that in the last Congress an omnibus bill was introduced and referred to the Judiciary Committee that touched on this problem in part, but the bill was not acted upon. The same bill was reintroduced this year. I thought the bill would receive the same treatment that it received in the last session, and for that reason I introduced a separate bill which deals merely with this subject. I hope that bill will be considered by the Judiciary Committee at an early date, and that it will be enacted into law.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, we are now considering legislation which is supposed to be needed. The chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry tells us that other legislation is needed to take care of wetbacks. That is agreed. So what is the objection to taking care of them in this bill?

Mr. WHERRY. That is what I am asking.

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

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

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

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

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

It is quite a problem throughout the Southwest, as to how to deal with the situation. But we must face it. Senators heard read a telegram from the head of a veterans' organization in Corpus Christi, Tex., a man representing about 50,000 Texas boys of Mexican origin, who complain that they cannot compete with this class of labor. They are unable to feed their families. I ask Senators, do they deserve protection? This situation exists in my State, in the case of people whose ancestors have lived there for generations, perhaps for 400 years, people who now have sons fighting in the United States Army, not the Mexican Army, but the United States Army, the Marine Corps, and the Navy. Because they have to compete with this kind of competition, they have to leave home and family to try to get a piece of work in Nebraska or, possibly, in Wyoming. So the situation is serious. It will not only affect the American way of life unless something is done about it, but it will affect American labor, American standards of living, and American health. How can we look after 500,000 wetbacks, so far as the health laws are concerned? If they can beat the immigration laws, it is easy to beat the health laws. That is very dangerous. It is a problem of the Southwest. I want Senators seriously to consider that fact, and to realize that it is a matter which affects everyone.

I stated a little while ago that we had spent $120,000,000 to combat the foot-and-mouth disease, but we let into the country possibly a million wetbacks, the result of which is worse than the disease which I mentioned.

Mr. President, in its April 9 issue, Time magazine dealt with the problem, and Newsweek, in its April 16 issue, contained an article about the Woeful Wetbacks. The Washington Post carried an editorial on April 9, deploring, "the influx of aliens willing to work for wages that are indecently low according to American standards."

What do we hope for? What do we dream? With world conditions as they are, we tell the rest of the world to help save democracy. We sermonize to the entire world, yet we are willing to undermine democracy by importing labor without proper protection for American labor.

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

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. I am sympathetic with the Senator's views in connection with this matter, as I think he knows. I should like to have the Senator's view, because he comes from a State where the problem exists.

Mr. CHAVEZ. This is not easy for me. The position I take is probably not even good politics, but it is American, and that is enough.

Mr. CORDON. My question goes to this proposition: The proposed legislation, as reported by the committee, provides for orderly entrance into this country of Mexican nationals for specified periods of time, and under as much control, perhaps, as we can apply, but with the added value to the laborers of their being here legally, and, therefore, being in position to bargain with their employers for a higher rate of wages than they could obtain as fly-by-nights or wetbacks. In the Senator's view, would the enactment of the bill, as reported, in itself have a tendency to lessen the influx of Mexican laborers who come in illegally, and who, because of that fact, are discriminated against in the wage field?

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

I do not like to have a bill passed which would show preference to any foreigners——

Mr. CORDON. Nor do I.

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

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

Mr. CHAVEZ. Certainly.

Mr. CORDON. It seems to me there must be a rule of reason somewhere that would permit of an administrative officer making a finding based upon the best evidence obtainable. If we have done that, then until such time as we emerge entirely from this period of emergency and can develop a coordinated program of aid to domestic agricultural labor, so that we may provide it with information as to seasonal opportunities here, there, and yonder over the Nation——

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is the point.

Mr. CORDON. Until we have done that, it is utterly impossible for us ever to approximate the complete utilization of our domestic labor.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct. The Senator from Oregon is a member of the Committee on Appropriations. I happen to handle the appropriation bill for Federal Security and the Department of Labor. We appropriate millions of dollars every year for the Employment Bureau in that particular region of Federal activity. A short time ago Mr. Goodwin, in the hearings, justified the item concerning farm labor. Of course, I was interested in the labor proposition, including farm labor, because I knew that this bill was coming up. I read from the testimony of Mr. Goodwin:

> Senator CHAVEZ. Yes. Now to some extent your work is concerned with farm laborers; is it not?
>
> Mr. GOODWIN. That is a very important part of our job.
>
> Senator CHAVEZ. Of course it is important, but what are you doing—what is the agency doing in order to get American labor to those spots? I am talking about American labor now.
>
> Mr. GOODWIN. In the farm program we are putting all of the emphasis we can on the utilization of domestic labor. We are trying to get it transferred from one place to another; that is, where it is available in one place, and needed some place else.
>
> Senator CHAVEZ. What are you doing about the Indians? They can get killed on Okinawa or raise a flag on Iwo Jima, but what are you doing to get them a job on a farm?
>
> Mr. GOODWIN. The Indians?
>
> Senator CHAVEZ. Yes.
>
> Mr. GOODWIN. We have worked out programs with the Indian Service for the use of the Indians.

Here is the agency of the Federal Government which has to do with taking care of unemployment, but it has not investigated that source of supply. It is a large source of supply. There has not been sufficient study. As a matter of fact, there has been complete neglect in connection with investigating the availability of American labor even for farmers.

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

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. The Senator recalls, I am sure, the appropriation made last year and the year before for the Bureau of Indian Affairs, for the purpose of aiding in the placement of Indian labor, particularly agricultural labor.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct.

Mr. CORDON. At that time, as I recall, the committee had assurance, after close liaison between the service of the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Departmen of Labor's employment service, which appeared to me to offer promise, at least, of active effort on the part of both bureaus in that particular field.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The only difficulty that I have with the idea is that I do not like to have Indians treated as separate subjects.

Mr. CORDON. Neither do I.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I like to see an employment bureau treat an Indian as just another American. If it is necessary for him to work, he should have the opportunity to do so. Our country has become great through hard labor on the part of its citizens. I know the history of the State of North Dakota. I know that in the early days the pioneers who went there had to work very hard. That is all the Indian wants to do. Instead of isolating him, putting him under the control of the Indian Bureau, and letting him be treated as the Indian Bureau desires to treat him, namely, as a ward, he should be treated as a human being, and as any other American is treated. If he cannot earn more than $3 a day, that is too bad; but at least he should be given an opportunity, in the same way that other Americans are given an opportunity. The Indian does not want anyone to feel sorry for him. I do not like charity for an Indian. I want the Indian to be entitled to his rights, pure and simple, and nothing else. If we leave him entirely to the Indian Bureau, the poor Indian will have to turn to the east and say "Allah." I do not like that at all.

Mr. Goodwin, testifying before the Committee on Appropriations, proved conclusively, in my opinion, that much of the farm labor of this country has not been looked into, including Mr. Indian. I do not even like to refer to him as Mr. Indian. I do not like to see an amendment introduced which in effect says, "Be good to the Indian." As an American, he is entitled to everything that any other American is entitled to. We do not want anyone to be sorry for the Indian. We want him to be subject to law. That is what Mr. Indian wants. That is what the Puerto Rican wants. What is the use of adding to the bill an amendment which says, "Take care of and be nice to the Puerto Rican and the Indian"? Give them fair play. Let us say that we will be nice to all Americans, including the Puerto Ricans and

the Indians. That is all we expect of the bill. We are willing to cooperate along the lines suggested by the Senator from Oregon, and what I know are the ideas of my good friend from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER].

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

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. If the bill as reported by the committee is enacted, and receiving points are established along the American-Mexican border, would the fact that labor was made available at such points to employers in agriculture along the border, where at the present time the wetback problem is prevalent, aid in combating the problem, by reason of the fact that an employer of a large amount of labor in that area, who did not go to such a center to receive his employees, would, as a result, have a little closer scrutiny by immigration officers than if he had obtained his full quota of employees in the way provided by the bill?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I think that is another bad feature of the bill. The bill is sectional in its application. I like legislation which affects all States. The only one who would get any advantage from the bill is the employer who is close to the wetback.

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

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. If the bill should be amended, as I hope it will be amended, so as to provide an equitable distribution of workers from Mexico, so far as distant areas are concerned, those which are from 500 to 2,500 miles from the Mexican border——

Mr. CHAVEZ. They confront difficulties.

Mr. CORDON. Yes. Would those areas have to any appreciable extent in their employ any natives of Mexico who came in illegally? As I understand, the problem of the wetback exists chiefly along the border.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes. I presume the Senator from Oregon has been to El Paso, Tex. El Paso is on the border. There are two bridges across the Rio Grande at El Paso. All that is necessary to cross the border is to pay a small fee. I believe it costs three Mexican pennies to cross from the Mexican side to the American side. It takes about 5 minutes to walk across the bridge, from one side of the river to the other. Once the Mexicans have come across the bridge they scatter to other States. In the case of my State, it is a matter of walking about a mile. At one place a wetback does not even have to cross a bridge. He can walk from the Mexican side to New Mexican or Texas territory. The same thing happens in Arizona and in California, and along the Big Bend of the Rio Grande, clear to Brownsville, Tex. Naturally the ones who would get the benefit of the centers would be the men along the border. If a farmer takes his automobile across the bridge it costs him a quarter. It need not cost him anything, because he can make his arrangements at the border. However, if the pear grower at Medford, Oreg., thinks he needs 50 men to pick pears he would have to go from Medford, Oreg., to the Mexican border to make his arrangements. In the case of potatoes or wheat, the same thing would hold true. The grower would have to go perhaps 2,500 miles. So in that respect also the bill is unfair.

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

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes.

Mr. THYE. How would the Senator propose to amend the bill so as to overcome such specific weakness in it?

Mr. CHAVEZ. The way to do it is to make the bill applicable nationally in every respect.

Mr. THYE. It is, is it not? How can we specifically legislate to deny a Mexican the right to pay his 3 pennies to walk across the bridge?

Mr. CHAVEZ. We cannot.

Mr. THYE. How does the Senator from New Mexico propose to handle the problem? I would like to have him tell us how he proposes to handle the immigration question.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I am not talking about the immigration question. I am talking about the actual and practical difficulty which confronts a farmer who is 2,000 or 2,500 miles from the border, as compared with the farmer who is close to the border. The one who would get the real advantage would be the man along the border. He could get workers in a hurry and at very little cost.

Mr. THYE. For a number of years the Mexican worker has been employed in the onion fields, the sugar-beet fields, and in other types of stoop labor in which the average citizen of the United States would not engage. It would be immaterial whether such labor were offered to him, because he would not take it. That is also true with respect to potatoes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes.

Mr. THYE. It is true in late June in the harvesting of canning peas, in which there is a great deal of hard work involved in the handling of the green pea vines. It is also true during the summer in the harvesting of sweet corn. It is a slow, hard hand job. The average American worker will not turn to it if he can find any other kind of employment.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I understand.

Mr. THYE. So the fact is that in the North in Iowa, Minnesota, and Wisconsin—I am speaking now only of those States about which I personally know something—one can offer the worker any price he pleases to offer. He can offer 12 cents a bushel to dig potatoes, but he cannot find domestic workers to do the job. He can find Mexican workers.

The same thing is true with respect to harvesting peas and harvesting sweet corn. The sugar-beet work is an all-season job. From the time the sugar beets are planted in the spring they require thinning. The Mexican worker is perfectly willing to do that work and very happy to get the contract for it. The next process is weeding. Following the weeding comes the fall harvest. The beet must be first mechanically pulled, and then the Mexican tops the beet. In other words, he chops the green foliage off the root. All this is tedious work. We cannot find American workers who are willing to accept such work.

That is the question with which we are faced in the United States. Not one of us would discriminate against the American worker. Not one of us is willing to legislate in such a way as to deny an American man or woman the opportunity for a job. But when all is said and done, we have not enough domestic workers to do the work. We must try to provide labor. In World War II we had German prisoners all over the United States doing much of that hand labor. Following the return of the German prisoners, we then had to rely on offshore or imported labor.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct.

Mr. THYE. The Mexican was happy to go to Minnesota and the northern area of the United States to take a job.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Of course he was.

Mr. THYE. If we can find a way to amend the bill so as to overcome the Senator's fear, I am sure that all of us will join with him. But we cannot legislate to fill all the jobs in the United States which require agricultural workers by calling on domestic labor, because there is not enough domestic labor to do the work. We must have offshore workers to supplement the supply of domestic labor.

Mr. CHAVEZ. According to some statements which have been inserted in the record of this discussion here are plenty of Americans willing to do the work. Let me ask the Senator a question. Of course I know that the average American would not want to do stoop labor. He is used to different types of labor. But there are some who, because of necessity, must do it. They are fine Americans. Everything is not rosy with them. The Senator has been Governor of his State, and I am sure that he has looked into many of these questions. Even during my days in the Congress, Indians from Minnesota have told me that they could not find work, even when they wanted to work. We felt sorry for them, and appropriated money to take care of them. Are there not at least some citizens of that type available in Minnesota, who would work if given an opportunity?

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

Mr. CHAVEZ. And they have beautiful lakes.

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

Nevertheless, in spite of all that, last fall, during late October, when we were threatened with a freeze, I received a great number of calls from the northwestern section of Minnesota where potatoes were then being harvested. It was late in the year. The producer was fearful that his potato crop or sugar-beet crop would be damaged by frost, or possibly buried by a snowstorm.

I received a great number of calls from producers in that area begging for the opportunity to set aside a Federal law. Of course, a Federal law cannot be set aside in that manner; but they wanted a certain provision of Federal law set aside so that school children could have the privilege of being excused from school for a few days, to go into the fields and dig potatoes or help to harvest sugar beets. The producer was willing to pay almost any price they might ask, in order to get the job done.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. CHAVEZ. Certainly.

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

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

Mr. THYE. I thank the Senator for the compliment and I may say that the employment office in Minnesota can stand up under the light of public inspection at any time. While I was governor of the State we concerned ourselves with the treatment received by the imported worker, the conditions under which he was compelled to live, and other factors.

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

Mr. CHAVEZ. Let us take one thing at a time. The Senator from Minnesota spoke of the fact that there are many types of work American laborers will not perform.

Mr. THYE. Yes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Very well. Let us concede for the sake of the argument that American labor will not be available for certain types of work. Therefore, we must import outside labor. In carrying out that plan, what is there wrong in protecting our own labor first? Charity should begin at home. Why should it be wrong for us to place in the basic law the provision that first priority should go to American labor? We do it with respect to everything else.

Mr. THYE. Does not the law provide that the employment office must certify the need for labor, and if it does not so certify, the area will not receive the labor?

Mr. CHAVEZ. No; but I have an amendment which will make that compulsory; which recognizes the principle of taking care, for example, of New Mexico cotton first—and I should prefer that New Mexico hides were taken care of first, even before those that come from the State of Minnesota. Let us recognize that principle by a provision we place in the law. As a matter of practice, that would not mean a thing, except that we recognize the principle, because as the Senator from Minnesota said, and I think correctly, in many instances the American laborer will not undertake certain classes of work.

As the Senator knows, there are many Indians in my State. There are many Navajos there. If they are not available, very well, let us import labor from across the border. Many telegrams were sent to me in which the senders agreed with the chairman of the committee. Some telegrams came from Alamogordo, where the Mescalero Apaches live, but I never saw them working in the cotton fields. We appropriate money sometimes to help them. I had that matter in mind so far as labor is concerned.

Mr. President, I should like to proceed now with my statement.

Mr. THYE. I thank the Senator for having yielded and permitted me to take part in the discussion of the question.

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

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

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

My purpose in referring to the great amount of attention recently given to this question by the press of the Nation is to focus our thinking on the effect of the proposed legislation on the conditions described. I cannot see how this legislation will help remedy these conditions. I fear it will do just the reverse. I am afraid it will aggravate them. Many of the articles make it clear that there are large numbers of unemployed workers in the area into which the wetbacks and legal Mexican immigrants come. These unemployed are rejected by the growers because they prefer the foreign labor which is cheaper for them. Of the half million domestic native migrant workers—I am talking about a half million domestic migrant workers, not foreign migrant workers—a large proportion are descendants of Anglo-Americans from the eastern seaboard who crossed the Appalachians, settled in the once-fertile valleys of the Southwest and later were "tractored off" the land to become "Okies" made famous by John Steinbeck in his Grapes of Wrath. Another large number of these migrants, as I personally know, are Spanish-speaking Americans whose ancestors have been in this country for hundreds of years. Prior to World War II many of the people of my State of New Mexico also followed the crops, going from northern New Mexico into the Rio Grande Valley—into the neighboring States of Colorado and Arizona—obtaining employment to supplement the income they received from their own small farms. During and since World War II

most of these people have found it increasingly difficult to obtain employment in the large commercial farms. So, too, have the American Indians in my State—the Navajos, the Apaches, the Pueblos, and others—found difficulty, as their testimony before the Committee on Agriculture and Foresty shows. Some of those Indians appeared before the committees of the Senate and the House and testified in person.

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

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

That study further pointed out that there are a million and a half rural nonfarm families with family incomes of $2,000 or less in 1948. "Full employment of the workers in these families," the study says, "would add approximately 900,000 workers to the effective labor force."

The legislation we are now considering has nothing in it aimed at improving our methods of developing an adequate agricultural-labor supply from among the millions of underemployed and poverty-ridden families discussed by the Sparkman report. No; it limits itself to the importation of cheap labor from Mexico. This raises a serious question of public policy which the Congress of the United States must face. As the President's Commission put it:

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

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

> home and abroad to supply and replenish our seasonal and migratory work force?

Mr. President, should we attempt to ruin one segment of labor—agricultural labor—and try to provide for it an economy quite different from that applying to any other industry in our country? On that point, I read further from the report of the President's Commission:

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

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

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

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

That is the test.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I read further from the report:

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

Mr. President, I wish to point out to my good friend, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], that those who will be the recipients of work under this bill, if it is enacted, are more to be pitied than censured. Stern necessity confronts them. Of course, we have heard of church mice and of how poor they are, but I venture the assertion that some of the people dealt with by this bill are poorer than the poorest of church mice. Those people need work very badly. However, in trying to be charitable and kindly toward them, we must not let anything undermine our own economic system. That is the basis of my opposition to this bill. I believe in the hereafter, and I wish to be charitable. I think my record in this body is about as good as that of any other Member of this body, in that particular respect. I have voted without quibbling for the appropriation of billions of dollars to help starving people in Asia and in Europe.

However, I cannot convince myself that I am justified in doing that, if at the same time I neglect American citizens, even when we are dealing with charity.

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

CORPUS CHRISTI, TEX., *April 29, 1951.*

Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

American GI Forum Veterans' Organization representing more than 50,000 American veterans of Mexican origin wish to ask you to continue to fight to exclude foreign workers, especially in Texas. Thousands of veterans not able to make decent living because of low-wage competition by wetbacks and imported labor. Thousands of children of veterans are not able to enjoy good health because veterans and their families are forced to work for starvation wages because of imported labor. Americans of Mexican origin in Texas must have opportunity to live like human beings and first-class citizens. Best way to do it is to stop all imported labor.

What does the President's Commission say? What does the average farmer want? What does the average citizen want, the man who aspires to an income which will be adequate to maintain an American standard of living? He wants his children to be able to go to school, and later to be able to make their own living. American boys who have fought for the flag are entitled to decent treatment, too. The President's Commission, in the report to which I have referred, continues:

Cheap foreign labor is advantageous to the owners of large-scale farms which employ "stoop" labor in great quantities. Such farms are only 2 percent of the Nation's farm units—

As I pointed out earlier—

approximately 125,000, and only a fraction of this small number employs most of the alien farm workers. This cheap labor is in competition with the great group of family-type farms. It is hardly consistent for our Government to encourage a family type of agriculture and at the same time give direct assistance to the operators of large-scale farms in recruiting and employing low-wage foreign workers whose products compete with the family-type farms.

It is not surprising, therefore, that the farm organizations, typified by the National Farmers' Union and certain State branches of the American Farm Bureau Federation, and the Grange, which genuinely espouse family-type farming as a central policy in agriculture, are not sympathetic to legislation which gives advantage to the corporate, absentee-ownership type of farming. Even in my State, units of the American Farm Bureau Federation have telegraphed me expressing opposition to the committee bill.

Mr. President, if you will look back over the fight on the Farm Security Administration—whose primary objective was to reestablish in family-type farming agricultural workers, tenants, share croppers, and farm operators who had been pushed off the land—you will see what I mean.

Great progress has been made in that respect throughout the United States. Nor is it surprising, Mr. President, to find all of organized labor strongly opposed to this proposed legislation. Industrial labor understandably sees a serious threat to its standards in the flooding into this country of hundreds of thousands of underprivileged alien workers, multitudes of whom, as the Commission report makes clear, remain in this country illegally, even though they came into the country legally. These pools of alien labor willing to accept low wages obviously tend to tear down the standards of all labor, whether agricultural or industrial. Nor is it to be wondered at, that the churches and religious organizations of our country have become aroused at the conditions of this migratory labor which has been recently so tellingly described in the newspaper and magazine articles to which I have referred. These conditions are a scandal to our Nation and are a serious weakness before the world in our Nation's leadership in the fight against our enemies in the Kremlin. So long as they are allowed to continue—and, as I have said several times, the proposed legislation does nothing to remedy them, but will, in my judgment, tend to aggravate them—we as a people cannot stand before other peoples in other nations and maintain that we know so well how to order the affairs of people within our own borders that we may teach the rest of the world how to order its affairs. No, Mr. President, this proposed measure fails completely to face the grave problems with which we are confronted respecting agricultural labor. I introduced a measure, Senate bill 949, which I felt took some steps in the direction of facing those problems. It was not reported by the Senate Agriculture Committee. In truth—if we are to judge by the measure reported by the committee—the objectives my bill sought to achieve were scarcely considered at all by the committee.

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

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

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

RELATION OF AIR POWER TO THE SAFETY OF THE NATION

Mr. LODGE and Mr. HUMPHREY addressed the Chair.

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

Mr. CHAVEZ. I have concluded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I shall be glad to yield to any Senator who wishes to make a routine insertion in the RECORD. Other than that, I do not wish to yield. I have been waiting for quite a while to make this speech. It is not going to take very long, so I would rather not yield for anything other than a routine insertion.

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

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

I wish to make an urgent plea today for something which involves the safety of our troops in Europe—the tactical air force. Then I wish to speak with reference to air power as a whole in relation to the safety of the Nation.

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

Many Americans have assumed through these tense years of the so-called cold war that the United States could rely on its superiority in the mechanical weapons of sea power and air power. We always knew that we could not match the mass armies of Red Russia and her satellites man for man and gun for gun. But even the most unsophisticated lay-

man sensed that war had advanced somewhat beyond the point where the battle decision could be measured solely in terms of numbers of men.

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

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

The assurance of a former Secretary of National Defense that if the Soviets attacked at "4 o'clock we would be ready to strike back at 5" appears, in the light of the facts I propose to submit, as a most cruel misrepresentation.

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

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

Air power falls into three categories:

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

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

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

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

Mr. LODGE. I am glad to yield.

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

Mr. LODGE. I am so advised. Today we do not have an air defense which is capable of protecting our great industrial centers.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the distinguished Senator remember the testimony of General Vandenberg in relation to the resolution which was up for hearing, which had to do with defense bombing, when the distinguished general said that if the combined strategic air command of Russia came over the North Pole, which it could do within 5½ hours, it was his judgment that 70 percent of the Russian planes would get through?

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

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

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

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

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

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

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

Mr. WHERRY. If the Senator will yield further, I was not attempting to elicit that answer from the Senator. I am trying to establish that if we have mastery of the air, the first move we should make in defense, not only in the Pacific area but in Western Europe, is to be assured that we can do the same thing to Russia that Russia can do to the war potential of the United States.

Mr. LODGE. It is my opinion that we should have air superiority over the Soviet Union. If the Senator will bear with me, I shall in a moment take up the three types of air power. One is air defense. The second is offensive strategic air power by which we destroy the war-making installations of the enemy, and the third is tactical air power, by which a nation protects its own field forces and harasses the forces of the enemy. I want to discuss all three, which enter into the total concept of air power.

Mr. WHERRY. I agree that certainly when armies are on the ground, we must have tactical air power to protect them, that we have to protect them. Does not the able Senator, in view of the speech he is now making, agree with me that in making a choice in the expenditure of the defense dollar the priority, if we are to choose between arms, should be to make the investment in strategic air power capable of bombing Russia's war potential, in order to destroy it, as the first priority in our defense against an attack on Western Europe?

Mr. LODGE. I believe the strategic air command is the strongest element we have. Our security, and the fact that we have not yet had world war III, is due to the fact that the strategic air force acts as a deterrent. I do not at all challenge the decision to give it priority; not at all.

Mr. WHERRY. I expect to ask a question or two later, but would the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, in light of the need for strategic bombing, agree that if there had to be a choice, the first thing necessary would be to have mastery of the air and the ability to destroy Russia's war potential?

Mr. LODGE. I think we must have mastery of the air, but I do not wish to get into a discussion as to which of the three elements I have mentioned is the most important. If the Senator will bear with me, I shall say what I have to say about tactical aviation, which I think is very necessary at this time.

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

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I think it well that the Senator from Massachusetts is pointing out the major thesis he is presenting, in which I agree with him. As a member of the Armed Services Committee of the Senate, I am of the present opinion that we do not have mastery of the air. But if that be true, would it not also be true that if we proceeded with major bombing operations in Manchuria at this time we would open ourselves to the serious danger of air attack which might do tremendous damage not only to our fleet in the Pacific, but to some of our industrial centers on the western coast?

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

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

Mr. LODGE. Yes.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Massachusetts agree with me that at least before any decision is made to inaugurate the type of preventive war in which the bombing of Manchuria might involve us, we had better know whether we are in a position, so far as our Air Force is concerned, to defend our troops, our Navy, and our industrial centers of the West?

Mr. LODGE. I will say to the Senator from Oregon that is unquestionably one of the matters which ought to be gone into when the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Armed Services begin their hearings on Thursday. It is an absolutely vital consideration. I have outlined the three types of air power: defense, strategic, and tactical.

It has been clear for some time that while tactical air cannot defeat an enemy on the ground, no ground force can win against hostile tactical air superiority unless it is prepared to mass

tremendous weight of numbers and accept fantastic casualties. Our forces in Korea are massively outnumbered by the Chinese Reds. Yet so far, they have been able not only to hold, but inflict staggering casualties on the Chinese because of our great local air superiority. All this would change overnight, if the Soviet Union threw in its great weight of tactical air power, as the commanders of our forces in Korea have clearly warned.

The most encouraging aspect of the relative position of United States air power versus the Soviet is our ability to deliver an atomic air offensive. The best-qualified observers, and I believe most Senators agree, that the essential reason the Soviets have not dared to gamble on World War III rests with our ability to deliver an atomic attack on their homeland. Yet, I am informed that even our strategic air offensive is far from as formidable as it should be and that each day our relative superiority over the Soviets in this one element of strategic air power diminishes. I am advised that even the B-36, invaluable though it is, will not be an overwhelmingly strategic weapon long. Defense moves too rapidly on the heels of offensive capability to let any nation rest on a stopgap weapon. I understand that we should replace the B-36's as soon as possible with all-jet, high-speed bombers like the Boeing B-52, and the all-jet version of the B-36 and that at the present time insufficient funds are being provided to move quickly to this goal.

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

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

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

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

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. LODGE. Yes.

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

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

Mr. WHERRY. I believe the statement was taken from a United Press report. It was to the effect that the delayed start in providing air support for the Atlantic Pact army had created a problem which had become so critical that it was to be placed on the agenda of the British, French, and American conferences to be held shortly. I wondered whether the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts could tell us anything about that. I do not want him to reveal any military information which we are not entitled to have, but I should like to ascertain whether it is true that we have very little tactical air power in Western Europe to protect the army we are about to build there.

Mr. LODGE. I do not believe we have sufficient tactical air power there. I intend to develop the point in my remarks, and give the actual figures as I have been able to get them.

If we assume that the United States would contribute 20 percent of the North Atlantic Treaty tactical air force, that would mean 3,600 planes, or 48 tactical air groups, leaving 13,400 planes to be flown and operated by the other North Atlantic Treaty nations. Bear in mind, of course, that the United States will in all probability supply a substantial number of the planes to be manned and operated by the North Atlantic countries, assuming, always, that these nations make their own full and realistic effort in the air as on the ground. If they do make their full effort, I am advised that a figure of 6,000 planes to be supplied to these countries by the United States is a reasonable estimate considering the state of the plane manufacturing industry in Europe. To the total of 3,600 planes manned by United States personnel must, therefore, be added another 6,000 planes for operational use by the North Atlantic countries, or a rough total of 10,000 planes.

This total does not include the extra planes which are required due to wartime attrition. Nor does it include whatever American tactical planes may be needed in other parts of the world.

Mr. President, I submit that the budget for the coming fiscal year should, therefore, contain figures which will provide 48 tactical air groups of 3,600 manned planes and another 6,000 planes for operation by the member nations of the North Atlantic Treaty.

I realize that this is a tremendous figure. It must be at the least about three times as large as the tactical air force which I understand the administration plans to have. But the fact that we may soon have six of our own divisions in Europe leaves us no choice whatever. If we are to have six United States divisions in Europe by the beginning of 1952, then we must have an adequate amount of tactical aviation which can give them a real protective umbrella. To send troops overseas without adequate tactical aviation is just exactly the same as sending them into battle without rifles, tanks, or artillery.

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

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

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator for yielding once again. I appreciate his answers to the questions. I should like to ask a further question. It has come to my attention that the program

of building long-range bombers in this country has already slowed down in order to provide for more construction of tactical planes. Does the Senator know anything about that?

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

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

Mr. LODGE. Oh, yes.

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

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

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator place in the RECORD, if he has it, a statement of the amount of money which would be necessary for the 48 groups which he has just asked for?

Mr. LODGE. I am coming to that.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator also have figures for a larger force—for 98 groups, 150 groups, and so forth?

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

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

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

Mr. WHERRY. I commend the Senator.

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

Mr. WHERRY. I appreciate the answer of the Senator. I am in complete sympathy with the statement which has been made about the determination of the appropriations, and the numbers of Air Force units which should be supplied. I am in complete sympathy with the idea of making such an evaluation for all branches of the military service. I suggest to the distinguished Senator, because he is a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, which is now sitting with the Armed Services Committee as a joint committee to listen to evidence relative to defense dollars in the Pacific and the recommendations which are to be made, that he acquaint himself with the resolution which was submitted by the junior Senator from Nebraska for the consideration of the committee.

Mr. LODGE. I am not intimately familiar with it.

Mr. WHERRY. I refer to Senate Resolution 132. I should like to read paragraph (7), if the Senator will permit. It is only a few lines long.

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

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

Paragraph (7) is as follows:

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

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

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

Mr. WHERRY. Does not the Senator feel that the committee should interest itself in practical solutions?

Mr. LODGE. Oh, yes.

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

Mr. LODGE. I agree with the Senator.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. The point I was attempting to make was this: Take, for example, the Air Force. I happen to have the latest figures which I could get as to what it would cost to build a 95-group air force; also a 48-group force, a 120-group force, and a 150-group force. I also have figures as to what it

would cost to maintain them after the first year, in which they are built and placed on the line.

I am not sure that I should release these figures. I suppose the distinguished Senator has already seen them. But I am satisfied that my question is a very pertinent one, because, in view of what it will cost, for example, to build 150 air groups, and that is 100 groups short of what General Spaatz recommended, as the Senator well knows, for obtaining the mastery of the air——

Mr. LODGE. I am going to cover all those questions.

Mr. WHERRY. We have to make a choice of defense dollars. I submit to the Senator that when the recommendations have come before the Appropriations Committee, as he well knows, they have been divided, one-third here, one-third there, and one-third there, and there has been the reasoning, there has been the evidence taken, there have been the decisions made by the committees of the Senate that have made a choice of these defense dollars, and where they shall be spent to accomplish the very thing the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts is now recommending to the Senate. That is why I ask the question if the Senator does not feel that in our military development—we cannot be superior in everything—we do not have enough to go around. We have to make the right approach with the money we have, so that our position will be strong enough to be a deterrent, or to stop a war with Russia.

Mr. LODGE. Oh, yes; we have to spend our money in the most effective possible way. That is why I am here today urging a larger air force. I will proceed with my prepared statement, which I think will answer a good many of the questions raised by the Senator from Nebraska. What I was going to say was that it is highly disquieting to hear that we are not building a big enough air force. I hope the appropriate committees will press for action and see to it that we get these 48 tactical air groups, so that our soldiers in Europe will have the protection to which they are entitled. That is the first point we ought to make.

Ever since the end of World War II we have been plagued by lack of foresight and tragic miscalculations. We lacked foresight when we demobilized our Armed Forces and scattered our supplies and equipment to the four winds. We miscalculated tragically at Yalta. We erred grievously in June 1949, I think, when we evacuated Korea and announced to the world that it was no longer essential to our defense. I believe we created the vacuum into which the Communists moved. There was bungling and lack of foresight in many things which led up to the dismissal of General MacArthur, a most distressing and unfortunate event which I believe intelligent leadership could have avoided.

Mr. President, in order to understand our present dangerous situation as regards air power, we should allow our minds to go way back—back, first, to 1945, when the present occupant of the White House took office. At that time we had a power for peace which was unequaled in history and for which we had suffered a million casualties. Today, after 6 years, we seem to have thrown away the power for peace for which these million were killed, wounded, and captured.

We should then go back to those days when there was so much talk about having a balanced force as between land, sea, and air forces—days when the newspapers talked about a so-called rate of exchange in the argument to determine the allocation of funds to land, sea, and air forces—a rate of exchange whereby a certain number of air groups equaled a certain number of divisions which in turn equaled a certain number of ships. This so-called balanced-force idea is the price we pay for not having achieved real unification of our military power.

Mr. President, these figures which I have submitted show that not only are we inferior in hordes of land manpower; we have not even got superiority in the technical arms. Insofar as tactical aviation is concerned, the Soviets actually have air supremacy, in Europe and in Asia, over most of the world's land mass. This must be added to their massive infantry, armor, and artillery. Moreover, I am told that our own domestic air defenses are so feeble as almost to invite attack and that the Soviets have far greater domestic air defenses than we have at the moment. We excel them only in the quality of our long-range bombers and in numbers of atomic bombs. On this single fact our security hangs by a delicate thread.

This condition is not the fault of the American people, in my judgment. Nor is it the fault of the Congress which has always been willing to appropriate more for national defense than has been requested of it. Mr. President, it is clearly the fault of inadequate Executive leadership.

What must we do to get air superiority?

The present over-all objective of 95 groups is not big enough to include the 48 tactical groups of which I speak, and in addition to give us enough strategic aviation and enough air defense for the continental United States. Yet I understand that there is actually a question as to whether the Air Force will get enough out of the presently planned $41,000,000,000 national defense total to furnish even the 95 groups which the Air Force has already been allowed in principle. I understand further that even if the Air Force gets the inadequate funds which it has been promised that it cannot get the whole thing in operating condition in less than a year and a half. That gives you some idea of the jam, which, as a nation, we are in.

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

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts for his last statement. I think it is highly essential that those figures be known by the Members of the Senate. As I stated before, I feel the place they should come from is the Armed Services Committee; on its recommendation. Does the Senator know what it will cost to build a 150 air force group?

Mr. LODGE. I am coming to that in a moment, if the Senator from Nebraska will bear with me.

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

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

Mr. WHERRY. I know how the Senator feels about information being given publicly, but the appropriation bill has just been handed to me, and I have the estimates for the Air Force apparently for this year. They are not based on a 150 air group, but on a 75 air group. The figures are approximately what the Senator from Massachusetts has mentioned in his remarks this afternoon. They are made public. I am for open hearings whenever they can be had, because I believe when the facts and the figures are placed on the table where the people can see them and understand them the Congress will have the backing of the people. I think the information should be made public wherever it can be made public. I was deeply moved when I learned of the vote taken by the two committees a while ago about having the hearings on the global defense policy, in which General MacArthur is to participate, to be closed hearings. But in this particular instance I think there ought to be shown the American people what General Spaatz has recommended, what the Air Force officials have recommended.

Mr. LODGE. If the Senator will bear with me I am coming to General Spaatz in a moment.

The point I am trying to convey to my able friend from Nebraska is that our objective is not big enough, our proposed rate of attainment is not fast enough, and unless we increase our objective and step up our rate of national achievement we court national disaster.

To be brutally frank—and we must not be anything less—the requirements of our own national security cannot be met with guns-and-butter appropriations. It takes money. I asked General Spaatz, who commanded our wartime air forces in Europe with such great success, in recent hearings on the proposal to send troops to Europe, how many combat air groups would be necessary to carry out our national commitment to help defend America in Western Europe in case of an attack by the Soviet Union. He said the number which we had in World War II, which is 240 groups. Surely General Spaatz qualifies as an authority, since we are talking about the theater of potential air combat which he commanded in history's greatest war so far. But it is my understanding that present officers of the Air Force now on active duty and intimately familiar with new and prospective types of equipment do not place the figure quite that high.

To gain air superiority over the Soviet Union—on which the hope of peace depends—we need therefore not the administration's 95 groups, but, according to reliable authorities, a minimum of 150. Some say that to be certain of our superiority and not leave our destiny to the

fortunes of battle, we should have 175 groups. Certainly 150 groups will get us started off the present dead center of disastrous military inadequacy.

There is no doubt that 150 air groups will cost money, roughly an average of $25,000,000,000 a year while we maintain them at top combat proficiency. But it is quite clear to all of us that survival comes high at a time when the entire free world is faced with the greatest threat of our times. Insofar as manpower is concerned, the figures are interesting. Because of fixed overhead that goes with any military organization, supply requirements and maintenance, as well as combat personnel, the manpower required for Truman's 95 groups is 1,061,000 officers and men. To go to 150 groups, we need add literally little more than the combat crews. We would have an adequate Air Force of 150 groups, so I am told, with 1,400,000 officers and men.

So the necessary increase in expenditures would be much greater, of course, than the increase in the number of men who would be required.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. The figures I have received in regard to the cost of 150 air groups is approximately $34,600,000,000 for the first year, and thereafter the amount would decrease to $25,000,000,000 for maintenance, replacements, and so forth.

Before the Senator takes his seat, I hope he will answer the question I asked him first, because I am in favor of this defense measure, and I think we should have it. I should like very much to have the Senator from Massachusetts express his views on the choice which confronts us in regard to the spending of our dollars, and whether he believes that the Armed Services Committee must hold hearings and take evidence on this question and must suggest to us what our global policy should be, so that we can make a proper decision as to the amount of money we shall spend for defense purposes, and in what ways it shall be spent, and the amount of manpower required in backing up the expenditures we make.

Mr. LODGE. I think that is a fair question, and I intend to discuss it.

Mr. WHERRY. Furthermore, does not the Senator from Massachusetts believe that the joint hearings which are about to be had by the Senate Armed Services Committee and the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations should be open hearings, so that the people of the United States can know the facts about the policy we have in Korea and the facts bearing on the question of what policy we should have in the future?

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, when I conclude speaking on this topic, I shall be glad to take up some of the other topics.

Nothing on earth is quite so fatal on so large a scale as insufficient military power to defend yourself. It is cheaper to be strong and avoid war than to pinch pennies and then be engulfed in disaster.

There are many other things which are important in connection with national defense, but at the moment air power is the point of the spear. Senators will not quarrel with my statement that I have never been an extremist about air power. For one thing, I am a strong believer in the vital necessity of land power; that belief comes from prolonged and intimate experience in the Army. In fact, I have constantly demanded a bigger army, and I still fear that the present objective of 18 divisions and 18 regimental combat teams is too small.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will my colleague yield at this point for a question, or does he prefer that I wait until he concludes his remarks?

Mr. LODGE. No; I am glad to yield at this time.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. My question is this: The military services have established the figure of 3,500,000 men as representing a balanced force to be divided between the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force. If the Senator's suggestion that we have 150 air groups in our Air Force is adopted, does he believe the men required for that increase in the Air Force can be obtained from the total of 3,500,000 men by cutting down on the manpower allotments to the Army and the Navy, and by allotting more men to the Air Force; or does the Senator believe that his suggestion, if adopted, would require an increase in the total size of the Armed Forces; and, if so, approximately how much of an increase?

In this connection I call attention to the fact that although both my colleague and I voted in the negative on the question of establishing a ceiling of 4,000,000 men for the Armed Forces, yet a majority of the Senate voted in favor of establishing that ceiling.

Mr. LODGE. Yes, I voted against the ceiling.

Mr. President, it is my judgment that the increased number of men required by my proposal, which would be approximately 400,000, would certainly be added to the present total of the Armed Forces.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. So there would be an additional 400,000 men for the Air Force, to be added to the present total of 3,500,000; and in that way the size of the ground forces would be left at what it is at the present time. Is that correct?

Mr. LODGE. No; I am also advocating an increase in the Army. However, the 400,000 men would be in addition to those we otherwise have authorized.

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

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Let me say that I have no intention of reopening the debate on the ceiling for the Armed Forces, but I think I should correct an erroneous impression which I believe has been left in the RECORD. The ceiling voted by the Senate on the manpower to be available for the Armed Forces was voted on the basis of the balanced program the administration had set forth for the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force. Those of us who urged that Congress impose a manpower ceiling also urged that when there was an increase in the need for men in all the Armed Forces the military should request an increase in the ceiling. The vote the Senate took on the present ceiling does not mean that we insist on keeping it at 4,000,000. We simply stand for keeping the ceiling at 4,000,000 until the military show that they need more than that. Certainly, I would go along in favoring an increase in the ceiling of 3,450,000, which the military submitted to us, if we provide for 150 air groups.

So the question is not the ceiling, but whether the military should come to us to get permission to increase or raise the ceiling. That is the position we took.

Mr. LODGE. I am glad to have that statement on the part of the Senator from Oregon.

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

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I wonder whether the Senator from Massachusetts is aware of the fact that in the budget which came to us today—probably it came after the Senator from Massachusetts began his presentation—it appears that the Army is to get $20,800,000,000 the Navy, $15,100,000,000; the Air Force, $19,800,000,000; the Office of the Secretary of Defense, $500,000,000; and for proposed legislation relative to the military, in the field of public works, $4,500,000,000—making a total of $60,700,000,000. Does the Senator know what would be added to those figures if we increased the Air Force beyond 95 air groups? In the next year would be in a position, based on our income from productive sources, to expend more money than the amount required for the 95 air groups?

Mr. LODGE. I think we could in the next year; yes. I do not think there is much that can be done in that respect this year, but I think we can make progress in this respect in the next year.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Massachusetts means in 1952, does he?

Mr. LODGE. Yes.

Mr. FERGUSON. In other words, is it the position of the Senator from Massachusetts, that if we desire to create a larger Air Force and to have more air groups, we could and we should increase the proposed expenditures of $19,800,000,000 for the Air Force?

Mr. LODGE. Yes; and by doing so I think we would get results in from 1½ to 2 years.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does the Senator know how we could do that by means of increasing the expenditures for the Air Force and increasing the number of men available to the Air Force?

Mr. LODGE. I understand that for the fiscal year ending in 1952, we could very substantially increase the strength of our Air Force by increasing the appropriations. But we cannot expect to do very much in that respect during the remainder of the present fiscal year.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes, for the present fiscal year will end in 2 months.

Mr. LODGE. Yes.

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

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I am one of those who voted for the manpower ceiling on the Armed Forces. I voted for it because I thought the Air Force, rather than the

Army, should be increased in size, although as a member of the Appropriations Committee, I am perfectly willing to listen to the recommendations of the Armed Services Committee, in order to make sure that we obtain adequate national defense.

I wish to ask the distinguished Senator this question: When we must make a choice in the spending of the dollars available for defense purposes—and, of course, the figures which have just been read by the Senator from Michigan give us some idea of what the budget will be if we add to the expenditures needed for military purposes the expenditures proposed for nonmilitary purposes—does the Senator from Massachusetts believe that before we make commitments for the land forces, we should have our Air Force built up to a size at least sufficient to give protection not only at home but abroad, even if for that purpose we have to include the tactical Air Force the Senator from Massachusetts is requesting?

Mr. LODGE. No; the Senator from Nebraska constantly returns to the theme that we cannot do all, and therefore we should do only one. I constantly disagree with him. I think we can do all we need to do for our security if we give up the guns-and-butter approach. Of course, if we insist on a guns-and-butter approach and insist on continuing all the normal activities and all the normal, business-as-usual program, something will have to crack. Certainly this issue is a most fundamental one. It raises the question of whether our objective is sufficiently large and whether we are going to reach it fast enough. Ever since Korea, I have been saying on this floor that we are not getting ready fast enough. I constantly asked the question, "What are we waiting for?" I still am asking that question.

I said we should not have any more politics as usual and business as usual, and in my judgment when we have an army in Korea, as we have had ever since last June, and they are engaged in a life and death struggle, the men constituting that army are entitled to have us make the maximum use of the time that they are buying for us. They are like the boy who put his finger in the dike and prevented the whole countryside from being flooded. They are like General MacArthur's men at Bataan in 1942, who fought that desperate rearguard action—for what? To buy us time, so we could get ready. In 1942 we used the time, and we did get ready. What I am saying today is that we are not using the time, and we are not getting ready fast enough so that we can regain the initiative, so that the arrow of political and diplomatic and military pressure is pointing from us to them, instead of from them to us all the time. That is what I am trying to say to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY and Mr. HUMPHREY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. LODGE. I yield first to the Senator from Nebraska, after which I shall yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

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

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

Mr. LODGE. Regarding the importance of the determination of the policy relative to distribution of the defense dollar, I should like to say that the Senator is correct. He is also correct when he infers—he did not quite say it, but he inferred it, and I believe he believes it—that the lack of unification which we have among our armed services compels a great deal of compromise and horse trading, so that none of the services get hurt in their prestige, whereas, if we had real unification, the money would go much more scientifically where it ought to go in the light of military realities. I think those things are true. But I am trying to deal with the system as it is.

Mr. HUMPHREY rose.

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

Mr. LODGE. The Senator from Minnesota was on his feet, and I yield first to him, after which I shall yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. HUMPHREY. First of all, I wish to commend the Senator from Massachusetts, who is a most able and constructive member of the Committee on Foreign Relations and of the Senate. I know the Senator is giving us what he considers to be his best judgment, and his considered thought, and I have been impressed with it. In view of the limitation of our military strength, insofar as air power is concerned, and surely, other aspects of it, and particularly in view of the limitation of our strength in tactical air power, which means the air power that covers troop movements and troop deployment, I should like to ask the Senator how he feels we would be able to give effective logistic support to a landing of, let us say, from 300,000 to 600,000, or whatever figure some persons may choose, of the Nationalist troops upon the mainland of China, if we are so short of tactical air power, which I think has already been proved?

Mr. LODGE. That is one of the questions to which I hope we may get an answer at the hearings which are to begin on the 3d day of May. I do not have the answer to it. I hope we shall get it then.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator feels, though, the importance of tactical air power for any amphibious operation, does he not?

Mr. LODGE. I am not pretending to be an expert, I may say to the Senator from Minnesota. I think there is a wide variety of land operations, depending upon the coast, and the strength with which the coast is held, and it is very hard to make a hard and fast theoretical rule as to what is needed and what is not needed, in landing operations. Certainly in some places a great deal more tactical aviation is needed then in others. The question which the Senator asks is a very important one, and I think it is one for which the answer should be obtained at the hearings.

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

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

Mr. WHERRY and Mr. HUMPHREY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield, and if so, to whom?

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

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator a question the answer to which I am sure will bring out what I have in mind; what the cost would be for a 150-group Air Force.

Mr. LODGE. It is estimated that it would cost $25,000,000,000 to maintain it, after it is set up.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator know how much it would increase the present budget?

Mr. LODGE. No; I would hesitate to answer that.

Mr. WHERRY. It would increase it $15,000,000,000 more than has been estimated, according to the figures presented by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON]. What I want to ask the Senator is whether he would be in favor of adding $15,000,000,000 to the present budget estimates, or does he feel that there should be transfers made so as to accomplish the desired result regarding the Air Force, rather than to increase by so large a sum the estimates which have been submitted.

Mr. LODGE. Ideally speaking, I should like to eliminate all the waste in the Federal Government. I should like to eliminate the waste in the military, and I should like to eliminate the waste in all the nonmilitary activities. As one Senator, I have tried to make my contribution to that end, in sponsoring the bill which established the Hoover Commission. I believe there is a great deal of waste, much of it in the Military Establishment we can eliminate, and that we ought to eliminate it. But I do not want to postpone the salvation and the security of the United States until we have a chance to pick through the various items of appropriation and eliminate all the waste. I am for getting some results quickly, even if they do cost a little more than they ought to cost. We must work with the people we have, and we cannot simply be too theoretical about it.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not mean to suggest that the Senator from Massachussetts has not answered my question, but the answer does not cover the point I had in mind. I am for building up the Air Force, but does the Senator feel that we should appropriate an additional $15,000,000,000 for a 150-group Air Force, or should the money be transferred from the amount to some other branch of the military service, in order to get the desired results?

Mr. LODGE. Oh, no.

I do not think it should be made at the expense of the Army and the Navy.

Mr. WHERRY. That is where it has been transferred, if it is to be transferred at all.

Mr. LODGE. Oh, I do not want to do that. I have been in favor of 30 divisions right along, but we are not getting anything like that number.

Mr. WHERRY. There is a budget of $75,000,000,000.

Mr. LODGE. It is pretty tough, I know, and I think it will be a good deal tougher as we go along. If we are to be on an in-and-out basis for 5 or 10 years, I think that might ruin America.

Mr. WHERRY. I was simply asking for information.

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

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator know what the total budget, the nonmilitary and the military, will be for the next 10 years?

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

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

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

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

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

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

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I want to associate myself with the general philosophy of the statement of the Senator from Massachusetts. I recall that when the budget came to the Congress for the next fiscal year, many of the Members of the Senate were asked by some of our friends of the press what we thought about the budget, so far as military preparation was concerned. I recall that my answer was that we should have a minimum of 5,000,000 men in the Armed Forces and a minimum budget for military preparedness of $80,000,000,000. I want to say a word and then I wish to ask the Senator from Massachusetts a question. When he talks about mobilizing this country, he realizes that mobilization is more than simply military. There has been a report released which indicates that the present program of military defense has been cut and limited, because of inflation, to the tune of $3,000,000,000 of additional cost. In other words, we are appropriating a certain amount of money for the Air Force, but the price of materials has gone up so drastically that instead of getting a balanced schedule on the basis of dollar appropriations, we are getting fewer materials for the money appropriated. So I make the suggestion that mobilization means more than military mobilization; it means the cracking down which needs to be done by Government and which the Congress did not do when it refused to control speculation on the commodity exchange, and when we permitted scandalous profiteering at the expense of American security.

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

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

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

Mr. LODGE. Oh, yes.

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

Mr. LODGE. That is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I do not believe we can do that. I commend the Senator from Massachusetts for his courageous approach, and I join with him, not on the basis of partianship, but as an American. We cannot have this half-hearted effort in military and economic mobilization and have any semblance of security.

Mr. LODGE. That is true. The whole United States is on a terrible spot. We have never before been in a similar situation in our history. We have always been either at war or at peace. We are not at peace today; we are in a state of alert. We are in a limited war in Korea, which has been an extremely dreadful thing, and we find ourselves as a people, all 150,000,000 of us, in the same

boat, confronting a challenge the exact nature and outline of which have not been made clear to us.

I am not criticizing anyone for that. All I am saying is that we shall not get out of this vale of tears through which we are traveling at the moment unless we make a real major effort. We can make a major effort, I think, and still avoid expanding the war into a big one, but we shall not accomplish anything if we drag along in a sort of condition of perpetual military inadequacy.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am sure the Senator recalls a recent statement of one of the great men of our time, General Bradley, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, in which he said he had observed that some 6 or 7 months ago Congress could not get going fast enough, but that recently he had observed a letdown, which, of course, is not the opinion of the Senator from Massachusetts. But I think the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff made a very fair observation. In other words, I believe the Congress of the United States, yes, and the administration, are continually pounding into the American people the idea that the limited war in Korea is a matter of buying time. We should be making the most of our time. We are off on some grandiose scheme of where we can win a major operation in some other part of the world, when we should set our house in order before we start to move into other people's property.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. LODGE. I yield to my colleague.

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

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

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

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

Mr. President, we must place this matter of an adequate tactical Air Force second to none in importance. General MacArthur's statement that we are in a global struggle sets it in its proper significance. We must not bungle again on another life-and-death matter. I hope there will be prompt assurance from the administration and the appropriate committees that we will have air power which is able to do the job.

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

If there are no questions, I yield the floor.

CONFIRMATION OF NOMINATIONS IN THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. SALTONSTALL and Mr. MORSE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, at the moment, the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services [Mr. RUSSELL] is not in the Chamber. He has requested that I ask unanimous consent to have the Senate, as in executive session, confirm the nominations of approximately 1,400 graduates of the Naval Academy at Annapolis and graduates of college ROTC courses, so that they may receive their commissions in June. Therefore, from the Committee on Armed Services, I ask unanimous consent to report those nominations, as well as sundry nominations in the Army and in the United States Air Force, and request that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the nominations.

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

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

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Chair.

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

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I rise to discuss the pending bill, but before doing so, I wish to make a few brief comments on the able speech delivered by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. Once again he has performed a great service on the floor of the Senate by calling the attention of the American people to a matter of great moment, which deeply concerns them. It is very important, Mr. President, in these dark hours that Members of Congress make very clear to the American people that the situation is exceedingly serious so far as the security of our country is concerned, and that the time has come when the American people ought to stop talking so much about sacrificing in

other directions and should start to sacrifice on the economic front. I do not know why politicians are so hesitant about telling the American people what their duty is, for that is a part of the job we have in Congress.

I am very much concerned, as I face the various representations which are made to my office these days, about the fact that it appears to be true that millions of our citizens apparently feel that they can have lots of butter at the sacrifice of guns. The time has come when the American people will have to throw a vast amount of wealth into defense, and do it quickly. Moreover, they will have to pay for it now. They cannot justify leaving a legacy to posterity in the form of a tremendous national debt, economic debility, and inflation. The American people ought to be told that, in order to preserve their freedom, they must snap out of it now, and pay as they have never paid before. I do not know why politicians do not tell them that, if they are to remain a free people, they must proceed with the kind of paying which is going to mean a considerable lowering of the standard of living.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield for a question.

Mr. BREWSTER. I am very much impressed with what the Senator from Oregon is saying about the problem. I am wondering what the Senator from Oregon feels, as a member of one of the two committees which are most concerned with giving information to the American public, as to the difficulties with which the public will be faced in forming any sound conclusions in view of the fact that the hearings which are about to be held will be closed hearings.

Mr. MORSE. I had intended to address myself to that subject later in my remarks, but I am perfectly willing to take it up now. In fact, it was one of the points I was leading up to. If the Senator will permit me, I will finish the main point which I was discussing because I use that point as an introduction to my remarks as to the kind of hearings we ought to have on the whole defense program. If the Senator will permit me to finish my major point, I shall reach that question very shortly.

Mr. President, I think we must make it very clear to the American people that they should assume the same attitude of national sacrifice which characterized them on the fateful day of December 7, 1941, when we were shocked into a realization that the safety and security of the Nation were threatened then by the challenge of world fascism. Today they are threatened by the challenge of world communism.

I have made this very clear in my State. The people of Oregon understand my views on this question, and I desire to say from this desk to the people of America today what I have said to the people of my State. We not only must tighten our belts in order to make the economic sacrifices necessary to place this country in a position of security, in support of which the able Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] pleaded so eloquently on the floor of the Senate this afternoon, but I think we must undertake an all-out, full-scale economic and military mobilization for as long a time as may be necessary, in order to make clear to Russia that we intend to make it inadvisable for her to pursue an aggressive course of action, which I think she is clearly threatening on an ever-widening scale in the world today.

That means that all groups—American farmers, American labor, American businessmen; yes, American consumers generally—must come to attention on this question and make it clear to Members of Congress that they are ready to make the economic sacrifices which are necessary.

There was talk on the floor of the Senate this afternoon as to whether or not we can afford a defense budget of $75,000,000,000, $80,000,000,000, $85,000,000,000, or $90,000,000,000. Mr. President, we cannot afford a defense budget of less than that amount. I believe that within the next 24 months the defense budget will have to be more than that amount in order to provide the defense which is necessary. No one will ever convince me that once the American people have a full understanding of the facts in regard to the defense of their country, they are not going to join those of us who are trying to take positive steps to control the unconscionable greed and selfishness which have come to characterize some economic groups in respect to the defense program.

I served on the Preparedness Subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee. I was shocked at the open defiance which we encountered in connection with some of the business establishments dealing with vital war materials. They are making profits the like of which they have never before made in their history, and yet they want more. I am not going to hold my patience much longer, under the ruling of any committee in regard to keeping things secret. If this continues, the time will come when my obligations as a Member of the Senate will make it necessary, in my opinion, for me to serve notice that I shall not be bound to keep secret information dealing with the practices of some groups who, in my opinion, are guilty of unpatriotic commercialism in connection with the defense program. These are days when we are all in the same boat; and we can all sink together if as a people we do not develop quickly the unity which is necessary to meet the necessities of defense.

Mr. President, unfortunately I did not return to the city until after the meeting this morning. I have not been briefed as yet as to what happened in the joint meeting of the Armed Services Committee and the Foreign Relations Committee, except to be advised that in the beginning the hearings are to be behind closed doors. It may be that the first meeting or two should be in executive session, though I should like to hear the arguments even on that point. Insofar as the investigation as a whole is concerned, my position is pretty well known among my colleagues on the Armed Services Committee. I have taken the position that the general policy should be one of holding open hearings, and having executive sessions only when either a witness, the Defense Department, or the chairman of the committee decides that a particular item for discussion is of such a secret nature that in the interest of the people as a whole it should be discussed in executive session.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCMAHON in the chair). Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. Am I to assume from the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Oregon that he means that if he had been present this morning and voting he would have voted for the motion of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] for open public hearings? I know that the Senator from Oregon was unavoidably detained.

Mr. MORSE. I would have voted for a motion for open public hearings. I do not know the wording of the particular motion to which the Senator refers, but the Senator from New Hampshire will recall that the other afternoon I met with him and other Members of the minority party on the Armed Services Committee. At that meeting I announced that I felt that there ought to be open hearings, save and except in connection with questions or subject matters with respect to which either the Armed Services Committee, the witness, or the chairman of the committee should decide that the nature of the issue affected the national security and that therefore the hearings ought to be held in executive session.

We then discussed the possibility of some such procedure as this: Instead of taking the time which would be required to clear the room in order to receive the answer to a question which might be considered so secretive in its implications as to call for an executive session, we could simply lay such questions aside until later in the day. Then, we could clear the room once and take up the questions which had been laid aside.

Mr. BRIDGES. In essence, I may say to the Senator that that was the Hickenlooper motion. The Hickenlooper motion was that we proceed with open hearings; and then, when a matter which affected the security of the country became involved, either in the judgment of the witness or in the judgment of the committee, the discussion of that question would be postponed until an executive session of the committee, when the question could be discussed without endangering the national security.

Mr. MORSE. I would add one suggestion to the point I mentioned the other day as the Senator will recall. In my opinion, there ought to be present a representative of the Military Establishment to advise the committee as to whether or not a particular question might involve the security of the Nation so that when action was taken it would be taken on the basis of the advice of the military. For example, if the Joint Chiefs of Staff said, "This particular question goes to a matter of such military importance that we do not want it

answered in public because we do not desire to acquaint the Soviet Union with the answer," I would take it for granted—and I do not know of a member of the committee who would not follow such a suggestion—that we would be guided by such advice in the questions asked.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

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

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

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

I have been disturbed since I have been in the Senate by the tendency toward secret hearings on the part of the committees of the Senate. I have never voted for one of them. I remember a year and a half or so ago I made quite a fight for an open hearing in the case of a certain investigation. I think time proved me right in that case, and I believe time will prove us right in this case, for we ought to have open hearings on questions which affect the public so vitally as do those to be considered by the two committees sitting jointly.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MAYBANK in the chair). Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

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

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

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

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

Mr. MORSE. I wish to make one more comment. In the second place, I am afraid in this case, as in the past, the hearings will be closed in name only, and not in fact. There is not another Senator on this floor who does not become just as irritated as I do by the kind of pressure that is put on us by telephone calls early in the morning or late at night. "Were you in such and such a committee meeting? What happened?" "Well, I am sorry; it was in executive session." But, Mr. President, you and I know that in some way, somehow newspapermen put a lot of the pieces of the puzzle together, and before we know it they have something that somewhat resembles what happened in the committee meeting. They will say, "Senator X did not reply to this question," or "He says 'I will not confirm or deny.' Senator Y says: 'Maybe that happened, but I will not say whether or not it did.'" The newspapermen are exceedingly intelligent. They do not have to be told very much to know a great deal about what happened. That is their business. They follow the committees. They follow the Senators and Representatives. Sometimes it seems to me they can almost read what happened, by muscle tension.

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

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

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. LONG. In illustration of what the junior Senator from Louisiana had in mind, I refer to the release of the recent correspondence involving the arming of South Korean troops. The junior Senator from Louisiana was alarmed sometime ago to see that the correspondence which was released was complete, in that it told exactly how many rifles, how many machine guns the United States had which could be made available to arm an additional force of South Koreans, or even Chinese Nationalists. It seems to me the least that could have been done when that document was released was to delete the number of the various weapons.

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

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

Mr. MORSE. That is something which does not have anything to do with the question of open hearings. Each member of the committee will be under a very solemn obligation to see to it that he conducts himself in such a way that no secret information will be released.

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

Mr. MORSE. Under the able chairmanship of the Senator from Georgia, I am not at all worried about having come out, in the course of open hearing by the two committees, sitting jointly, any information which should not be divulged. The Senator from Georgia will be such an able guardian of the security of our country in that respect that we will not have a worry about any information which has not been carefully scrutinized becoming public during the course of the hearings. However, from

the standpoint of public opinion, which is requisite for the unity of the people of the country, the American people, in my judgment, should have removed from their minds any doubt that they are going to get all the facts about an issue which has simply rocked the Nation.

Mr. President, I wish to repeat what I said the other evening in a speech I made at Milwaukee on the general problem involved in the MacArthur issue, namely, that I think for too long this administration, on the claim that it has involved security matters, has kept from the American people a great deal of information which should have been made available to the American people. It seems to me that the thinking of the public would be much clearer if the information had been made available. There is a rising tide of demand on the part of the people that not so much information be kept from them. They feel that they are too much in the dark about what is going on. It seems to me that the average citizen recognizes that he should not be told about matters whose publication would endanger the security of the United States, but, week by week, he is discovering that many things which were kept from him some months ago would have been perfectly safe for him to have, and that he would have understood the situation much better if the information had been made available to him.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

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

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

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

WASHINGTON.—Senator TAFT today urged a half-million-man cut in the projected American military forces and a $20,000,000,000 reduction in the mobilization budget, but called for "a more aggressive war in Asia." The present fighting, he said, is "a stalemate war," which the American public, in his opinion, will not tolerate indefinitely. Taft asserted that "a soft war policy" carries danger of ending in "an appeasement peace." Taft asserted his belief that the proposed 3,500,000 strength of the American Armed Forces is "too high" for the economy to support indefinitely.

Mr. President, I simply wished to call the attention of the Senator from Oregon to that statement by the influential Senator from Ohio regarding the kind of situation we are in and the remedy he has for it.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am sure the Senator from Connecticut will not be at all surprised if I dissociate myself from those observations by the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. McMAHON. Knowing the Senator from Oregon as I do, I would not be at all surprised at that, but would think it highly unusual if the Senator from Oregon did not do so.

Mr. MORSE. I do so dissociate myself.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. Let me say that the Senate has had two or three experiences, within the last decade, in dealing with what seems to me to be the problem the Senator from Oregon is discussing.

One of them was the very extensive experience of the so-called Truman committee, presided over by the one who now is the President of the United States. That committee conducted a series of investigations while we were in the death throes of the war; and those of us who were members of the committee repeatedly held open, public hearings dealing with all phases of our production program and going into almost all of its details. We found it entirely expedient, when there arose any matters such as those the Senator from Oregon has referred to—material which could be regarded as "classified"—to set aside that procedure. The then presiding genius of that committee, Senator Truman, now President Truman, handled the situation in cooperation with the committee and the counsel, but at the same time gave out the fullest possible information to the American people, information covering 90 percent of all matters dealt with by the committee, which revealed the derelictions of those in authority, which were repeatedly and mercilessly exposed by him, even though they reached into the very purlieus of the White House.

In the second place, we had the Pearl Harbor investigation, presided over by the one who now is Vice President of the United States and the President of the Senate. On both those committees I served; and in the latter case I saw the then Senator BARKLEY, now Vice President BARKLEY, repeatedly handle the difficult and delicate probing into of the activities incident to Pearl Harbor and the diplomatic and military problems associated with Pearl Harbor. He did so with the same finesse, thereby excluding the 5 or 10 percent of the information which should have been kept secret, but at the same time giving to the people generally the 90 percent as it came.

We have had another—and even more recent—illustration of the situation to which the Senator from Oregon has been referring. That occurred a year or more ago when he militantly attacked the executive hearings held by a rather popular and attractive committee which was concerned with the investigation of certain charges. The committee held executive sessions on those matters. The catastrophic results of that policy, so far as it affected some of those who were immediately concerned with it, are still reverberating throughout the Nation. It seems that if they had heeded the warning of the Senator from Oregon a year ago and had taken to heart the results of the experience of the Truman committee and the Pearl Harbor committee which was headed by the present Vice President, Mr. BARKLEY, they would have avoided the difficulties which arose in connection with that committee hearing, and which had the Nation virtually convulsed.

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

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

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

It is very much to be hoped—and I gather that the Senator from Oregon

concurs and agrees—that further consideration will be given to this matter, so that there may be a fair presentation by the ladies and gentlemen of the press as to why the proposed procedure is not practicable or desirable—with the result that a change will occur, so that although the 5 or 10 percent of the material presented at the hearings which may be said to be top-secret material will be kept secret with the committee and with the executive departments concerned, yet, as the Senator has indicated, meanwhile the customary course will be permitted in the case of the great bulk of the information which will come out in regard to the myriad of matters about which there should be no concealment.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. MORSE. I have not had a chance to talk to anyone. I have just returned to the Capitol.

Mr. WHERRY. I thought perhaps the Senator had.

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

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

Mr. WHERRY. That was my second question.

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

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

Mr. MORSE. That is my opinion.

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

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

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

Mr. President I have one other little matter upon which I wish to comment for a moment or two before I undertake a very brief prepared speech which I have on the farm-labor bill now pending before the Senate. In view of the mail which I have been receiving recently it occurs to me that I should express myself as a member of the Armed Services Committee. In doing so I am expressing only my personal opinion, but I feel I should state my views with respect to the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Gen. Omar N. Bradley. The American people should be told by some one who has had an opportunity to observe General Bradley in a good many committee hearings, both in public and in the executive sessions of our committee, that at least, so far as I am concerned, they have every right to have complete confidence in the great general who is Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Speaking only for myself, but on the basis of many opportunities to observe him and test him and check him, I say there is no military officer in this country with stars on his shoulders in whom I have greater confidence than I have in Omar N. Bradley. He is an exceedingly able military man. He is a completely honest witness before our committees, and, in my opinion, it would be constitutionally impossible for Omar N. Bradley ever to express a thought which did not represent his honest judgment.

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

Mr. MORSE. In a moment I will yield. Any reflection on Omar N. Bradley by anyone, leaving the impression, as many people seem to have the impression, from the mail which I have been receiving, that he is a military and political figurehead simply cannot be squared with the facts. In this critical hour, in the absence of facts, it is a disservice to shake the confidence of the American people in their Joint Chiefs of Staff, when upon the work of that great body of military men depend the security and the lives of millions of American citizens.

Mr. President, as we go into the hearings which are about to be convened, I desire to be one at least who raises his voice in expressing confidence in the Joint Chiefs of Staff. I have checked into the speech which General Bradley made in Chicago the other night, and I find that the major views expressed in that speech were already a matter of written record, contained in a magazine article which General Bradley had previously written and published.

I also have in mind the speech General Bradley made in North Carolina some weeks ago in which he forewarned the American people as to the great dangers which confront us. Someone should point out, Mr. President, that the job of the Joint Chiefs of Staff involves the defense of America not only in one segment of the world, but on a global basis, and it also involves a coordinating of the military policy of the Nation with our foreign policy. If they are not coordinated, we shall find ourselves in such a position that our security will be greatly weakened by inconsistencies and irreconcilables which develop in connection with our policies.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to say to the Senator from Oregon that I have the utmost confidence in General Bradley's integrity of statement regarding military questions and regarding matters which he believes come within the military purview. I have seen no reason to doubt any statement of his at any time, either before a committee or in private conversation.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts. I completely agree with his observation, and I am glad to have him thus bear out the major thesis of this part of the speech which I am making.

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

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

I desire to say, Mr. President, as one whose record shows he has disagreed with the administration in respect to a great many of its policies in Asia, that I started disagreeing with the administration on the floor of the Senate on July 28, 1945, in a major speech regarding the then Korean situation. Following through, step by step, I was in disagreement not only on the evacuation of Korea, but, before that, on the very partition of Korea itself. I was in disagreement with the administration because we did not build our strength in Korea much greater than we did, and I was in fundamental disagreement in January 1950, with the announced policy as to what our front line of defense would be in the Pacific.

There was a long-standing disagreement with the administration with reference to neutralizing the forces of the Nationalist Chinese Government. I have not been one who has held any brief for the leaders of the Nationalist Chinese Government, but, rather, I have been one who has felt that they, more than anyone else, are responsible for the loss of China to the Communists, because they did not put into effect the economic reforms which I think it was their duty to put into effect while, at the same time, they were getting economic aid from the United States.

In spite of those disagreements with the administration on Asiatic policy, Mr. President, I have also been one who has been very much opposed, and still am, to our starting an all-out major engagement on the mainland of China until we are ready to back up any such offense as that. I await the hearings which are about to start for proof that I am wrong.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield for a question.

Mr. MAYBANK. I wanted to ask the Senator if he voted for the 70-group air force several years ago?

Mr. MORSE. I did.

Mr. MAYBANK. Would the Senator object to my making an observation?

Mr. MORSE. I have no objection, if no other Senator objects, and if I do not lose the floor thereby.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I join with the Senator in his statement with respect to General Bradley. I had great confidence in him throughout the last war.

I was impressed by the article in this morning's newspaper regarding the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] and the 120-group air force. The Senator from Oregon was a member of the committee, and we both supported the 70-group air force. I intend to support any bill coming before the Senate which will give us even greater air power.

I agree with the Senator from Oregon that we do not know exactly how strong our air power is in comparison with that of other nations.

I was one who regretted the dreadful mistakes made in the demobilization program of 1946, 1947, 1948, and 1949, during which the fleet was placed in mothballs, where, largely, it still remains. Air bases were closed down; the manufacture of airplanes was stopped until a small loan was made to Glenn Martin to enable him to continue his operations. The Army was demobilized. That is one of the main reasons why we find ourselves in the position in which we are today. As I look back upon those days when I was a member of the Military Affairs Committee, later the Armed Services Committee, and when I was a member of the Committee on Appropriations, I admire and respect the Senators who tried their best to do their duty when Secretary of Defense Johnson wanted, as I saw it, to carry the curtailment even further.

Mr. President, I congratulate and commend the Senator from Oregon, because I know he did all he could on the Senate floor to keep America strong. I understand, from what the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] has said, a speech was made today that we must reduce the size of the military. Very frankly, I think the great weakness of our international policy is the weakness of our armed services, which I hope we shall build up stronger and stronger as the days go by.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I deeply appreciate the remarks of the Senator from South Carolina, and I pay him no idle compliment when I say that when he was a member of the Armed Services Committee he was a constant fighter for a stronger defense program for the United States. It was a matter of regret to me that we sometimes did not find ourselves in the majority in support of the program for which the Senator from South Carolina consistently fought.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. With reference to the discussion earlier in the day by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] and other Senators relative to the air power of the country, the Senator from Oregon, I am sure, has not overlooked the fact that the President of the United States appointed a very able commission to study the question of air power. It was headed by Mr. Finletter, who subsequently became Secretary of the Air Force. The group recommended to the Nation and to Congress that the very minimum which the Nation should have for its security was 70 air groups. I am sure the Senator will recall that during the same year a joint aviation committee was appointed, consisting of representatives of both Houses of Congress. The committee came to the same conclusion, namely, that 70 air groups should be the absolute minimum for the security of this Nation. Yet, the fact of the matter is that the President of the United States, supported by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, finally determined that we should not have 70 air groups, but 45 air groups.

When the House of Representatives increased the number to 55 groups, the matter came before the Senate. The Senator will recall that during the debate on the appropriation bill I offered an amendment which would have raised the number from 45 groups to the higher figure, so that we could at least get what the House had agreed on. I believe the Senator from Oregon voted for the amendment. A number of Senators now present did so.

In all frankness and fairness, I must say to the Senators who voted against the amendment that between the time the House of Representatives acted on the appropriation bill and the matter came before the conference committee, a group of Senators had gone to the White House, where they were told by the President of the United States that if the number was increased he would freeze the amount so that it would not go above 45 groups. I think the RECORD ought to be absolutely clear that, despite the very able report of the Finletter Commission and the report of the combined congressional committee, the President of the United States, long after the Berlin blockade and long after the threat against Greece and Turkey, determined on his own initiative and on that of his Joint Chiefs of Staff to freeze the air power of this country at 45 groups, and that they did not change their position until the aggression in Korea had occurred.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am very glad the Senator from California has made this statement for the RECORD. There is no doubt about the fact that the executive branch of the Government has made serious mistakes in the whole defense program. The one he has mentioned is a good example.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

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

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

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

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES RECEIVED

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

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

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

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

Richard T. Rives, of Alabama, to be United States circuit judge, fifth circuit, vice Leon McCord, retired.

By Mr. RUSSELL, from the Committee on Armed Services:

Daniel K. Edwards, of North Carolina, to be Assistant Secretary of Defense, vice Marx Leva, resigned.

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

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

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

RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION—W. STUART SYMINGTON

The legislative clerk read the nomination of W. Stuart Symington to be Administrator of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, very often I have been charged with unduly criticizing the administration about its appointments in the executive departments. I should like to say on the floor of the United States Senate that I think the appointment of W. Stuart Symington is a good one. I am not saying that I agree with everything that is being done in connection with the Reconstruction Finance Corporation; but I do wish to say that, as appointments come and go, I hope that those who so freely criticize me as being against many appointments will at least give me credit for forcefully saying what I think.

I am in favor of the nomination of Mr. Symington, and I hope it will be confirmed by the Senate. If we could have more appointments like that of Mr. Symington we would make progress. If there were at the head of the Department of State one who could fill that position as ably as Mr. Symington functions in his office, perhaps we would have more unity in the United States of America. I am in favor of the confirmation of Mr. Symington's nomination.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, and on my own behalf, I am happy that the Senator from Nebraska feels as he does about the distinguished gentleman from Missouri who will head the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for as long as it may exist.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I am happy to hear the praise that has been given Mr. Stuart Symington's nomination. The President of the United States is being complimented for nominating a man as thoroughly qualified as Mr. Symington, and it is a pleasure to hear such comments, particularly from the other side of the aisle. I personally agree that Mr. Symington is one of the ablest men in or out of government, and the people of the United States are fortunate that he has been prevailed upon to give of his great talents and ability in the public service. I am glad that Mr. Symington is to continue in the service of his country.

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

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

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

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

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

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

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

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

That completes the Executive Calendar.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

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

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

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

REMOVAL OF GENERAL MACARTHUR—OPEN OR CLOSED HEARINGS

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

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I had hoped, in view of the remarks of other Senators, to have a few words to say this afternoon on the question of open or closed hearings of the committee which is investigating the facts and circumstances surrounding the removal of General MacArthur from his several commands in the Far East. I have a record of the hearings of the Committee on Armed Services, at which the hearings referred to were ordered and arranged. I believe they clearly demonstrate that no partisanship at all was involved in the decisions made. When I, as chairman, was insistent that General MacArthur be given an opportunity to address Congress as well as be heard before the committee, the committee was unanimous in its views that the hearings be conducted in closed session. No other thought was expressed or indicated by any member of the committee at that time. All correspondence with General MacArthur looking to his appearance was carried on in the belief and on the theory that the hearings would be held in executive session.

I do not desire to interrupt the remarks of the Senator from Oregon at this time, if he desires to continue. I shall be glad to defer my statement until tomorrow. I have an appointment for 5 o'clock, but I should like to proceed for approximately 10 minutes, if the Senator would be so generous as to yield to me that much time——

Mr. MORSE. I am very happy to yield to the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that the Senator from Oregon asks unanimous consent, without his losing the floor, to yield to the Senator from Georgia to speak for 10 minutes. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Georgia may proceed.

Mr. RUSSELL. I undertook to approach this matter without the slightest idea or tinge of partisanship. The consultations which I had with respect to calling the committee together were had with Republican members of the committee. I did not consult with the White House or with any representative of the administration. I did not confer with General MacArthur or with any of his representatives. I knew that an event had transpired which would stir the emotions of the American people. I believed that the Committee on Armed Services had a very definite responsibility to look into and to make a full inquiry as to the facts and circumstances which surrounded and caused the event. The committee was called together and we discussed the subject. I had no one to protect in the hearings; nor did I have the slightest desire to smear anyone.

When the committee met I stated my views very briefly. I saw to it that every member of the committee present had an opportunity to express himself before I would permit the committee to vote on any motion which was made at that

hearing. Senators who have spoken today about the terrible injustice which has been done the people of the country because of the hearings which are being commenced in executive session had an opportunity to be heard then, with all their eloquence.

As a matter of fact, the first suggestion that the hearings should be held in executive session came from a Republican member of the committee. I shall not call his name. However, the transcript of the hearing bears out the statement that the first member of the committee who suggested that the hearings should be in executive session was a very distinguished leader in the Republican Party. Other members discussed it.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUTLER of Maryland in the chair). Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Until the last sentence which the Senator spoke I was rather confident that he was referring to me; but I was not quite sure after the last sentence. However, inasmuch as my name was used and inasmuch as I think the Senator was referring to me, I will say very frankly that when we held that hearing I did believe that we should have executive sessions. That was the first day, as I remember it, after the news came out, and before General MacArthur spoke before the Congress.

After the general spoke before the Congress, and when it was perfectly obvious that tremendous interest was aroused, and there was great emotional interest among the people of the country, I, very frankly, changed my mind. I believe that we should have public hearings. I say that very frankly, because I have the utmost respect for the chairman, and I know that he tries to be loyal in carrying out the committee's desire.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator for relieving me of any embarrassment in connection with the mention of his name.

This meeting occurred on the 13th of April. I have forgotten the exact date of General MacArthur's address to the Congress. I think it was the 17th, but I am not positive as to that. Today is the 30th day of April. Though I had stated in the press that at the direction of the committee this would be an executive hearing of General MacArthur unless he expressed a desire for it to be held in open session, today, when the two committees met and the vote was had upon this question, that was the first time I knew that the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] had changed his opinion.

I was in the position of the leader of a group of men going forth into battle. We had met and agreed upon the plans of the campaign. We advanced toward our objective—the hearings—in accordance with the plans which were formulated. When the firing started I found that my associates, who had advanced so bravely with me, and who had suggested the plans for the contest, had not only deserted the colors, but were arrayed on the side of the enemy. That is why I was so startled today by what transpired in the meeting of the two committees.

Mr. President, here is the record. The distinguished Senator from Massachuetts having made his statement, I can point out that, as appears on page 3, he was the first one who mentioned anything about an executive hearing. He said:

> I sincerely hope that this committee will take the lead, through its chairman, for whom we all have the greatest respect, in doing his utmost to have General MacArthur and the other people whom you have mentioned—

The "you," referring to me—

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

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

Mr. President, I do not desire to read all the record of the hearing. The distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], who today is so determined that the hearings should all be in open session, stated, when he was asked the specific question whether they should be in open session or executive session:

> I am troubled about that question, Senator BYRD. I think the general's wishes should prevail. If the general wants an executive session because he feels the things he is to discuss would involve the security of the Nation, we should follow his wishes. If, on the other hand, the general said he would like to have part of it in executive session and part of it in public, we ought to follow that.

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

I have always believed that the objective of any honest legislative inquiry is to discover the truth. Every Member who has had any considerable experience in dealing with restricted documents knows that the discovery of the truth is greatly complicated, if not completely defeated, by having a part of the hearings in open session and a part in closed session, some of them before the television cameras, with men under tension and likely to ask some question which is predicated or based upon one of the secret documents.

That was the tenor of the statements which were made at the meeting when it was agreed that the hearings should be held in executive session.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I prefer to complete my statement. However, I yield to my friend from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. I wish to ask one question. Does not the Senator feel that we can get the truth in open hearings?

Mr. RUSSELL. We cannot get it in the continuity in which we should get it unless we wish to disregard the lives and safety of American soldiers and the future welfare of this Nation.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I am not taking issue with the Senator with regard to any secret information. No one has a corner on that. I am asking about the statement which the Senator made. Does not the Senator feel that we can get the truth in open hearings?

Mr. RUSSELL. Not without endangering the national security.

Mr. WHERRY. I am referring to matters which are not vital to the national security.

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

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

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

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

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

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

However, with respect to certain broad questions of national defense policy, and the distribution of the national defense dollar, I believe that the American people will get the truth as they would like

to have it, when the facts are on the table. I believe that in his heart our distinguished chairman knows that open hearings, conducted as he can conduct them, ably as any other Member of this body could conduct them, would result in disclosing the facts, and enable us to get the truth. The truth will enable us to unite the people more quickly than would be the case if we tried to interpret the cold record of a transcript, as we are trying to do here today.

Mr. RUSSELL. So the Senator from Nebraska differs with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. He wants to put the hearings on television and on the radio.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not know anything about what the Senator from Ohio wants. I am speaking as the junior Senator from Nebraska.

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

Mr. WHERRY. The Republicans have had no conference on this subject.

Mr. RUSSELL. I said a policy meeting.

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

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

Mr. WHERRY. If the distinguished Senator from Ohio called a policy meeting to act on that question, I was not aware of it. He might have done so. I was not at any such meeting. Had one been held, the Senator from Nebraska would have been there. I have been at no meeting called by the Republicans on policy matters such as the distinguished Senator is talking about. In fact, every Republican I have talked to, and every Republican who has spoken today on this floor has completely disassociated himself from any partisan politics in the matter of open hearings.

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

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

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

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

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator will be treated fairly.

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

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Nebraska is a very able debater, but it will be many a day before he will be able to tie the shoestrings of Douglas MacArthur when it comes to speaking for Douglas MacArthur.

Mr. WHERRY. I agree with that.

Mr. RUSSELL. I gave General MacArthur his option of appearing in open or closed hearing. I told him that we had planned to have the hearing in executive meeting, just exactly as the committee voted, unless he expressed a desire to the contrary. And now the Senator from Nebraska says that the general does not know exactly what he ought to do. The Senator says we ought to have open hearings even if the general had not requested open hearings.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I have had no consultation with General MacArthur. I do not know what his wishes are. When the Senator from Georgia spoke to me I thought he said the committee would finally make that determination. In fact I am quite sure the Senator said that.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am quite sure I did not make any such statement at all.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator did not privately?

Mr. RUSSELL. No.

Mr. WHERRY. I misunderstood the Senator. I thought the Senator said MacArthur had not responded, and that the Senator would let the committee decide.

Mr. RUSSELL. No, I made no such statement, because when I went out of the committee——

Mr. WHERRY. No, I mean to the junior Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. RUSSELL. No, I made no such statement.

Mr. WHERRY. If the Senator says he did not, then I must say I misunderstood him. I am not talking about a meeting. I am talking about a consultation I had with the distinguished Senator from Georgia. I understood him to say that he had submitted the matter to General MacArthur, that he had not heard from him, and that if he did not hear from him he would let the committee decide whether it wanted open or closed hearings.

Mr. RUSSELL. No, I made no such statement. This is what I said to General MacArthur. I had a few communications with General MacArthur.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator had more than I had.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. I have had none.

Mr. RUSSELL. I think I wired him five times, in addition to talking to him about this hearing when he was here. I had a brief moment with him to discuss it with him then. And every telegram I sent to him that mentioned the type of hearing that was to be had mentioned "in executive session." When he finally accepted I wired him to this effect:

> In accordance with your suggestion we have fixed hearing for Thursday, May 3, at 10 o'clock. Unless you express desire to the contrary, hearing will be in executive session.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. If the distinguished Senator from Georgia now says that he had no such conversation with me, then I want to say that I misunderstood the Senator. I will accept his word at 100 cents on the dollar.

With respect to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], I wish to read from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 26, 1951, what he said on the floor of the Senate. The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] had the floor, and at the request of the Senator from Ohio yielded to him. Then the Senator from Ohio stated:

> Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, it was stated yesterday that I advocated television and radio reports of hearings on the MacArthur matter. I advocated nothing of the kind. I advocated public hearings. My personal opinion is that if I were conducting the hearings I would not permit radio and television coverage. No such suggestion was made by the Republican policy committee.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am quite confident the Senator from Ohio—I will not say with certainty because men are easily mistaken about what transpires in a hurried conference off the floor of the Senate—but if I mistake not he told me himself that the policy committee had taken that position. But I do know that several representatives of the press came to my office saying they had just had an interview with the Senator from Ohio following a Republican policy committee meeting, and that the members of the committee had taken the position that the hearings should be open. I know that transpired. There cannot be any question about it, because I was in my own office and seated there, where I could not possibly have been mistaken about that statement.

Mr. WHERRY. I will not labor the matter any more. I have just read what the Senator from Ohio stated on the floor of the Senate. Of course, the Senator from Georgia has a right to his own personal opinion. I have no knowledge of any action taken by the policy committee on this matter. It is not a partisan question. The way to get at the truth is to have open hearings where the story can be told. I am not advocating any open hearings on matters involving the security of the United States. But, in view of the fact that these issues have been raised, and in view of the fact that the people of the United States now know the recommendations of General MacArthur, I believe it is of interest, and of importance in order to secure the unity of the people, to let General MacArthur testify in open hearings—that portion at least of the testimony which I think would be of interest in the national defense of the country. When it comes to matters of national security, the Senator from Georgia very well knows that the hearings can be held in such a fashion that there will be no violation of any classified information relating to the national security.

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

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

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

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

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; I yield.

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

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I would that the light had appeared to the distinguished Senator on the occasion of the meeting of the committee on April 13 when we arranged these hearings, and when he was advocating executive sessions in order to protect the security of the United States.

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

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

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

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course not.

Mr. KNOWLAND. As the Senator has pointed out, there is not a member of the committee, on either the Democratic side or the Republican side, who does not recognize that, obviously, matters dealing with the national security, matters dealing with security problems, matters dealing with current military operations, cannot be discussed in open committee sessions.

However, I realize that that is not the issue.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. President, I have not prepared a statement to present at this time. I was somewhat interested in the remarks that the cold, written record could not convey what would take place at the hearings. I could not reconcile that statement with the position of the Senator from Ohio, who on occasion is considered the leader, or at least one of the leaders, on the other side of the aisle, because if we hold the hearings in public, unless we rent the baseball park, we shall have the hearings in the Senate caucus room, in the Senate Office Building. In that case, what will the American people generally get except the cold, written record? As everyone knows, in that case the only persons who would be able to obtain admittance to that room would be perhaps the wives of Senators or the best friends of Senators. After representatives of the press had been accommodated there, not more than 200 persons could possibly be admitted to that room. The result would be that the American people as a whole would still have to rely on the cold, written record, unless television or radio were used.

Mr. President, I have wished to have the hearing proceed in a thorough, complete, and dignified manner, in an effort to obtain the facts. However, if we are going to have open hearings, I disagree with the Senator from Ohio. In that case we ought not play favorites by simply letting 200 people attend the hearings. If we are going to run the risk of exposing to our enemies the most vital secrets this Nation has, let it be done before the television and before the radio, and not just depend on the

two representatives of Pravda who would attend those hearings to carry the secrets to the Kremlin. Let the news go out generally, because those who oppose our Nation would get the secret information just as completely from the two press representatives who would attend the hearings as they would from the radio and the television, but in the meantime the American people would be denied an opportunity to see the show.

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

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

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

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

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

Would not the Senator from Georgia agree that it would be a great help in getting at the true state of facts, which all of us want to get at, and in working out the decisions from those facts, and would not much of our problem be eliminated, if the President or high officials of the present administration were to request General MacArthur to come into conference with them? Then they could see if, after talking with him face to face across the table, they could work out such policies which would justify the statement, from both General MacArthur and the high officials of the Government, that they were in accord and were working together on policies in relation to the Far East. Would not that eliminate many of the present difficulties and give the people a great deal of confidence? Would it not also eliminate many of our problems, if such a request came from the administration? It could not come from General MacArthur under present circumstances.

Would the Senator care to express an opinion on that subject?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I am not sure whether I understand the Senator from Massachusetts——

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I do not blame the Senator at all if he does not understand what I have just said.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not know whether the Senator from Massachusetts has adopted the Stassen proposal or whether he wishes to have television and radio coverage of a meeting between President Truman and General MacArthur. I do not care to comment on the Stassen proposal.

I wish to say to the Senator from Massachusetts that, unfortunately, I am not able to arrange conferences at the White House in regard to such matters, and the White House has never asked to confer with me on matters of this kind. I know Mr. Stassen made a very cogent and sensational statement about this matter. Everyone "wants in" on this matter, and I am not surprised that Mr. Stassen came out with his proposal.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It seems to me that if there could be such a conference man to man, across a table, and if there could be a sufficient meeting of the minds by high officials in the administration and General MacArthur, we could then go forward in a united effort with great understanding and approval by responsible persons holding the various points of view. Much would be gained by such a meeting of minds, and many of our problems in the Congress would be eliminated. I ask the Senator's opinion on that.

Mr. RUSSELL. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts that, as I have said heretofore, I cannot arrange that; but if the Senator can get up any scheme which will get me out of the necessity of conducting these hearings, a plan which will unify the American people, and which will make it unnecessary for us to go through all this inquiry, he will have my most ardent support. I am the one person who does not expect to gain anything from the MacArthur hearings. I think I am in a game in which I cannot win.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one more question?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Does not the Senator agree that what we want today is as complete unity and understanding as possible on the part of the leaders of the Government as to the policies with relation to the Far East, so that the people of the United States, the mothers and fathers of the boys who are in Korea, the mothers and fathers of the boys who are in the Army anywhere, will have confidence in the leadership of our armed services, and confidence that we are going forward, not with a difference of opinion, but with an understanding on the part of those who command?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am all with the Senator in seeking unity. That was exactly the point I hand in mind when I called the committee together to make plans for the hearing. It was to get unity in the committee. My desire was that we be united, and not have partisanship in the hearings. For that reason I called the committee together and got all the members to express their views. Then, when the motion was made the second time, by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the motion was, as I read it from the record:

> That the program as outlined by the chairman, which I understand is to invite General MacArthur and others to testify before the committee, be approved, with the understanding that the details and conditions, et cetera, will be in the hands of the chairman.

Mr. President, I did not put that motion just then. In the interest of unity, I undertook to outline what I thought was the proper program for the committee. So I then made this statement:

> I want to make this statement of my views on that. It was my opinion we should invite General Marshall over here, the Secretary of Defense, as the first witness. I think that hearing should be in executive session.
>
> Senator SALTONSTALL. No question about it.

I then proceeded:

> After we go through these hearings, we can have the record combed for security matters rather rapidly, and I think you can always get the evidence out within 24 hours if you desire to take that course, without endangering the matter of security. It is my purpose further—

I was seeking unity, Mr. President—

> In the absence of any contrary action by the committee, to suggest to General MacArthur that his appearance be in executive session, at least the first meeting, but leave it to him in the last analysis if he wishes to appear at a public hearing.

Yes, Mr. President, I am all for unity. I was seeking unity then, and, after that statement was made, the committee approved the motion unanimously, knowing what plans had been made for the hearing of General MacArthur. But then unity ended through no fault of mine.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Was that not just about what the Senator told me—"You can leave it to the committee"?

Mr. RUSSELL. I did not tell the Senator that about General MacArthur, because the Senator from Oregon suggested that General MacArthur have his option, and for that reason, the option was preserved all the way through to General MacArthur as I read from this telegram here; and certainly I would not have undertaken to deceive the Senator, when I had told General MacArthur in the telegram that we would hold an open hearing if he expressed any desire for it.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I may say that what the Senator has just read confirms, in my judgment, what he told the junior Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. RUSSELL. If the Senator from Nebraska can get any consolation from that——

Mr. WHERRY. I can get a little.

Mr. RUSSELL. I said that I planned to have the hearings in executive session, if the motion carried.

Mr. WHERRY. "Leave it to the committee."

Mr. RUSSELL. I did not say a word about leaving it to the committee. We were agreeing on procedures then.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator was trying to get unity. He was going to get unity, and he was talking to the committee.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator was asking the members of the committee to help him decide what he was to do.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. That was the point.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator from Georgia agrees, does he not, that we could not hear General Marshall in

executive session and then hear General MacArthur in open session, if that were his expressed desire, but that we either had to hear all the officials in open session, or hear all the officials in closed session. I shall not speak for anyone but myself, but I agree with the Senator that, at the time the committee discussed the matter, there was a feeling that we could not do it that way, but does not the Senator agree that since then it appears that it would be much more difficult to hold the hearings in executive session, and give the people of the country confidence that we were getting at the truth?

Mr. RUSSELL. It is much more difficult, but I apprehended that at the time I made the statement. It so happens that I have been privileged to know General MacArthur quite a while. His magnificent effort in the House was no surprise to me. I know that General MacArthur was a man who had a fine presence, and a magnificent command of the English language. He swept this Nation from one end to the other by his appearance before the Congress. That may have changed the situation in the minds of some Senators because many by reason of what people said, "We want to see more of MacArthur on the television." There may be a greater demand since then for public hearings. But certainly the basic issues involved of protecting the security of the Nation have been in no wise affected merely because General MacArthur made such a magnificent appearance before the Congress, because he made such a magnificent speech at Chicago, and because he will have the opportunity to speak in public anywhere he pleases in the United States. He has spoken; he has given us his program in public, and now the principal thing which remains to this committee is to go into the classified and secret matters which will cast light upon the program which he outlined before the country so eloquently in the Hall of the House of Representatives.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Is not the issue now the welfare of the country?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is the only purpose I seek to serve—the protection of the public interest.

Mr. CHAVEZ. It is beyond the matter of personalities, even as to the President and the general, is it not?

Mr. RUSSELL. I have sought to keep it that way. I have sought to keep away from personalities in this matter.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I congratulate the Senator.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have endeavored to search for the facts, in order that we may have a thorough inquiry. That is the only way we can discover the truth. It cannot be done under klieg lights with secret documents, agreeable as that might be to those who would like to respond to the mail that they have received. I have had a number of letters saying, "If you do not let me see General MacArthur on television when he appears before your committee, I will never be for you again." One dear old lady wrote and said she was bedridden, and because she could not get out, she thought I was cruel to her in not letting her see and hear General MacArthur on the television. I hope the general will appear on television a sufficient number of times to permit all the people to see him and get his views. He is an able man, and they are entitled to have his views. But when we are dealing with secret matters of this nature, it is no time to be putting on a television show from which we cannot exclude agents of our enemies.

Now, after the statement was made that I would suggest to General MacArthur that his appearance be in executive session, the record further shows here that in my effort to be nonpartisan—at that time it had not been agreed that General MacArthur was to address the Congress—and I could read from the RECORD here, showing that I thought some plan should be made, even if the Armed Services Committee had to invite all the Members of Congress to some place where General MacArthur could be heard. That is when I was trying to be fair and trying to be objective and trying to disregard any political considerations. That motion, I may say, was carried unanimously. No one then rose on either side of the aisle to say, "Oh, no, this will never do; the American people must hear all the facts, at an open hearing." That is only the second thought. It all came after the committee had taken action, and after I had moved out in accordance with the unanimous suggestions of my committee, very carefully bringing down to the last scale the suggestion of the Senator from Oregon that we leave to General MacArthur the option as to whether he wanted to appear in open hearings. Then I find that some circumstances have arisen, some events have transpired, some politics have been cooked up, and the views and opinions of men are different.

I felt, Mr. President, in justice to myself and in the attempt I have made to be fair and nonpartisan in the matter, that I should make that statement.

I further wish to offer for the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, the telegram which I sent to General MacArthur and a letter which I wrote on April 13, the same date on which we held the meeting, to the Secretary of State, in which I told him he was expected to be present and that there would be an executive session of the committee, carrying out the will of the committee as it had expressed it. I asked him to transmit to General MacArthur a telegram inviting him to appear before the committee. I stated to General MacArthur that the meeting would be in executive session, and tried to get him to fix a date. There was a little difficulty about that. In my efforts to be nonpartisan, and to eschew all politics, I requested the staff of the committee to show this message to the distinguished ranking minority member of the committee, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. He approved the communication which stated that the hearings were to be held in executive session. When charges start flying around with regard to the hearings, as they will, I can at least console myself by this record which shows that I made, as best I could, with the light before me, an honest effort to start the hearings on a nonpartisan basis and to keep them that way in order that we might spend our time, energies, and efforts, and whatever talent we might possess, in getting at the facts of the matter, rather than in attempting to make political capital out of any part of it.

I ask unanimous consent that these various communications referring to the nature of the hearings be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the communications were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APRIL 13, 1951.

Hon. GEORGE C. MARSHALL,
Secretary of Defense,
The Pentagon, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: The Senate Armed Services Committee has decided by unanimous vote to conduct a full inquiry into the military situation in the Far East and the facts surrounding the relief of General of the Army Douglas MacArthur from his assignment in that area.

The committee requests that you appear at the first hearing, which will be held on Wednesday, April 18, 1951, at 10:30 a. m., in room 212 Senate Office Building. This will be an executive session of the committee.

The committee would also like to hear the views of General MacArthur at the earliest practicable date following your appearance. The general's first appearance before the committee will also be in executive session. Later sessions will be in accordance with the desires of General MacArthur and the committee.

In view of the foregoing I request that you convey the following message to General MacArthur by the most expeditious means of communication available:

"The Senate Armed Services Committee unanimously requests that you appear before it to give your views on the military situation in the Far East and the circumstances leading up to your relief from your several commands in that area. The committee plans to hear the Secretary of Defense on Wednesday, April 18, and will schedule a subsequent meeting with you to be held at your convenience. This initial meeting will be in executive session. Additionally, the Armed Services Committee has under consideration extending to all members of the Senate and House of Representatives an invitation to an open meeting with you to hear such views as you may care to express. Please inform me as promptly as possible when you will be available to advise with the committee and whether you are agreeable to appearing at a meeting to which all Members of the Congress will have been invited. Personal regards. Signed, RICHARD B. RUSSELL, United States Senator, chairman, Senate Committee on Armed Services."

I should appreciate it very much if you would inform us as to the time when General MacArthur receives the above message and if you would transmit the reply to me upon receipt.

With assurances of esteem, I am
Sincerely yours,
——— ———, *Chairman.*

From CINCFE, Tokyo, Japan, from General of the Army Douglas MacArthur.
To Department of the Army, Washington, D. C.
(Personal for General Marshall.)

Reur DEF 88528 April 14, please give Senator RUSSELL my personal regards and inform him that I am advised resolutions are pending in Congress inviting me to address a joint session as was done in the cases of

General Eisenhower and Clay and others when they first came from abroad and that until action has been taken on such resolutions I would deem it inappropriate to make any other plans. If such resolutions are approved, I would regard it a great honor and distinction to address the Congress in general terms.

APRIL 14, 1951.

Hon. GEORGE C. MARSHALL,
Secretary of Defense,
The Pentagon, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I wish to thank you for transmitting my previous message to General MacArthur and for sending me the general's reply.

I request that you convey the following message to General MacArthur by the most expeditious means of communication available:

Re your message: Insofar as I am advised, all members of the Senate Armed Services Committee are supporting the resolution for you to address joint meeting of Congress. Suggestion in my wire that committee was considering inviting all Members of the Congress to an open meeting to hear you was made before it became clear that a concurrent resolution might be adopted. Indications are this resolution will be approved on Tuesday the 17th. My first message referred more especially to your appearance before the committee in executive session to discuss with us the matters referred to in that message. We, of course, realize that any invitation extended to you by concurrent congressional resolution will take precedence over committee hearings and understand why you might prefer that your address to the Congress should be in general terms. However, the members of the Armed Services Committee, having definite responsibilities in the field of national defense, wish to discuss with you in executive session matters which might affect security if made public. Please inform me as promptly as possible what dates subsequent to April 18 will be convenient for you to meet with the committee. Regards. Signed RICHARD B. RUSSELL, United States Senator, Chairman, Senate Committee on Armed Services.

I should appreciate it very much if you would inform us as to the time when General MacArthur receives the above message and if you would transmit the reply to me upon receipt.

With assurances of esteem, I am,
Sincerely yours,
——— ———, *Chairman.*

From CINCFE, Tokyo, Japan, signed MacArthur.

To Department of the Army, Washington, D. C.

(Personal for General Marshall.)

Reference your 88565. Please convey to Senator RUSSELL my regards and state that I will be available to appear before the Senate Armed Services Committee at any time after I have addressed the Congress in accordance with the concurrent resolution to that effect.

General of the Army DOUGLAS MACARTHUR,
Hotel Waldorf-Astoria,
New York, N. Y.:

The Committee on Armed Services appreciates the desire of millions of our fellow citizens to express their deep sense of gratitude for your outstanding contributions to the welfare and security of our Nation. We are also mindful of the continuing importance of the committee having the benefit of your advice and counsel at the earliest practicable time, as set forth in my previous communications, and in our conversation here last Thursday. We would like to hear you at an executive session to be called at 10:30 a. m., April 30, 1951, in Room 212, Senate Office Building. The delay already occasioned in the scheduling of hearings has caused some criticism in the Congress, and as chairman of the committee I deem it important that you be here on April 30 if this can be accomplished without undue inconvenience to you on account of other commitments which you may have previously made and which you feel it would be inappropriate for you to forego. The Committee on Foreign Relations desires to sit with the Committee on Armed Services during these hearings and this will undoubtedly be arranged. The text of this telegram has not been made public by me or my conferees.

RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
United States Senator,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services.

(At 9:48 a. m. General Reber conveyed the following message from General MacArthur for Senator RUSSELL, which was received through Secretary Marshall. General Reber will send the official copy over right away.)

Thank you very much for your courteous message. I had planned to visit my ancestral home in Milwaukee on Friday, going by way of Chicago, and on Monday, April 30, had planned to take Mrs. MacArthur to her old home in Murfreesboro, Tenn., returning thence to New York. This would complete my immediate commitments and I could appear before your committee Wednesday or Thursday of next week if this would be satisfactory. Cordial personal regards.

APRIL 24, 1951.

General of the Army DOUGLAS MACARTHUR,
Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, New York, N. Y.:

Many thanks for your wire. In accordance with your suggestion we have fixed hearing for Thursday, May 3, at 10 o'clock. Unless you express desire to the contrary hearing will be in executive session.

RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
Chairman, United States Senate Armed Services Committee.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. I should like to have the distinguished Senator from Georgia know that I am confident, knowing him as I do, that he will give the public the benefit of every fact that can be given in keeping with the security of the United States and the welfare of the country.

I should like to say also, if I may, that I have the utmost confidence in the Senator's fairness. I know he has no other motive than the safety and welfare of our country.

We talk about unity, Mr. President. Unity is a two-way street. We cannot achieve unity by rising on the floor of the Senate and expressing a lack of confidence in the Joint Chiefs of Staff, who are charged with the planning of the defense of the Nation. When I hear such remarks I become alarmed about what may happen. If we cannot trust those who are charged with the responsibility of planning the fighting in Korea and planning the defense of this Nation, in whom can we place our trust, other than in our Maker? I think it would be well at this time, Mr. President, if we would place a little more trust in Him and do a little bit less talking on the floor, and particularly when such talk tends to raise grave, but completely unwarranted, doubts about competent, trustworthy, experienced, and conscientious men who are performing their duty. I am sure that the people of this Nation will properly construe such remarks to be partisan politics.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator from Arizona has just made a very highly idealistic type of statement, with which I entirely agree. He has stated that unity is a two-way street. It seems to me that the best thing that can come out of this controversy is a better understanding, a more united understanding, by using both sides of that street, particularly by those who are "in the know."

We have the administration on one side, and—I do not like to say it—somewhere, not quite on the same sidewalk, is General MacArthur, who has been in the Far East for 14 years and who has a great deal of knowledge of the subject. If there could be a greater understanding between those two groups, if unity is a two-way street, it seems to me that the troubles of the Senator from Georgia, for whom we all have the utmost of good wishes and good feeling, and in whom we have the greatest confidence, would be eliminated, as would those of other Senators who are on the committee, and the confidence of the American people would be greatly accelerated if that two-way street were brought a little bit more into the center by both groups. It is still possible. As a Senator on this side of the aisle, I pray equally with the Senator from Arizona that it may be accomplished and that from the hearings will come the truth upon which decisions can be based.

Mr. RUSSELL. I share fervently the last wish expressed by the Senator from Massachusetts, that out of these hearings shall come the truth. That is the only objective I have in mind.

Mr. President, I am one of the few Members of the Senate of the United States who never cared particularly to have the chairmanship of a committee. I accepted the chairmanship of the Armed Services Committee when my predecessor, through the vicissitudes of politics, was removed. I felt that I should be shirking a duty if I did not assume the position.

I had no personal interest in conducting any hearings on the MacArthur controversy. I realized then, and shall realize constantly through the hectic days that lie ahead, that there is nothing political that I could gain from it. But I did feel that the Armed Services Committee had a definite responsibility with respect to the question, and I sought to discharge that responsibility. I went about it in as nonpartisan or unpartisan a manner as I knew, and I shall continue to undertake to be absolutely fair in the matter, even though some changes have occurred in others since the date of the meeting to arrange the hearings. I want the American people to get the truth, the whole truth, and I hope it will be nothing but the truth. Certainly I want them to get the truth as to all the facts and circumstances which led up to or which are related to this event. In my opinion, we can better secure it by launching the hearing in executive ses-

sion. If it becomes desirable later to hold open sessions, I shall not oppose it.

But General MacArthur has made his statement before the Congress. We have recently requested secret documents, and I shall request that many more be brought in in order to have all the facts. I have utilized every means at my command, after conferring with experienced representatives of the press, to get the testimony which can go to the people, that which is not affected by secrets which are vital to the security of the Nation, into the hands of the people as rapidly as it can be done. I have arranged for an extra shift of reporters for the committee so that the record can be transcribed almost as rapidly as it is done by the efficient reportorial staff of the Senate.

I have arranged to have a man of rank and experience representing the Defense Department present and to take the record when it is transcribed, together with a representative of the witness, to decide what matters are covered by national security, to eliminate them from the record, and to have another transcript made. Within the past hour and a half I have conferred with representatives of the press in an endeavor to have the testimony released page by page, as soon as the secret matter can be eliminated. There will be no delay in getting the facts to the people. We will get them to the people with a degree of continuity which it would be impossible to achieve if we held open hearings and had to go repeatedly from the caucus room down to the committee room for executive sessions.

I am not undertaking to play politics in this matter. I have set out on a course and I have not deviated from it. I still think it is the proper course. I believe that events will justify the action that has been taken.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I should like to salute the chairman of the committee for the courageous stand he has taken in protecting what I believe to be the vital interests of the Nation. Certainly as a member of the committee, realizing what is transpiring, I, for one, can well understand that he is subjecting himself to a great amount of criticism for doing what in his judgement is vital to protect the very lives of the men who are fighting to save America.

There is no Member of this body whom I have observed to be more sincere and courageous in his point of view, or more independent in fighting against the administration or anyone else when he thought they were wrong. I recall two occasions in the previous Congress when the Senator from Georgia single handedly fought against proposed legislation of the administration, even when it was sponsored by so-called bipartisan groups, because he felt that it was not a course which the Nation should follow. Certainly his record in the past justifies every confidence in him.

I should like to point out also that the Democratic members of the committee who voted solidly with the Senator from Georgia are not members who have been known to follow the line of the Democratic administration. I refer, for example, to the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. He has been known as a man of complete independence. I know he would not support the Senator from Georgia in the position he is taking if he did not have complete confidence in him.

The so-called Kefauver committee has made many disclosures which have been the subject of substantial political capital by those opposing the Democratic administration. The Kefauver committee has never been known to withhold information. Two members of that committee are members of the Committee on Armed Services. I refer to the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT].

Furthermore, there has been much political capital made of the exposures which were made in the State of Mississippi by the Senators from Mississippi. The junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] is also among those who believe that we should back the chairman of the committee in protecting the vital secrets of the Nation.

It seems to come with little grace from some members of the committee, who changed their minds—after they had stated that it was important to keep the vital secrets, so that they would not be available to our enemies—now to say that we should throw all these matters out on the table and risk that any one of the witnesses may drop from his lips, although inadvertently, some vital secrets on which the survival of the United States may depend.

Mr. RUSSELL. The high compliment paid to me by the Senator from Louisiana in the early part of his remarks makes me feel very humble.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. I do not like to interrupt the Senator. I believe that the Senator from Louisiana, in making his statement, is entirely out of order when he says that the members of the committee who voted for open hearings want to make available to the world vital secrets. I have served on the Committee on Armed Services and prior to that on the Military Affairs Committee, and also the Commitee on Appropriations, in which we discussed these subjects for years. No member of those committees has disclosed vital secrets.

Mr. LONG. I did not say it or insinuate it.

Mr. BRIDGES. I am glad to hear the Senator say so.

Mr. LONG. I said such things could happen.

Mr. BRIDGES. I am glad the Senator did not insinuate it.

Mr. RUSSELL. I did not understand the Senator from Louisiana to make any such charge. He suggested that such a thing could flow from open hearings. I agree with him completely. I shall go ahead with the matter and handle it to the best of my ability, seeking the truth at all times. I shall hew to the line and let the chips fall where they may. Whatever disclosures are not tinged with considerations of national security I shall undertake to make available to the American people at the earliest date.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, if the Senator from Georgia will yield, let me say that I am not a member of the committee. I would have liked to be a member, but I am not.

I have been in favor of open hearings since I have been a Member of the United States Senate. There is no exception in this instance. The idea of suggesting on the floor of the Senate that people would drop secrets of national security is beside the point. We have just come through a series of hearings, conducted by the Senator from Texas on the subject of foreign relations, which had to do with global policy. When they got to the point where important information was being asked for, the important witnesses knew when not to give the committee information which involved the national security, and everyone sustained them in it.

I am surprised, I am amazed, that this question should take the course it is taking now. After General MacArthur has laid his recommendations on the table, it seems to me the only thing to do is to hold open hearings on the global national defense policy, and appropriations which the people of the country should support. No one is talking about security matters. No one wants to bring them to light. We want them to be secure. Certainly the American people and Members of Congress have the right to know the facts with respect to global defense policy. Testimony can be taken from General MacArthur and other witnesses without jeopardizing the security of the country.

I have had a great deal of admiration for the distinguished Senator from Georgia, and will continue to have it; but I am surprised when he stands on the floor, regardless of what the committee said on April 13, and implies now that we cannot have open hearings. I am not advocating that the hearings be held in the ball park, or that we put on a show. Certainly I think that if we hold open hearings the public will get the truth. The people need the truth. It is only when people get the truth that they are made free. I should like to have open hearings.

Long before the Senator had his communications with General MacArthur there was talk about whether or not the committee would hold open hearings. I said then, and I now repeat, because nothing has changed my mind, that the hearings ought to be open. I do not mean that we should put on a show. I do not want a show, any more than does any other Senator. To my way of thinking—and I have been here for 9 years—the only way we can get the facts is not by secrecy, secret diplomacy, secret meetings, secret commitments, but by placing the facts on the table. I believe that is what the American people want. I believe a demand should rise up from the American people to get the facts. The only way to get them is by open hearings.

Mr. RUSSELL. I can understand the appeal which the Senator's remarks would have, and they would have a greater appeal to me—although they

are not addressed to me personally, if such arguments had been made before the joint committees heard General Eisenhower in executive session, at which time not a single document of the character I have referred to was used. It was merely the taking of testimony. Yet he was heard in executive session. The Senator from Nebraska was present at the hearing.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. Just a moment, please. His resolution was pending before the committee at that time. The Senator did not take the floor at that time and with great vehemence say we ought to have open hearings for General Eisenhower. It is only when we get to the MacArthur incident that he makes the statement that everything should be held in the open.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. I was not a member of the committee which invited General Eisenhower. If there had been any question raised as to whether or not open or closed hearings should be held, I would have been in favor of holding open hearings just the same.

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course it is easy for the Senator to make that statement, but I will not engage in debate with him on the point. The fact is that the Senator did not do so.

Mr. WHERRY. I was not a member of the committee.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is not a member of the committee now, yet he is undertaking to advise the committee. He says he hopes that the public will rise up and demand open hearings. When we were engaged in hearing General Eisenhower, when the Senator had his resolution pending, which was of great importance, I did not hear him make any such statement. Of course, not quite the same glamour attached to General Eisenhower.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to say to the distinguished Senator from Georgia that I want the RECORD to show that charges have been made that there has been a change.

Mr. RUSSELL. The record proves changes have been made.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. It is said that a change has been made. I am not speaking for members of the committee. I am not a member of the committee, as I have stated. I was not on the committee when General Eisenhower was invited here. But when I understood that possibly General MacArthur would be the only witness to appear before the committee my position was that I thought he ought to speak to the American people. I have not changed my position. I think if we had more generals like MacArthur and Eisenhower speaking to the American people we would be a great deal better off. It is proposed to take down many of the things which they say, in a cold record, and then let it become garbled and interpreted by this man, that man, and someone in the National Defense Establishment, who will say, "This can go in, but that must go out." What would we have left? We would not have the facts which the American people want.

Mr. RUSSELL. If we were to follow that argument to a logical conclusion, if one could be reached——

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator is now becoming personal.

Mr. RUSSELL. It would mean that everything would be in open session, including the secret documents which have been requested.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I am sorry the Senator made his last remark, to the effect that if we were to follow what the Senator from Nebraska has said to a logical conclusion, if it were possible——

Mr. RUSSELL. I did not make that statement; and I will leave it to the record.

Mr. WHERRY. What did the Senator say?

Mr. RUSSELL. I said, following this to a logical conclusion, if it could be reached, we would have to have everything in open session.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not see much difference.

Mr. President, the logical conclusion is that the American people want the facts. The only way we can get them is in open hearings. I hope that the distinguished chairman may reflect upon the demand of the American people and the Congress, who are entitled to know the facts, and that the hearings will be open, so that we may get the facts, which mean so much to the security of the country.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, all the facts will come out in this investigation. I should like to respond to the public clamor as much as would anyone else, but I shall not in any circumstances, whatever the results may be, yield to any demand that a single line of testimony shall come out which will endanger the lives of the lowliest, humblest privates who are risking their lives in behalf of the American people in combat in Korea. We cannot have these hearings in open session without risking not only the lives of those men, but the future security of the Nation.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Does not the Senator from Georgia feel that if some of the documents which have been suppressed for 4 years had been made available to the American people and the American Congress, we would not have risked 60,000 casualties in Korea, with more than 10,000 of them dead? Does not the Senator from Georgia recognize the fact that there has been a consistent policy on the part of the administration to conceal from the Congress and the American people—and we shall document it—information which, if it had been made available to them, might not have resulted in 60,000 casualties?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is certainly on the wrong track if he thinks he can fix on me responsibility for any mistakes made by the administration; but merely because the administration may have made mistakes, I do not intend to compound past mistakes when American lives and the future welfare of the Nation are endangered by holding public hearings on secret documents.

Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to say to the very able chairman of the Armed Services Committee, of which I have the honor to be a member, that my admiration for him is without limit. It was not in any way diminished by the exceedingly able argument which the Senator from Georgia has just made on the floor of the Senate. I can admire a man very much, as I admire the Senator from Georgia, and not always agree with every conclusion or observation which he makes.

I do not agree with a couple of observations which my friend from Georgia made in the very able argument which he has just presented to the Senate. Perhaps I should say that I would make certain modifications or reservations with respect to his argument.

The Senator from Georgia is entirely correct when he points out that on April 13 the Armed Services Committee held a meeting to which he referred. He is completely correct in stating that the observations which he read from the RECORD were made. In fact, I think the RECORD will show that I seconded the Byrd motion. I shall do whatever I can to make the record complete and full. I believe that at one time, when the observation was made in the committee that it would be left up to the chairman to work out the details in regard to the hearings, we all agreed. My recollection is that my good friend from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] agreed to that proposal, but made the observation that, of course, it would be with the understanding—I do not quote him exactly, but I quote his meaning—that the chairman would consult with the ranking minority member on the committee, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. The Senator from Georgia said, in effect, that the Senator from California need have no question on that score, that he would always consult with the Senator from New Hampshire with regard to matters of procedure which affected the full committee. We certainly were very much of one mind that that was the way it should be left.

Let me say to my good friend from Georgia that I think there are two factors which need to be considered, in view of the able argument which he has made, and in the light of what has transpired since April 13. I cannot speak for other members of the committee. I can speak only for the junior Senator from Oregon. However, when we discussed this matter on April 13 I certainly had no idea, and I do not believe any other member of the committee had any idea, that the hearing would trans-

form itself into the broad investigation which it has now become. At the time we were discussing this matter on April 13 we were seeking to find out the facts by bringing General MacArthur, General Marshall, and members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff before the committee, to testify as to why the course of action against General MacArthur was taken.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator from Oregon for his kind personal references. I should like to say that the record also shows that it was not indicated that General MacArthur was to be the only witness. The record will show that I stated we ought to have the Secretary of State and others.

Mr. MORSE. I stated that we ought to have the Secretary of State.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from California suggested the names of two or three or four persons who he thought should appear.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. In a moment. It was never contemplated that this would be a very limited hearing. I believe that even at that distance, every member of the committee saw that some very broad issues were involved in the hearing.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Oregon has the floor.

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

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will say to the Senator that he is correct. At that hearing the Senator from California suggested the name of General Wedemeyer, who had made a report on both China and Korea. He suggested that General Wedemeyer should be one of the witnesses; also Admiral Radford, who was commander in chief in the Pacific; Admiral Badger, who had formerly commanded in the Far East; and perhaps several others.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is correct. We were not deciding merely to hear General MacArthur and Secretary Marshall.

Mr. MORSE. The junior Senator from Oregon neither said that, nor did he mean to imply it.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Oregon stated that the scope of the hearing had broadened.

Mr. MORSE. That is the argument which I now wish to make.

Mr. RUSSELL. If the Senator will forgive me, I am now an hour and 22 minutes late in keeping an engagement with some people whom I assured I would meet at 5 o'clock. I know that the Senator will be fair in his approach to this question. I merely wish to observe that it would have been of great assistance to me in undertaking to maintain the bipartisan complexion of the committee if members who had changed their minds had been generous enough to come to me and show me the courtesy of saying, "I have changed my mind; I think we ought to have another meeting and change our plans." Instead I was out fighting for the committee plan, upon which the members had all agreed, while members of the committee were engaged in changing their minds without apprising me of that fact.

Mr. MORSE. A part of my argument will bear on that subject. I am sure that if the Senator wishes to make comment on it, he will have adequate time to do so tomorrow. I shall be very brief.

Coming back to the argument which I was making, I point out that the when the committee met on April 13, at least it was not my anticipation—and I doubt if it was the anticipation of other members of the committee generally—that the invesigation which is now pending would ever develop into the broad scope which now characterizes it. As the record which is on the desk of the Senator from Georgia will show, I am sure, at that time we discussed the possible limitation of the hearings to the Armed Services Committee alone. It was primarily a military matter. As we saw it at that time, it was primarily a matter of going into the question of military policy and MacArthur's relationship to the military policy. It was a question as to looking into the reasons for the President's removal of MacArthur.

Mr. President, a great deal of business of the Armed Services Committee of the Senate has been conducted in executive session. It has never been the position of the junior Senator from Oregon that all committees should hold all meetings in public. The Armed Services Committee particularly has to transact business on a great many matters that require executive sessions.

Occasionally we consider a question involving discipline. It has been my experience in the Armed Services Committee that when we consider such a subject, unless it involves a great question of public policy, we do conduct a public hearing, at least in making preliminary investigation of the facts. When I said in the committee meeting, as I did, and the record quotes me accurately, that I had great doubt about whether the MacArthur hearing should be in public or in executive session, it was because I was not clear in my mind as to what kind of a meeting might develop, because I knew we could not escape the consideration of some security matters, and because I took it for granted that the general would necessarily have to express his position in regard to his administration in Asia, and would have to discuss some secret military matter. So I said I thought we ought to leave the decision to the general.

Mr. President, that was before the general made his address to the joint meeting of the Congress. That address became a challenge of the military and foreign policy of the United States, and, in my opinion, called for a thorough investigation of the charges the general made, because one cannot read the speech which he made before the two Houses of Congress without fully appreciating that he laid down a serious indictment of the foreign and military policy of the United States. It called not only for the assumption of jurisdiction on the part of the Armed Services Committee, but for the assumption of jurisdiction also on the part of the Foreign Relations Committee.

Although I was not present this morning, it is my understanding that the meeting held this morning was a joint meeting of the Armed Services and the Foreign Relations Committees.

The whole basis of the hearings has been broadened now into an investigation of foreign and military policy. I take the position, Mr. President, that whenever a committee of the Senate indulges in hearings which become an investigation of great questions of public policy they should be open hearings. That is the position I have always taken in the Senate.

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

Mr. MORSE. I will yield in a moment. We have not had a meeting of the committee since April 13. We have not had a meeting since the MacArthur speech before the joint meeting of the Congress.

It is all very well for my good friend the Senator from Georgia to say that we should have come to him and told him that we were troubled about developments and that we ought to have a meeting. I say most respectfully to the Senator from Georgia—and he will reply to this, I am sure, or he will be free to reply to it tomorrow—that in my judgment, after the general's speech to the two Houses of Congress, a meeting of the Armed Services Committee should have been held. We should not be acting now on the basis of the only meeting, that of April 13, prior to the speech of the general, until this morning when there was a joint meeting, apparently, of the Armed Services Committee and the Foreign Relations Committee.

Mr. President, the responsibility cannot be shifted to individual members of the committee. The responsibility is that of the chairman of the committee. My opinion is that after the speech by General MacArthur and all the discussion that has followed, and with public statements appearing in the press on the part of some members of the Armed Services Committee, including the junior Senator from Oregon, the investigation ought to be conducted in public so far as it is possible to conduct it in public. It seems to me the chairman of the committee ought to have gotten us together before, if we are to broaden the hearing body into a combination of the Armed Services and the Foreign Relations Committees, to which I have no objection. Apparently the members of the Foreign Relations Committee have voting privileges in the joint meeting, and I have no objection to that. That was a matter which could very well have been discussed by the Armed Services Committee on some date subsequent to April 13 and prior to this morning.

Mr. President, there has been pretty adequate discussion publicly by members of the Armed Services Committee of their views on the controversy. The chairman, who is a brilliant lawyer, has had what we lawyers say is actual notice. He did not walk into the meeting this

morning to discuss for the first time that some members of the Armed Services Committee had doubt as to whether or not we should hold the kind of meeting we talked about on April 13, which no longer is possible, because the nature of the whole hearing has changed. I do not think the chairman of the committee had any doubt of the fact that there was quite a different opinion on the part of several members of the Armed Services Committee from what their opinion was when on April 13 we thought we were going to conduct an investigation by the Armed Services Committee much more limited in scope than it will now be.

The Senator from Georgia said he knew General MacArthur, and he apparently was not surprised at the kind of speech he made, and the serious charges he made. But the junior Senator from Oregon was surprised. He was shocked. He was perfectly satisfied that that speech broadened the base of the whole hearing, and that we are now in an investigation.

I now yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I am very grateful to the Senator from Oregon for making the remarks which he has just concluded along the line he has followed, namely, that we face a different situation at the present time. I wish to say to the Senator from Oregon that this morning in the joint meeting, as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, I called the specific attention of the chairman and the other members to the fact that this was the first time I had had any opportunity in any way officially to express myself on the question of open or closed hearings. There had never been an effort, so far as I recall, at least never in my presence, to elicit the views of the members of the Foreign Relations Committee as to whether or not the hearings should be open or closed.

Mr. MORSE. I think that is one of the major weaknesses of the position of the Senator from Georgia. He is still proceeding on the assumption that we of the Armed Services Committee are determining the proceeding, and now it is a joint meeting that is to be held.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. To that extent I feel that the argument of the Senator from Georgia is not valid. The situation is different, as the Senator from Oregon points out, from what it was at the time of the meeting on the 13th of April. The situation then was nebulous. Then it appeared there might be merely a meeting with an individual officer who was giving information on a certain specific set of circumstances or specific points. I raised the question in the joint committee meeting that there were some extremely broad policies now injected into the situation—as, for instance, the question of the over-all military approach or the question of the participation of this country in the Orient and in other places. I said that no issue had stirred the American people more deeply than this one had in recent days, and that the American people had a right to the fullest possible degree of public testimony, leaving to the very eminent persons who would testify, as well as to the committee itself, the determination of when certain information, if elicited and if given publicly, might immediately affect the security of the United States. When it did we could say, "We will pull the curtain over that particular piece of evidence at this moment, and we shall take it up either later today or tomorrow morning or at a future time in executive session, because the future of the country might be endangered by disclosing that particular evidence."

Not only can the overwhelming bulk of the material be given in public, but the entire theory, up one side and down the other, has been discussed in public. Those who defend the MacArthur theory of defense have discussed it. Those who would blacken the character and the entire historic conduct of General MacArthur in military affairs have been dragging the issue up and down, and they have been secretly "leaking out" information as to what their discussions will be.

I think the entire American people have a right to obtain the fullest degree of public information, and by means of such procedure it can be given while still maintaining the security of the Nation.

I demonstrated my position on that matter in the joint committee, this morning, by making a motion which was voted down; but at least I then demonstrated my position.

In the past several days I have said unofficially to certain newspaper reporters that I thought the hearings in connection with this matter should be open.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Iowa made that motion in the joint committee this morning, did he not?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I did.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Iowa made the motion as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, did he not?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I understood that this morning all of us were members of the one joint committee.

Mr. MORSE. But the seat of the Senator from Iowa on the joint committee comes to him because of his membership on the Committee on Foreign Relations, does it not?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. It does.

Mr. MORSE. In other words, as a member of the present joint committee, the Senator from Iowa was recognized by the chairman of the joint committee, who is chairman of the Armed Services Committee; and the Senator from Iowa made a motion, and discussion was had on the basis of the motion; and the motion was put to a vote, was it not?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. That is correct.

Mr. MORSE. In other words, we now have a voting joint committee which is presided over by the chairman of the Armed Services Committee—which is quite different from the action taken in the Armed Services Committee on April 13. The record on the desk of the Senator from Georgia will show that at that meeting we discussed the question in terms of keeping the hearings strictly Armed Services hearings with other Members of the Senate, including members of the Foreign Relations Committee—if they cared to do so—participating in the meetings, but they were to be meetings of the Armed Services Committee, were they not?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Technically, and using the language of the chairman, if one could carry it to its logical conclusion—which, of course, I think would be far-fetched—the argument made by the Senator from Georgia is about like saying that because the Senator from California is a member of the Appropriations Committee and the Senator from New Hampshire is a member of the Appropriations Committee, if the Appropriations Committee discusses a certain matter and decides at that time that some action should be taken, then, if those Senators go into a meeting of an entirely different committee, they must be bound, in respect to the new committee's action, by some discussion which was had under different circumstances in the Appropriations Committee, of which they are members.

However, the joint committee is a totally new committee. The chairman of the joint committee was elected only this morning, and this morning was the first time that Senators as members of the composite committee have had a chance to act.

So I think the arguments of the Senator from Georgia are not quite valid because the committee is a completely new one.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from Iowa because the argument I was making in reply to the Senator from Georgia is that he is using a transcript which, in my opinion, deals with a set of facts and a question of jurisdiction not now relative to the problem before the Senate, for the Senator from Georgia is dealing with a transcript which has to do with the Armed Services Committee and its contemplation of the holding of an entirely different type of hearing from that now proposed.

I am sorry the Senator from Georgia is not now in the Chamber, but I know he will reply to these statements tomorrow, or at least will be free to do so.

Therefore, I say most respectfully to my good friend, the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee, that I do not think he can escape responsibility, in the matter of holding open hearings, by saying that those of us who are members of the Armed Services Committee should have come to him sometime between April 13 and this morning and should have told him that we had come to the conclusion that open hearings should be held.

First, the nature of the hearings had changed. Second, the entire membership of the committee has changed. It is now a joint committee. I think we also see that it is a matter ab initio, insofar as deciding this matter is concerned.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further, let me say that since the Senator from Georgia has read some of the transcript into the RECORD, I should like to call the attention of the Senator from Oregon to page 11 of

the transcript, where some discussion of this subject occurred. I had this to say:

I think what we should all be striving for is as soon as possible to get away from the obvious great division of American public opinion and in the Congress, and try to see if we can get to a place where we can develop a degree of unity again. Consequently, if the Members of Congress were foreclosed now, those who are not members of this committee or of the Foreign Relations Committee, I think we might find a revolt on our hands in the two Houses, which would tend to divide us, rather than unite us. I have no final conclusion on that, but that is at least one thought I have.

In other words, we have here a problem on which all of us were reserving some judgments. However, as the Senator from Oregon has pointed out, we now have an entirely different situation which grows out of the statement made by General MacArthur on the 19th of this month, almost 1 week—it was 6 days—after the meeting on the 13th; and, in addition—as has already been pointed out this morning, and the Senator has pointed out why he could not be present—the two committees now have met. The Senator from Texas, who happens to be chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, moved that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] be made the chairman of the joint committee. Both the members of the Foreign Relations Committee and the members of the Armed Services Committee voted unanimously that the Senator from Georgia be the chairman of the joint committee. At that point a new, temporary joint committee was constituted.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from California permit me to ask him a personal question?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes.

Mr. MORSE. Did the Senator from California, after the meeting on April 13, believe the committee would not be meeting again, after the chairman had written some communications, which the transcript will show we agreed should be written, to certain persons in the Department of Defense and in the administration, and after the committee obtained information for us in respect to other questions which we raised in the meeting on April 13? Did the Senator from California really think that we would not be meeting again to consider matters of procedure until we started the hearings?

Mr. KNOWLAND. No; I will say not. However, in making that statement now, I do not intend to cast any reflection upon the chairman of the committee, let me say, because I have, as does the Senator from Oregon, a very high regard for the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Georgia, and he has had many responsibilities and problems, as all of us have had.

However, the fact of the matter is that new events have occurred. For instance, on the 21st of this month there was released—from the White House, presumably—a document dealing with the Wake Island conference, a document which until today I had assumed had been merely a set of notes. Nevertheless, today it turns out that the document was a top-secret document which was not declassified until the last 24 hours. It immediately put all members of the committee, all of us who are seeking to find what the facts are, on notice that apparently the administration, in order to bolster its case, is willing to declassify documents in order to give a one-sided version. At that point I think a great many of us changed our minds as to how the meetings of the two committees might fairly be conducted.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President——

Mr. MORSE. I will yield presently to the Senator from Michigan. I promised the Senator from New Hampshire some minutes ago, before the Senator from Michigan rose, that I would yield to him.

Mr. BRIDGES. Does the Senator from Michigan desire to ask a question?

Mr. FERGUSON. I have only a few questions I wanted to ask.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. The questions are, First, whether the Armed Services Committee, or the two committees sitting jointly this morning, at any time considered the question of the formation of a joint committee of the House and Senate, as proposed by the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. MORSE. I may say, first, I was not at the meeting this morning, so I do not know what was discussed there. My recollection is that the resolution of the Senator from Michigan was not discussed at any meeting of the Armed Services Committee at which I was present, with the possible exception that there may have been some very brief references to it, and only in the sense of saying that such a resolution had been submitted. But there was no discussion of it at any time when I was present. Recently there have been but the two meetings of the Armed Services Committee, first, the meeting on April 13; and second, the meeting this morning. I know of no meeting of the Armed Services Committee since April 13, unless there was one the other day in regard to the confirmation of some personnel, and minor details, but not for the purpose of discussing this investigation.

Mr. FERGUSON. My purpose in trying to get this information was to determine whether the resolution which was proposed by the Senator from Michigan on April 10, and whether another resolution which was proposed on the 17th, and which is now lying on the table, and is being held there by the majority, because it is impossible to get an adjournment of the Senate, have been purposely delayed; in other words, whether there is what is known as a parliamentary filibuster against those resolutions. I wondered whether the resolutions were being considered by either of these two committees.

Mr. MORSE. So far as my experience within the committee is concerned, the resolutions have not been discussed at any meeting I have attended, and so far as I know since April 13 there has been no meeting except the one this morning. One short meeting, I understand, was held the other day on personnel matters.

Mr. FERGUSON. I wonder whether the Senator will yield, that I may, with unanimous consent, ask the Senator from New Hampshire a question.

Mr. MORSE. I ask unanimous consent that I may yield for that purpose, without losing the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FERGUSON. The question I desire to ask the Senator from New Hampshire is as to whether either the Armed Services Committee, or the two committees, sitting jointly, have passed upon the question of whether they would or might consider a concurrent resolution providing for the appointment of a joint committee by the two Houses.

Mr. BRIDGES. I would have to say that so far as I know neither the Armed Services Committee, sitting as the Armed Services Committee, nor the two committees, sitting jointly this morning, ever discussed the resolution. I personally have discussed the subject with other members of the Armed Services Committee, including the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Georgia, but it has never come before either the Armed Services Committee or the two committees sitting jointly.

Mr. FERGUSON. So it has not been as the result of action either by the Armed Services Committee or by the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Relations, sitting jointly, that the Senate is not adjourning so as to permit the Senate to vote upon that question. Is that correct?

Mr. BRIDGES. That is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall conclude by saying that in my opinion the situation is quite a bit different today from what it was on April 13. The nature of the hearing has changed materially. It has transformed itself into an investigation rather than simply a fact-finding hearing to get the facts as to why the break between the President and MacArthur occurred, in regard to its military aspects, which was the subject of discussion on April 13.

The junior Senator from Oregon even entertained some doubt on April 13 as to that kind of hearing, because he could see that it might transform itself into an investigation. But when we come to deal with the investigation of a question of public policy, the junior Senator from Oregon will always, as in the past, stand for open hearings, because I think that, as I said last year, we would then get about as close to the intent of the Constitution of the United States as possible in regard to fair hearings. It has been held many times in court decisions that a fair hearing involves a public hearing.

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

Mr. MORSE. I will yield in a moment. In view of the fact that we now have two committees sitting jointly, I certainly think the situation is entirely different from what it was on April 13, and

that it was quite appropriate that the question be voted on by the two committees, sitting jointly.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BRIDGES. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Oregon that I think the issue devolves on two approaches to two procedures, one of which was the motion of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] this morning, that we proceed with open hearings, and then hold closed hearings whenever a matter affecting the security of the country was involved. The other was a motion made by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] to adopt the plan advocated by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], namely, that we start with closed hearings, and perhaps decide to hold open hearings later.

I may say to the Senator from Oregon that I have been a member either of the former Military Affairs Committee of the Senate, or its successor, the Armed Services Committee, for 15 years. I have been a member of the Appropriations Committee, and formerly the War Department Subcommittee of that committee and the Naval Affairs Subcommitee of that committee, and now I am a member of the Armed Services Subcommittee of that committee.

I have been a member of various other commitees, such as the so-called Truman committee, and others. I have yet to see a procedure followed under which the committee started with closed hearings, and then went into open hearings. I have very often, at least a hundred times, probably several hundred times, known of instances of hearings which began as open hearings, but which became closed hearings when matters came up of a highly secret nature involving the security of the country, and a witness, or the committee chairman, or a member of the committee, would say, "I prefer that this be heard in executive session." That is the procedure which was advocated in the Hickenlooper approach this morning, which I think is the sound procedure.

Mr. MORSE. I completely agree with the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. President, to start with an open hearing would establish a policy of procedure. I believe it to be very important to serve notice on the American people that as a matter of policy we are going to conduct our investigations in open hearings. The Senator from Georgia is absolutely correct in warning that, as a matter of national security, there are parts of the hearings which will have to be conducted in executive session. I have always taken the position that, when it is necessary, every loyal and patriotic citizen of America would want the committee to conduct that part of the hearings in secret. But the American people are disturbed, as I find from going about the country, because they do not feel that they are getting the information they ought to receive as to matters of great public policy which concern them so geatly in these days. I hope that at a subsequent meeting of the two committees, sitting jointly, a majority will decide that we should proceed in public hearings.

Mr. KNOWLAND and Mr. CHAVEZ addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. MORSE. I yield first to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to say before the Senator concludes that the able Senator from Georgia made a very effective talk, and we all have a high admiration for him. One statement he made, however, disturbed me considerably. I refer to the statement in which he intimated that the White House did not discuss with him such problems as those which have arisen. That is a very unfortunate thing for the country, because the able Senator from Georgia is chairman of one of the most powerful committees of this body, the Armed Services Committee, a committee which deals directly with the defense of the Nation, a committee which helps the Congress of the United States to decide its constitutional obligations with regard to raising and supporting armies and navies and providing therefor. I am satisfied that had the President consulted with him, as he might very properly have done, he might not have made the tragic mistake of removing General MacArthur in the manner in which it was done, and without at least calling the general back for consultation.

As the Senator from Oregon knows, there are four classes of security matters, namely, restricted, confidential, secret, and top secret, and I believe that if the White House had consulted with the able Senator from Georgia before it allowed the leak of the Wake Island conference to take place in the way it did, the Senator from Georgia knowing about security matters, would certainly have advised them that they must not release a top-secret document to one individual newspaper to give a one-sided picture of the situation, without making it available to all people by properly declassifying it, and perhaps giving General MacArthur a chance, at least, to look at the memorandum before it was released. It is very unfortunate that the White House does not call upon the judgment, the standing, and the ability of the able Senator from Georgia more than it apparently does. It might keep out of trouble if it would do so.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall postpone until another time the speech which I rose to give today on the farm-labor problem. Quite innocently, I am afraid I started something on the floor, and it took more time than I had expected. I am gratified that so many of my colleagues on this side of the aisle share my view on this issue. Perhaps the debate will serve some useful purpose.

I yield the floor.

SUPPLYING OF AGRICULTURAL WORKERS FROM MEXICO

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

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, earlier in the day I discussed the farm-labor bill, and inserted in the RECORD, by unanimous consent, some telegrams sustaining my position. Since that time I have received quite a number of telegrams from Pueblo Indians in my State. There are 17 pueblos in my State, and some of the Indians have sent me telegrams supporting my position that they should be employed before foreign labor is employed. I ask unanimous consent that the telegrams be inserted in the RECORD, together with telegrams from individuals and associations in my State and some telegrams from other States relative to the same issue.

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

ZUNI, N. MEX., *April 30, 1951.*

Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Senator of New Mexico,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

The Ramah Tribal Council in behalf of the Ramah Navajos want to compliment you on your gallant stand on Senate bill 984. You have our full support on your stand on this bill.

CHAVEZ COHO,
Delegate, Ramah Tribal Council.

ZUNI, N. MEX., *April 30, 1951.*

Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Senator of New Mexico,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

The Zuni Tribal Council in behalf of the Zuni Indians want to compliment you on your gallant stand on Senate bill 984. You have our full support on your stand on this bill.

CONRAD LESARLLEY,
Governor, Zuni Pueblo.

ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX., *April 30, 1951.*

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

We members of Isleta Pueblo want to thank you for your gallant fight for your amendments to S. 984. We are opposed to the original Ellender bill.

JUAN REY ABEITA,
Governor, Isleta Pueblo.

ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX., *April 30, 1951.*

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

We members of the All Pueblo Council are in full accord with your amendments to Senate bill 984. We are opposed to Ellender bill as reported to the Senate.

DIEGO ABEITA.

ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX., *April 30, 1951.*

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

We members of the Isleta Pueblo want to commend you on your fight against the Ellender bill as originally reported to the Senate. We are backing you 100 percent on amendments to S. 984.

JOE S. ABEITA,
Ex-Governor, Isleta.

ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX., *April 30, 1951.*

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

We members of the Three Pueblo Committee appreciate and will never forget the fight you are putting against the original Ellender

bill. We are in full accord with your amendments to S. 984.

PAT TOYA,
Chairman, Three Pueblo Committee, Jemez Pueblo.

ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX., *April 30, 1951.*
United States Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

I want to thank you for your splendid fight for your amendments to Senate bill No. 984. I am opposed to Ellender bill as reported to the Senate.

ABEL PAISANO,
Former Chairman of All Pueblo Council, Laguna.

TAOS, N. MEX., *April 30, 1951.*
Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Washington, D. C.:

We do not favor Senate bill 984 as originally introduced by Senator ELLENDER. It will be detrimental to working people in the Southwest. Bill must be amended to eliminate its bad features. Our standards of wages and living are much higher than Mexican laborers.

ERNEST MARTINEZ,
Manager, Taos Municipal Water and Sewer System.

ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX., *April 30, 1951.*
Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Senate Office Building, Washington D. C.:

Albuquerque Typographical Union requests your opposition to S. 984; believes objective unnecessary.

OSCAR NYGQUIST,
President
G. T. GRIFFIN,
Secretary.

TAOS, N. MEX., *April 30, 1951.*
Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
United States Senate, Washington D. C.:

Original Ellender Senate bill 984 very detrimental to laboring people in our State unless amended to eliminate undesirable features. Bill should be defeated.

PASCUAL MARTINEZ,
Chairman, Municipal Water Board.

ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX., *April 30, 1951.*
Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Senate Office Building, Washington D. C.:

Veterans of Foreign Wars, department of New Mexico, urge your support in Senate bill 984 with your amendment. We are not in favor of Senate bill 984 without amendment.

MILES A. METCALFE,
Department Adjutant Quartermaster.

SUPERIOR, WIS., *April 30, 1951.*
Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Senate Office Building:

We owners of family-sized farms ask you to vote against bill S. 984 being considered in Senate now to import Mexican laborers for large American farms in competition with us small farm operators.

KARL SCHIMENEK,
President,
Dairy Farmers Local 293, A. F. of L.
JOHN BANKS,
Representative, Local 293, A. F. of L.

GALVESTON, TEX., *April 30, 1951.*
Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

This council and its affiliated unions urgently request that you use the influence of your great office to actively oppose S. 984 or support amendments to same.

W. N. NEWMAN,
Secretary, Galveston Labor Council.

SAN ANTONIO, TEX., *April 30, 1951.*
Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ:

Urgently object to enactment of bill S. 984. Do support amendment to protect American workers.

W. P. SCHWERTLICH,
Secretary, San Antonio Trades Council.

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE BUCHANAN, OF PENNSYLVANIA

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the resolutions from the House of Representatives, which will be read.

The resolutions were read, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.,
April 30, 1951.

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. FRANK BUCHANAN, a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania.

Resolved, That a committee of 10 Members of the House with such Members of the Senate as may be joined be appointed to attend the funeral.

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms of the House be authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the provision of these resolutions and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect the House do now adjourn.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, the people of Pennsylvania were saddened by the announcement of the death of Representative FRANK BUCHANAN. He served as one of the five Members of the House from Allegheny County, Pa. He was from an industrial district. Prior to serving as a Representative in Congress, during his life he had served as a member of the council of his city, and he also served well as the mayor of the city of McKeesport.

FRANK BUCHANAN was a fine friend. He was greatly interested in our form of Government. He came up the hard way. I wish to express to the people of his district and to his family our great and profound regret at his passing.

Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 134) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. FRANK BUCHANAN, late a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania.

Resolved, That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the Presiding Officer to join the committee appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair appoints as the committee on the part of the Senate to attend the funeral of the late Representative the two Senators from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN and Mr. DUFF].

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the late Representative BUCHANAN, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was unanimously agreed to, and (at 6 o'clock and 56 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 1, 1951, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 30 (legislative day of April 17), 1951:

UNITED STATES TARIFF COMMISSION

Oscar B. Ryder, of Virginia, to be a member of the United States Tariff Commission for the term expiring June 16, 1957 (reappointment).

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE

Roswell L. Gilpatric, of New York, to be Assistant Secretary of the Air Force, vice Harold C. Stuart, resigned.

IN THE ARMY

Maj. Gen. George Ellis Armstrong, O16548, Army of the United States (brigadier general, Medical Corps, U. S. Army), for appointment as the Surgeon General, United States Army, and as major general in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of section 206 of the Army Organization Act of 1950 and section 513 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of captain, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Lance T. McBee	Lawrence McGlade
Gordon B. Swango	John P. Flynn, Jr.
George H. Elias	Duane A. Swinford
James Sharp II	Edgar A. Monroe
Myron P. Wieczorek	William N. Gustafson
John B. Marshall, Jr.	Stanley B. Voth
Gustave F. Lueddeke, Jr.	John Padach, Jr.
	Thomas G. Elder
John H. Campbell	Harold V. Deering
Dwain Wise	Anthony R. DiGiovanni
Charles C. Ward	
Robert Wade	Eugene T. Card
Harold L. Mayfield	Hugh D. Argo
William A. Lutnick	Calvin Wall
Owen V. Gallentine	Donald M. Winters
Ernest L. Engelkes	Charles A. Broudy
Ernest R. Doyle, Jr.	Martin Capages
Nichloas M. Seminoff	Beryl B. Sessions
Robert H. Cook	William W. Bryant
Robert J. Craig	Allen L. Phillips
Cloyd V. Hines	Grover S. Stewart, Jr.
Elmer A. Krieg	George M. Dauphine
John C. Boulware	Herschel G. Connell
James W. Luther	Curtis D. Jernigan
Arthur S. Tarkington	Harry B. Stuckey
Marshall S. Campbell	Rex A. Deasy
Victor E. Johnson, Jr.	Robert N. Welch
Dewey F. Durnford, Jr.	Richard G. Gilmore
Noble L. Beck	Dean Caswell
Leroy V. Corbett	Harold R. Foltz
Clyde P. Guy	John B. Mason
Henry A. Checklou	Clifford A. Allison
Leslie L. Davenport	Danny "W" Johnson
Gene Robertson	Murray V. Harlan, Jr.
James P. Bruce	William H. Mulvey
Clyde B. Shropshire	Robert S. Robertson
John D. Cotton	Louis E. Dunning
Taylor H. Wagner	John H. Cavalero
Robert W. Minick	Walter Panchision
Anthony Edwards	Marshall S. Austin
Lud R. Tucker	Chester J. Poppa
William H. Kellogg	Lewis C. Street III
Robert C. Evans	Leo J. Corboy, Jr.
Marion H. Deckard	Glenn L. Ferguson, Jr.
Charles H. Ludden	William J. Long

Lawrence J. Hofmeister
Joe "B" Henson
Theodore R. Moore
Thomas J. Jones
James R. Weaver
Clarence H. Pritchett
William L. Walker
Thomas O. Weghorst
Floyd H. Butler, Jr.
Richard H. Bushnell
Douglas D. Petty, Jr.
Wayne H. Hoereth
William A. Davis
Theodore W. Turcotte
James H. Berge, Jr.
James M. Weidner
George W. Caso
Thomas L. Sullivan
Floyd E. Hyatt
John E. Halliwill
Charles I. Rice, Jr.
William H. Ness, Jr.
Daniel Greene
Thomas R. Egan
Charles E. Street, Jr.
Donald H. Foss
Cecil B. LaFayette
Earl F. Patrick
Kerwin W. Jacobs
George D. Kew
Don M. Perkins
Thornwell R. Mangum
James T. Cronin
Lawrence C. Norton
Poul F. Pedersen
Harold L. Haley
George H. Green, Jr.
Thirl D. Johnson
Russell A. Davidson
Stuart V. Schuyler
Ernest E. Poor
James L. Dumas
Coleman C. Jones
Roger C. Lawson
Harry F. Abbott
Jack H. Adam
John V. Hanes
James R. Coltrane
Richard H. Fairchild
Wilbourn Waller
Eldon C. Stanton
Leo R. Jillisky
Howard Wolf
Arthur F. Shupe
Eugene M. Oster
Wayne R. Johnson
James R. Jones
Byron J. Melancon
Clarence M. Hurst
Max F. Brumfield
Joseph O. Compton, Jr.
Patrick D. Boyle
Arthur W. Latta, Jr.
Fred F. Eubanks, Jr.
Adlin P. Daigle
Francis K. Tomlinson, Jr.
George Kuprash
Frank S. Crawford
Ted J. Foster
William D. Watson
Donald H. Edwards
Ray Connelly
Kenneth G. Hadcock
Nelson E. Brown
Harold L. Green
Lloyd F. Childers
James W. Smith
Billie "E" Loos
John Browne
John P. Baden
Herman L. Mixson
William G. Carter
Gerald C. Armstrong
George L. Davis, Jr.
William H. MacCormack
Breen G. Lansford
Richard P. Greene
Edd F. Peel
William G. Joslyn
Ben C. Porter
John S. Alexander
William A. Mazzarella
Joe B. Crownover
Dene T. Harp
Eugene W. Gleason
John E. Quay, Jr.
Francis W. Vaught
Paul G. Graham
Manning "T" Jeter, Jr.
Edgar F. Remington
John E. McVey
John L. Scott
Drury W. Wood, Jr.
Elbert F. Price
Gordon R. Squires
Joseph W. Krewer
John J. Murphy
Robert D. Slay
Richard W. Benton
Harold F. Keller
Robert L. Parnell, Jr.
McDonald D. Tweed
James B. Turner, Jr.
Loren W. Calhoun
William F. Harrell
Harvey L. Jensen
Truman Clark
Vincent J. Marzelo
Thomas H. Nichols, Jr
Louis J. McGowan
Joseph A. Nelson
Rocco D. Bianchi
Robert V. Anderson
William L. Hall
Charles H. Watkins, Jr.
Chester M. Lupushansky
Billie L. Fletcher
Samuel B. Burnett
Edgar D. Pitman
Landon E. Christian
David M. Bidwell
Harry Hunter, Jr.
Donald R. Dempster
Cecil L. Champion, Jr.
Eraine M. Patrias
Joseph DiFrank, Jr.
Richard J. Fellingham
Walter E. Sparling
Paul L. Hitchcock
William R. Quinn
Joseph L. Wosser, Jr.
Stanley G. Dunwiddie, Jr.
Jack G. Kelly
Elwin M. Jones
Julian G. Bass, Jr.
Daniel A. Somerville
Emanuel R. Amann
Wallace N. Wood
Dale Gutshall
Robert B. Lipscombe, Jr.
George R. Pillon
Charles N. Sims, Jr.
James T. Doswell II
Reed T. King
George T. Keys
Jeremiah D. Shanahan
Paul T. Wiedenkeller
Leslie W. Bays
Leo Gerlach
Bobby Carter
Donald R. Harris, Jr.
Roy E. Oliver
Jerome J. C. Beau
Edward E. Kaufer
Nathan A. Smith
Eugene V. Pointer
Eugenous M. Hovatter
Robert D. Bohn
Ermel D. Bowen
Leo G. Wears
Matthew A. Clary, Jr.
Lawrence C. Switzer, Jr.
John F. LaSpada
William E. Barrineau
Edward D. Murray
Walter C. Kirk
Frank L. Straner
William K. Dormady
Gordon K. Jackson
Theodore A. Stawicki
Oscar H. Kirsch
Wilbur C. Kellogg, Jr.
Roland R. Miller
James W. Shank
Norman Vining
Lloyd J. Engelhardt
Clement T. Corcoran
Joseph W. Luker
Thomas A. White
Ardath C. Smith
Eugene W. Derrickson
Delmar L. Edwards
Keithe W. Costello
Charles W. Abrahams
Howard H. Zagrodzky
Martin J. Itzin
James B. Anderson
Earl W. Thompson
James P. Mariades
Robert W. Hamilton
William C. Airheart
Edward L. Walls, Jr.
Frederick A. Murchall
George H. Dodenhoff
Jerome L. Goebel
Paul D. King
Donald M. Bloomer
Keith D. Nolan
Robert A. Meyer
Donald R. Judge
Frederick G. Connelly
Jack R. Grey
Oliver E. Dial
Samuel A. Wallace
Walter G. Hunter
William S. Harris
Edward B. McNeill, Jr.
Milton B. Cooper
Louis T. Iglehart, Jr.
John J. Fedor
Gordon B. McPherson
Paul F. Curtis
John "M" Price
Duane W. Skow
Orlin A. P. Hughes
Ralph B. Crossman
Edward W. Carmichael
Donald H. Brooks
Charles D. Mize
Burton L. Lucas, Jr.
William F. Doehler
James M. Sherwood
Henry L. Claterbos
Joseph F. Holzbauer
Eugene B. Fallon
Thomas E. Gleason
Roy H. Miller
Sumner A. Vale
Lawrence V. M. Wickham
William P. Cosgrove
Horton E. Roeder
Palmer H. Rixey
Carl O. H. Haroldson
Frederic A. Hale, Jr.
William L. McCulloch
Don H. Blanchard
Robert C. Messman
Ray N. Joens
James G. Dionisopoulos
John W. McNulty, Jr.
James C. Gasser
Henry A. Berck
Bernard L. Turner
Lyle V. Tope
Harold C. Fuson
Richard D. Temple
Walter L. Persac
Francis R. Kraince
Lavern J. Oltmer
George A. Brigham
Francis C. Opeka
Raymond W. Mullane
William J. Hinson, Jr.
David P. Graf
Burneal E. Smith
John G. Theros
George A. Gibson
Russel H. Stoneman
Robert H. Emswiler
Gus Robinson
Herbert E. Mendenhall
Hermann L. Anderson
Forrest E. Caudle
Robert W. Bayless
Jack Wood
Eugene S. Kane, Jr.
Charles J. Brewer
Wesley F. Demmons
Arnold S. Baker, Jr.
Mark A. Rainer, Jr.
Harvey E. Spielman
Wilmer W. Hixson
John W. Collier, Jr.
Gene M. Hoover
Maurice A. David
James W. Dunning
Angelo J. Sammartino
James F. Williams
Gordon H. Keller, Jr.
Eugene Millette
Hiel L. VanCampen
Harry G. Torbett
Robert G. Scurrah
Howard A. Blancheri
Leo G. Lewis, Jr.
Adolph G. Schwenk
James Landrum, Jr.
Samuel Taub, Jr.
Earl K. Vickers, Jr.
Emil M. Misura
Lyle B. Matthews, Jr.
Raymond McArthur
Charles S. Wilder
Joseph B. Harrison
Standish Green
Arnold P. Smith
Leo R. Ryan
Frank P. Stivers, Jr.
Loren R. Smith
Lee H. Hardee
Miller M. Blue
Patrick J. Dayson
Francis E. Finch
Jack Glenn
Melvyn H. Kerr
Richard H. Mample
Charles A. Arneson
William R. Affleck, Jr.
Thomas P. O'Callaghan
Ernest R. Olson
Mildridge E. Mangum
Guy W. Rowlett
David W. Graybeal
Robert Zeugner
Joseph T. Odenthal
Theodore D. Hess
Thomas J. Horgan, Jr.
George E. Smith
William B. Creel
Willie J. Mixson
Arthur R. Dykeman
Reuben H. Hanson
Hugh M. Steele
Stewart C. Barber
Parker O. Pettigrew
Samuel L. Eddy, Jr.
Albert W. Snell
Walter L. Hill
John B. Wilson, Jr.
Albin L. Lindall, Jr.
John L. Hamilton, Jr.
Francis A. Ratchford
Almarion S. Bailey
Charles E. Wydner, Jr.
George B. Woodbury
Leo R. Sonnenberg
Chester V. Farmer
James E. Pearsall
James W. Campbell
Daniel R. Evans
Robert A. Henry
William D. Pomeroy
Paul B. Byrum
William H. Lanagan, Jr.
William M. Smith
Paul D. LaFond
Jay V. Poage
Ralph E. Brandel
Ralph E. Lower
William F. Koehnlein
Amo F. Judd
John Craig
Donald E. Watterson
Harold E. Savage
Edwin B. White, Jr.
Victor Stoyanow
Harry G. Robinson, Jr.
Louis J. Sartor
Meyer LaBellman
Frank A. Eldracher, Jr.
Marvin D. Volkert
John Ladutko
Donald McGuire
Ralph D. Cail
Connor W. Hollingsworth
William J. Beer
Francis J. Murphy
Howard L. Franklin

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of captain for limited duty, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

William D. Miears
Robert J. Greenway
William M. Rossiter
Oscar A. Bosma
John C. Hudock
Felix L. Ferranto
Alfred T. Coon
William L. Nolte
Adam A. Metz
Edgar S. Hamilton
Paul Adams
Bill L. Parham
Gerald L. Pines
Henry G. Goare
Warren L. Mobley
Kenneth M. Stayer

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ALABAMA

Bill Cunningham, Jasper, Ala., in place of W. D. Leake, retired.

Mildred A. Kimbrel, Trinity, Ala., in place of F. D. Lile, retired.

CALIFORNIA

Lucile G. Jamieson, Dana Point, Calif., in place of D. T. Prenter, resigned.

Elizabeth Lane, Lemoncove, Calif., in place of F. J. Darby, resigned.

Samuel H. Brandt, Robles Del Rio, Calif., in place of W. I. Henry, resigned.

Bessie L. McEver, Santa Rita Park, Calif., in place of W. M. Sargent, resigned.

Mildred A. Hauser, Santa Ynez, Calif., in place of V. E. Mackey, resigned.

COLORADO

George B. Peck, Jr., Estes Park., Colo., in place of J. B. Sella, deceased.

Leslie E. Taylor, Haxtun, Colo., in place of T. C. Crist, deceased.

Kenneth M. Sloan, Hot Sulphur Springs, Colo., in place of M. L. Huffaker, resigned.

Vance E. Neighbors, Longmont, Colo., in place of A. B. Adkisson, retired.

Carleton Hoffmeister, Rifle, Colo., in place of J. M. McLearn, resigned.

GEORGIA

William E. Boatwright, Rayle, Ga., in place of Bessie Boatwright, retired.

IDAHO

James W. Hann, Buhl, Idaho, in place of L. P. Runyon, retired.

ILLINOIS

Richard J. Schnell, Elgin, Ill., in place of Joseph Kreeger, retired.

Clarence G. Sinn, Marissa, Ill., in place of H. J. Young, retired.

Raymond T. Gavin, Maywood, Ill., in place of J. W. Duffy, retired.

Neal W. Boddeker, Niota, Ill., in place of W. T. Steiner, resigned.

INDIANA

Claude B. Holder, Hope, Ind., in place of A. C. Reeves, transferred.

Norman Bretz, Huntingburg, Ind., in place of N. L. A. Koerner, retired.

Paul V. Geiger, Markle, Ind., in place of C. A. Kelsey, transferred.

Frank S. Anderson, Salem, Ind., in place of H. L. Menaugh, retired.

IOWA

Earl E. Grinstead, Danville, Iowa, in place of S. H. Sater, retired.

Eugene E. Stinn, Earling, Iowa, in place of J. J. Langenfeld, resigned.

Charles E. Hinde, Early, Iowa, in place of R. A. Kelley, transferred.

Clarence L. Suer, Otho, Iowa, in place of O. C. Hanson, retired.

KANSAS

Harold E. Kirmer, Spearville, Kans., in place of R. J. Laudick, transferred.

KENTUCKY

Ray A. Brafford, Gray, Ky., in place of R. I. Gray, retired.

MARYLAND

Josephine O. Harding, Berwyn, Md., in place of P. J. Byrne, transferred.

MASSACHUSETTS

Ralph R. Wilson, Rockport, Mass., in place of W. D. Powers, retired.

William J. Dowd, South Walpole, Mass., in place of J. J. Easton, retired.

MICHIGAN

Thomas H. Branigan, Auburn, Mich., in place of O. W. Murphy, removed.

Charles E. Wesner, Buchanan, Mich., in place of A. G. Haslett, retired.

J. Donald Van Sickle, Carson City, Mich., in place of W. J. Grace, transferred.

Arthur G. Warlick, Jr., Colon, Mich., in place of H. K. Snook, resigned.

Vernon P. McGuire, Detour, Mich., in place of J. A. McDonald, retired.

Julian J. Zochowski, Newport, Mich., in place of W. W. Francisco, transferred.

Albert C. Johnston, Palmyra, Mich., in place of Ruth Hoffman, transferred.

John S. Miller, Rapid River, Mich., in place of F. T. Cavill, transferred.

MINNESOTA

Marcel E. Novotny, Badger, Minn., in place of O. M. Wammer, transferred.

Leon C. Smith, Granada, Minn., in place of C. H. Hiatt, deceased.

Walter A. Wichelman, Hamburg, Minn., in place of M. B. Scheele, transferred.

MISSOURI

Michael B. Lee., Milan, Mo., in place of S. G. Morehead, resigned.

MONTANA

Roland Keith Taylor, Fairview, Mont., in place of M. H. Johnson, resigned.

Walter J. Maddock, Sunburst, Mont., in place of J. W. Huntsberger, retired.

NEW JERSEY

Wayne Stahl, Cranbury, N. J., in place of J. N. Stonaker, deceased.

Helen B. Cubberley, Deerfield Street, N. J., in place of C. B. Moore, retired.

NEW YORK

John V. Hartigan, Chatham, N. Y., in place of John Hartigan, retired.

Norris F. Patchen, Martville, N. Y., in place of D. W. Mott, transferred.

Anthony M. Cipriano, Mount Morris, N. Y., in place of L. C. Donovan, deceased.

John F. Harrison, Port Jervis, N. Y., in place of T. J. Conmy, retired.

Harry L. Gregory, Roxbury, N. Y., in place of M. H. Fanning, deceased.

NORTH CAROLINA

Samuel L. Davis, West Jefferson, N. C., in place of B. D. Barr, resigned.

Davis Francis Hill, Youngsville, N. C., in place of M. F. Cheatham, retired.

OHIO

Stanley M. Bardon, Grafton, Ohio, in place of T. C. Washington, resigned.

Raphael J. Frangella, North Olmsted, Ohio, in place of M. C. Eldridge, resigned.

Chester R. Ralstin, Otway, Ohio, in place of Frank Koenig, transferred.

OKLAHOMA

Alice M. Farhar, Okeene, Okla., in place of W. G. Baustert, transferred.

PENNSYLVANIA

Stewart S. Young, Duncannon, Pa., in place of W. O. Miller, retired.

Harvey O. Eck, Emmaus, Pa., in place of A. F. Buck, deceased.

Elizabeth M. Murphy, Hokendauqua, Pa., in place of M. S. Porter, retired.

Bertha N. Martin, Intercourse, Pa., in place of C. M. Brubaker, retired.

James L. O'Toole, Sharon, Pa., in place of J. L. Considine, retired.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Francis G. Jurrens, Buffalo Gap, S. Dak., in place of W. J. Nolan, transferred.

TENNESSEE

Carey Spence Nicely, Corryton, Tenn., in place of E. B. Mullins, retired.

TEXAS

Bruce W. Bray, Albany, Tex., in place of P. H. Williams, retired.

Mary E. Russell, Annona, Tex., in place of T. E. Lawson, retired.

Joe L. Shelton, Brownfield, Tex., in place of J. H. Dallas, resigned.

Billy M. Wall, Nacogdoches, Tex., in place of Mary Thomason, resigned.

VIRGINIA

Thomas G. Cunningham, Mount Vernon, Va., in place of E. J. Monroe, resigned.

WASHINGTON

Hugh A. Miller, Granite Falls, Wash., in place of C. R. Monk, resigned.

WISCONSIN

Arthur L. Peters, Frederic, Wis., in place of Victoria St. Angelo, resigned.

Donald L. Bennett, Glen Haven, Wis., in place of E. R. White, transferred.

Edwin R. Barden, Platteville, Wis., in place of H. M. Harms, transferred.

Herman J. Glinski, Stevens Point, Wis., in place of F. A. Hirzy, resigned.

Michael J. Gonring, West Bend, Wis., in place of F. P. O'Meara, deceased.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 30 (legislative day of April 17), 1951:

RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

W. Stuart Symington, of Missouri, to be Administrator of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR CORPS OF THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

To be surgeon (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective date of acceptance

C. Dudley Miller

To be a dental surgeon (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective date of acceptance

Peter B. Drez

To be senior assistant dental surgeon (equivalent to the Army rank of captain), effective date of acceptance

Frank C. Sammis, Jr.

To be senior assistant pharmacists (equivalent to the Army rank of captain), effective date of acceptance

Reede M. Ames
Frank E. Dondero
Eileen Foley
Milton W. Skolaut
Jacob Levy
Paul R. Jolly

To be junior assistant pharmacist (equivalent to the Army rank of second lieutenant), effective date of acceptance

Joseph N. Salvino

To be senior scientist (equivalent to the Army rank of lieutenant colonel), effective date of acceptance

Herbert E. Stokinger

To be sanitarian (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective date of acceptance

John C. Eason, Jr.

To be senior assistant sanitarian (equivalent to the Army rank of captain), effective date of acceptance

Wallace W. Jonz

To be senior assistant scientists (equivalent to the Army rank of captain), effective date of acceptance

Elvio H. Sadun
Edwin J. Robinson, Jr.
Geoffrey M. Jeffery

To be senior assistant nurse officer (equivalent to the Army rank of captain), effective date of acceptance

Virginia L. Porter

To be senior assistant pharmacists (equivalent to the Army rank of captain), effective date of acceptance

Martin Yanishevsky
Henry W. Beard
Richard B. Sherwood
Alfred A. Rosenberg
John A. Scigliano
William M. Hanna

To be junior assistant sanitary engineer (equivalent to the Army rank of second lieutenant), effective date of acceptance

Ralph K. Longaker

To be senior assistant veterinarian (equivalent to the Army rank of captain), effective date of acceptance

Ladd N. Loomis

To be senior assistant nurse officer (equivalent to the Army rank of captain), effective date of acceptance

Merilys E. Porter

IN THE ARMY

CHIEF SIGNAL OFFICER AND MAJOR GENERAL

Brig. Gen. George Irving Back, O10267, United States Army, for appointment as Chief Signal Officer, United States Army, and as major general in the Regular Army of the United States.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

The nominations of William M. Murray et al. for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on March 28, 1951, and appear in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of William M. Murray, which is shown on page 2960, and ending with the name of Gordon C. Russell, which is shown on page 2961.

The nominations of George R. Clammer et al. for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on April 11, 1951, and may be found in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of George R. Clammer, which appears on page 3671, and ending with the name of Harry A. Yoder, which is shown on page 3672.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

The nominations of George Edward Adams et al. for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on April 11, 1951, and appear in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of George Edward Adams, which is shown on page 3665, and ending with the name of William Stephen Rooney, which is shown on page 3671.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

APPOINTMENTS IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

The following-named persons for appointment in the United States Air Force, in the grades indicated, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force under the provisions of section 506, Public

Law 381, Eightieth Congress (Officer Personnel Act of 1947), and title II, Public Law 365, Eightieth Congress (Army-Navy-Public Health Service Medical Officer Procurement Act of 1947):

To be majors, United States Air Force (medical)

Arthur J. Katzberg, O482310.
Gordon H. Rhoades, AO277553.

To be captains, United States Air Force (medical)

Kenneth W. Clement, O1746021.
James F. DeLoach, O1736633.
Robert C. Doherty, AO1906863.
Bernard E. Flaherty, AO1745326.
Robert J. Kurth, AO1766746.

To be captains, United States Air Force (dental)

William H. Book, AO401408.
Henry I. Copeland, Jr., AO966807.
Maurice L. Parrish, AO1775019.
Loren H. Schwarzrock, AO1700871.

To be first lieutenants, United States Air Force (medical)

Charles A. Berry.
Donald P. Ford, AO2213605.
Samuel L. Gabby, Jr., AO2212535.
Billy N. Gray, AO670884.
Thomas M. Holcomb, AO970162.
Ronald W. Krumbach, AO2212400.
John R. Weimer, AO2212322.

To be first lieutenants, United States Air Force (dental)

Ernest M. Baird II, AO1864300.
Clarence M. McCall, Jr., AO1906199.
Owen J. Morrissey, AO1545132.
Edwin W. Owen, AO870020.
Russell J. Salentine, AO1906198.
Vincent A. Segreto, AO966302.

The following-named distinguished officer candidates for appointment in the United States Air Force in the grade indicated, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force under the provisions of section 506, Public Law 381, Eightieth Congress (Officer Personnel Act of 1947):

To be second lieutenants

Jack A. Hayes, AO1910602.
Walfred J. Larson, AO591376.
Edward C. Lassiter, AO1910620.
Frank H. Rave, AO1910642.
Pasquale Torraco, AO1910663.
Miles S. Washington, Jr., AO1910672.

The following-named distinguished officer candidate for appointment in the United States Air Force in the grade indicated, with date of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force under the provisions of section 506, Public Law 381, Eightieth Congress (Officer Personnel Act of 1947), and section 301, Public Law 625, Eightieth Congress (Women's Armed Services Integration Act of 1948):

To be second lieutenant

Anita M. Bellizzi, AL1910565.

The following-named distinguished aviation cadet for appointment in the United States Air Force in the grade indicated, with date of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force under the provisions of section 506, Public Law 381, Eightieth Congress (Officer Personnel Act of 1947):

To be second lieutenant

Lansing G. Scofield.

The following-named person for appointment in the United States Air Force in the grade indicated, with date of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force under the provisions of section 506, Public Law 381, Eightieth Congress (Officer Personnel Act of 1947):

To be second lieutenant

George R. Loftis, 532986, USN.

The following-named persons for appointment in the United States Air Force under the provisions of section 103, Public Law 36, Eightieth Congress (Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947), as amended by Public Law 514, Eighty-first Congress, in the grades indicated, with dates of ranks to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force under the provisions of section 105, Public Law 36, Eightieth Congress, as amended by section 2 of Public Law 514, Eighty-first Congress:

To be captains, United States Air Force (nurses)

Muriel Ammons, N727562.
Mary E. Anderson, AN727475.
Juliet M. D. Anton, AN802148.
Elena M. Ardoin, AN789745.
Nellie J. Bailey, AN733947.
Alice R. Bakutis, AN752143.
Madeline Barneycastle, AN787666.
Marjorie E. Beakes, AN757386.
Josephine M. Becker, AN730943.
Adeline T. Bell, AN734657.
Mildred A. Bell, AN759776.
Rose M. Bendetti, N722630.
Dorothy M. Berendsen, AN741020.
Helen E. Berman, AN742712.
Eleanor E. Bernick, AN725678.
Una L. Black, AN735065.
Janice M. Blount, AN787292.
Jonita R. Bonham, AN790311.
Edith Brandes, AN798849.
Helen L. Brennan, AN755503.
Helen E. Brown, AN793092.
Elizabeth L. Buzan, AN732918.
Kathrine G. Cahill, AN734232.
Flora G. Carmine, AN728249.
Barbara H. Carson, AN790314.
Mildred E. Castleberry, AN787674.
Maclovia Cavazos, AN779372.
Dorothy J. Christison, AN733166.
E. Lynne Christy, AN725397.
Helen A. Chupka, AN730123.
Margaret S. Clouse, AN736535.
Eleanor B. Cochran, AN775978.
Catherine A. Coffman, AN776283.
Cora E. Conerly, AN735050.
Elizabeth J. Conroy, N720395.
Mary I. Cossey, AN756154.
Opal G. Davis, AN732653.
Charlotte B. Detweiler, AN725968.
Aileen A. Dupont, AN721360.
Ona M. Emigh, AN790577.
Marie O. Eyman, AN760227.
Margaret M. Fallon, AN720332.
Florence F. Fintak, AN730564.
Rose M. Fiorello, AN755411.
Pearl M. Fleming, AN720266.
Ruth M. Foley, AN722543.
Josephine E. Fornara, AN793977.
June H. Freedman, AN737941.
Joyce Godard, AN727209.
Viola Graham, AN759835.
Lillian A. Gravis, AN789580.
Anne M. Gregg, AN 789643.
Matilda D. Grinevich, AN723284.
Angelica L. Gulick, AN790188.
Edith J. Gunning, AN723212.
Karolyna J. Harrison, AN774044.
Grace J. Hayden, AN720038.
Martha J. Hierstein, AN731429.
Emily E. Hilbus, AN775470.
Mary E. Hoadley, AN731391.
Ethel A. Hoefly, AN758457.
Ernestine F. Hohberger, AN788742.
Helen Humphries, AN727378.
Marguerite L. Jernigan, AN726408.
Josephine Jezek, AN787359.
Esther M. Johnson, AN733006.
Margaret E. Johnson, AN768458.
Martha L. Johnson, AN724407.
Frieda E. Keso, AN730435.
Helen M. Kiley, AN751748.
Helen H. King, AN732153.
Vera D. King, AN728149.
Kathryn E. Kovatovich, AN733522.
Alice R. Krieble, AN745257.
Marguerite M. Laetsch, AN752944.
Marion E. Leeper, AN784292.
Dorothy E. Lonergan, AN730554.
Nara M. Luzietti, AN756854.
Mary C. Lynch, AN703953.
Ethel S. Madden AN785083.
Jeanne R. Marquis, AN720020.
Edna S. Mattonen, AN784930.
Blanche A. McCloskey, AN774136.
Marguerite E. McDonald, AN720244.
Margaret E. McKenzie, AN788569.
Mary E. McNamara, AN730121.
Dorothy M. Menge, AN731106.
Pauline T. Michalka, AN734714.
Idabelle Miller, AN788981.
Isabelle A. Miller, AN784638.
Kathryn Miller, AN789934.
Mary V. Miller, AN788564.
Elizabeth S. Moritz, AN797466.
Kathryn A. Moyes, AN771432.
Elizabeth A. Murphy, AN736021.
Sara K. Neese, AN759293.
Myrtle N. Nereson, AN737706.
Annice E. Norred, AN727736.
Cecilia E. Obenhoff, AN771049.
Dominica B. O'Brien, AN775331.
Mary E. O'Donnell, AN723131.
Suzanne M. Ottoy, AN743720.
Merilys E. Porter, 6787199.
Marbara W. Preston, AN778086.
Violet I. Price, AN723214.
Alice M. Ragin, AN745326.
Anne D. Reams, AN769352.
Margaret E. Remington, AN788713.
Margaret A. Richey, AN734379.
Winifred M. Robinson, AN787269.
Winnie B. Sanders, N726507.
Rose N. Slusher, AN767854.
Elinor V. Smith, AN741293.
Elverene N. Smith, AN760076.
Charlotte M. Stein, AN771554.
Melba G. Stone, AN742768.
Esther E. Taylor, AN727765.
Frances J. Valentine, AN789393.
Mary L. Van Horn, AN797591.
Fanny E. Vlahovich, AN723758.
Mabel L. Wakeland, AN726869.
Gertrude M. Walsh, AN752366.
Patricia I. Ward, AN726012.
Bernice V. Wasilewski, AN760373.
Amy R. Webster, AN726945.
Helen O. Weissbeck, AN732384.
Eleanor Welch, AN723710.
Eva J. Wheeler, AN731466.
Mary L. White, AN797502.
Clara D. Whitley, AN733830.
Elizabeth A. Wright, AN724532.
Jane H. York, AN745254.
Emily E. Zack, AN742490.
Alice E. Zayatz, AN751463.
Mabel M. Zibell, AN790434.

To be captains, United States Air Force (women's medical specialists)

Jack LaRue, AM2271.
Mary M. Laughlin, AM2359.
Dellamae Motley, AR234.
Frances E. Smith, AR2378.

To be first lieutenants, United States Air Force (nurses)

Theresa L. Bell, AN778039.
Thelma L. Dawson, AN794681.
Irene C. Falkenhagen, AN758841.
Katheryne J. Hills, AN790802.
Dorothy H. Janowicz, AN799356.
Evelyn N. Lawrence, AN780190.
Dorothy N. Livingston, AN762821.
Margaret J. Mills, AN770031.
Lyla P. Milroy, AN785781.
Mary M. Mullen, AN753862.
Anna Obletiloff, AN796735.
Mary A. Partin, AN765386.
Jane Saunders, AN765873.
Mary A. Schreiber, AN768785.
Madeline P. Sebasky, AN801369.
Rose M. Shefuo, AN796151.
Lillian M. Soto, AN1865751.
Lillian F. Stone, AN796205.
Hilda E. Velasquez, AN780079.
Hope E. Waite, AN754480.
Zada C. Zarling, AN795695.

To be first lieutenants, United States Air Force (women's medical specialists)

Frances M. Gasson, AR2370.
Jean R. Gates, AM2213207.
Dorothy M. Griffin, AM2240.
Betty F. Hearne, AM2832.
Doris C. Knausz, AM2280.
Julia V. Skellchock, AR1836.

The following-named persons for appointment in the United States Air Force in the grade indicated, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force under the provisions of section 101, Public Law 36, Eightieth Congress (Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947):

To be second lieutenants, United States Air Force (nurses)

Helen E. Calm, AN792249.
Dorothy M. Horton, AN1906113.
Joan E. Kelley, AN1906106.

The following-named distinguished aviation cadets for appointment in the United States Air Force in the grade indicated, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force under the provisions of section 506, Public Law 381, Eightieth Congress (Officer Personnel Act of 1947):

To be second lieutenants

Charles D. Anderson	William M. Kottas
Kenneth G. Baker	Frank B. McGehee
Frank E. Bennett	James R. Odom, Jr.
Philip C. Davis, Jr.	Tom M. Skillman
Cyril H. Dingwell	Otis A. Sleep
Joseph J. Gyulavics	Paul E. Snodgress
William B. Johnson	William J. Warren

The following-named person for appointment in the United States Air Force in the grade indicated, with date of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force under the provisions of title II, Public Law 365, Eightieth Congress (Army-Navy-Public Health Service Medical Officer Procurement Act of 1947):

To be captain, United States Air Force (medical)

Paul Bittick, Jr.

The following-named persons for appointment in the United States Air Force under the provisions of section 103, Public Law 36, Eightieth Congress (Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947), as amended by Public Law 514, Eighty-first Congress, in the grades indicated, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force under the provisions of section 105, Public Law 36, Eightieth Congress, as amended by section 2 of Public Law 514, Eighty-first Congress:

To be captains, United States Air Force (nurses)

Janice A. Albert, AN787252.
Myrtle R. Brewer, AN765537.
Bernice E. Britton, AN725855.
Etta Chandler, AN760295.
Margaret E. Daniel, AN724676.
Gussie L. Dowell, AN788005.
Geraldine E. Hellen, AN744119.
Margaret M. Kiefer, AN731698.
Lillian M. Kinkela, AN788295.
Lucile C. Slattery, AN759493.
Clare E. Stanton, AN720344.
Margaret Vizard, AN731281.

To be first lieutenant, United States Air Force (nurse)

Genevieve E. Martell, AN800023.

To be first lieutenant, United States Air Force (Women's Medical Specialist)

Janet E. Cook, AM2605.

The following-named distinguished aviation cadets for appointment in the United States Air Force in the grade indicated, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force under the provisions of section 506, Public Law 381, Eightieth Congress (Officer Personnel Act of 1947):

To be second lieutenants

John C. Fremont	Robert P. King
Bruce E. Graham	James I. Meeker
Virgil I. Grissom	Dallas K. Stephens
Thomas E. Hadley II	Richard J. Swan
Robert B. Hunter, Jr.	Albert H. Ward, Jr.

The following-named cadets, United States Military Academy, for appointment in the United States Air Force, in the grade of second lieutenant, effective June 1, 1951, upon their graduation, under the provisions of section 506, Public Law 381, Eightieth Congress (Officer Personnel Act of 1947). Date of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force.

Edwin Eugene Aldrin, Jr.
William Anderson Allen
Loren Albin Anderson
Robert Douglas Anderson
Walter Julian Bacon II
Willett John Baird, Jr.
John Garland Ballard, Jr.
Daniel Spaulding Barnes
William Thomas Barnett
Arnim Lavelle Brantley
Lou Enlow Bretzke
John Freeman Brown, Jr.
Lewis Christian Buffington, Jr.
Jose Andres Chacon
Donn Fergus Chandler
Clyde Cocke, Jr.
Mathews McCleave Collins
Julius Ronald Conti, Jr.
Peyton Ellsworth Cook
Ralph Cooper
Patrick Joseph Corrigan
John Harrold Craigie
John Walter Croan
Joseph Paul Crocco
John William Cunningham
William Hugh Cuthbertson
Gordon Elmer Danforth
John Charles Mousseau des Islets
Samuel Thomas Dickens
Gerald Edgar Dickson, Jr.
Richard Gerry Dingman
Wayne Manford Dozier
Billy Joe Ellis
Lawrence Lee Eppley, Jr.
Frank Raymond Fischl, Jr.
Frank Reese Forrest
Charles Lynn Galloway
Bruno Antonio Giordano
John Leslie Glossbrenner
John Bennett Gordon, Jr.
Adam Allan Gorski, Jr.
Richard Paul Guidroz
Samuel Murton Guild, Jr.
Richard Alan Haggren
Frederick Jordan Hampton
Daniel Mark Harmon
Harold Edward Headlee
Robert Michael Hechinger
Gerald Keith Hendricks
Frederic Allison Henney, Jr.
Kennith Frank Hite
Franklin Herbert Hodgkins
David Webster Huff
Allan Parker Hunt, Jr.
John Colcock Hutson
Robert Louis Jacobs
Saul Antman Jacobs
Harley Earl Jeans
Loyd Merrill Johnson
Verle LaFayette Johnston
Peter Rowland Kuhn
Barney McCoy Landry, Jr.
Larry James Larsen
Robert Lerner
David Edward Leyshon
Ledyard Long, Jr.
Harold Gene Marsh
Peter Matthews
Anthony Wayne Maynard, Jr.
Robert Franklin McDonald
Donald Albert McGann
Thomas Henry McMullen
Paul Richard Miller
Dain William Milliman, Jr.
William Gregory Moretti, Jr.
Robert Frank Niemann
Alfred Dobson Norton
Robert Earle Olson
John Robert Osborn
Howard Louis Peckham, Jr.
Frank George Penney
Leland Carl Pinkel
Leo Fred Post, Jr.
John Cooper Powell
Jack Lewis Price
Edward Rudolph Prince, Jr.
William Michael Quinn
Irving Butler Reed
Gerald Selah Reeve
Fred Guillermo Reichard
William Lloyd Richardson, Jr.
John Ritchie
David Eaithell Rogers
Donald Henry Roloff
Ernest Guy Rose
William Joseph Ryan
John Alexander Samotis
David Myron Schlatter, Jr.
Seth Ward Scruggs
Philip Sheridan
George Shibata
John Wesley Shine
Harold Dean Shultz
Frank Elliott Sisson II
Carleton Keith Sprague
John Paul Starrett
George Alden Sundlie
Everette Taylor
Stanley Milward Umstead, Jr.
Hoyt Sanford Vandenberg, Jr.
William J. Veurink
Frank Elliott Walker, Jr.
Stephen Watsey
Absalom Theodore Webber, Jr.
Howard Olen Wiles, Jr.
Thomas Humphrey Williams
Charles Russell Witmer, Jr.
James Russell Young, Jr.
Donald David Zurawski

The following-named midshipmen, United States Naval Academy, for appointment in the United States Air Force, in the grade of second lieutenant, effective June 1, 1951, upon their graduation, under the provisions of section 506, Public Law 381, Eightieth Congress (Officer Personnel Act of 1947). Date of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force:

John Edwin Allen
Harvey Thomas Bailey
Weldon Ralph Baird
Dickey Lee Baltz
William Oakley Banks
Thomas Augustus Bartenfeld, Jr.
Henry Leigh Baulch
Ralph Russell Baurichter
William John Bell
Victor Cokayne Benjovsky
John Orrin Berga
John Theodore Berrier
Everett Dale Biddle, Jr.
Clement Dixon Billingslea
Paul Russell Birch
Jackson Huffman Bowden
Horace Lane Brame
Robert B. Bregman
Joseph Philip Brenkle
Donald Atwood Brewer
Gerald Allen Brown
Jack Darwin Brown
James Richard Brown
Sidney Pat Burke
Theo Kit Carson
Patrick Joseph Cashman, Jr.
Wallace Gilbert Christner
Vincent Pancrazio Ciamprone
Edward Paul Clark
Donld Conklin Cole
Donald King Cole
Thomas Patrick Conlin
John Watson Cooper
Joseph Patrick Corrigan III
William Patrick Craven
Alvan Macauley Crews
Gerald Thomas Cullen
Joseph Edward Dailey
Walter Millard Drake, Jr.
Charles Bauer Duke, Jr.
Donald Duane Dusch
Ernest Edward Ebrite
Halvor Martin Ekeren
Antonio Manuel Fernandez, Jr.
David Frederick Ferree
Edward Dunne Flynn
William Hammersley Frasca
Joseph Thomas Garofalo, Jr.

Marvin Colgan Gaske
Robert Edwin Genter
Herman Mills Giesen
Ralph James Gilbert
Leo Glenn, Jr.
Frederick Francis Gorschboth
Robert Patterson Gould
James Harris Grady
Fred Brown Graham
Donald Robert Griesmer
Edward Shuldon Guthrie, Jr.
David William Hall
Frank Charles Halstead
John Francis Hanaway
Robert Chester Harding
Harry George Hartman
LeRoy Kenneth Heidbreder
John David Hemenway
Richard Chester Higgins, Jr.
Max Lloyd Hill, Jr.
Joseph Patrick Hillock, Jr.
Raymond Helttula Howard
James Charles Hunt, Jr.
Francis Robert Hunter, Jr.
Calvin William Hurd
James Benson Irwin
Thomas LeRoy Jackson
Carl Charles Jaffurs
David Russell James
Albert William Johnson
Boyd Walker Johnson
Robert Burns Kalisch
Donald Jerome Kay
Jack Ish Kendrick
Kermit Alexander Kirby
Cecil Edward Langmack
Jerome LaPides
Robert Vernon Larson
James Arthur Latham
William Henry Lawton, Jr.
John Hirst Lederle
Mark Eliot Lemelman
Raymond Harry Lessig
William Duexsaint LeStourgeon
Robert Brierley Loughead, Jr.
Edward Miller Lyden
Paul Leslie Maier
Louis Gene Marlow
John Floyd Martin
Paul Brice Martin
Keith Wayne Matson
John Francis McCaffrey
James Edward McCormick
Charles Evans McDonough
James Eugene McGarrah
John Ferries McGrew
Robert Henderson McIntosh
Charles Joe Meadow
John Nicholas Mehelas
Robert Louis Meinhold
Freddie Dan Meredith
Bernard Stanley Morgan, Jr.
Tipton Pryor Mott-Smith
Joseph John Mularz
David Michael Mullaney
James Barber Murphy
Daniel Crawford Murray
Robert Walker Muth
Stanford Nall
David Fenton Neely
William Boyd Nelson
Donald Alfred Nicksay
John Walter Niven
Charles Wolfgang Nyquist
Charles Clark O'Brien
Basil Anthony Ortolivo
Philip Miller Pahl
Robert Dixon Painter
William Joseph Pardee
James Wheeler Parmelee
Erwin Crockett Peake
James Dargan Perky
Benjamin Francis Price
Kenneth Elmer Pruden
Rudolph Walter Pysz
Lawrence Radkowsky
Jack Lloyd Ramey
Raun Jay Rasmussen
Richard Harold Rasmussen
Robert John Rehwaldt
Raymond Walter Reig
Donald Anthony Richitt
Raymond Arthur Robbins
Louis Aubrey Roberts, Jr.
Robert Martin Roberts
William Gordon Rollins
Theodore Chapman Rook
Robert Walker Roy
Anthony Durk Rynties
Kenneth James Schlagheck
John Preston Schuler
Leonard Warren Seagren
Louis Walker Sessions
Thomas Llewellyn Sheets
Thomas Webster Sherman, Jr.
Stewart Mitchell Singer
John George Skidmore
Paul Amos Smith, Jr.
William Morris Smith, Jr.
Frank Alan Stelzer
Perry Lee Stephens
William Griffith Stephenson III
Walter Clarence Stevens, Jr.
David Twogood Stockman
William Rex Thomas, Jr.
Anthony Stearns Thorne
Frederick James Trost
Willard Martin Truesdell
Edward Wingfield Verner
Charles Matthew Waespy
Richard Ambrose Walsh III
Clifford Lloyd Ward
William Alexander Weaver
Oscar Werner Weber
Donald Elliott Westbrook
James Eugene White
Carr Choate Whitener
William Alonzo Williams, Jr.
William Boyd Wilson

IN THE NAVY

The nominations of David E. Allison et al., for appointment in the Navy, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on April 3, 1951, and appear in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of David E. Allison, which is shown on page 3195, and ending with the name of Ruth Williams, which is shown on page 3198.

The nominations of Henry H. Adams, Jr., et. al., for appointment in the Navy, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on April 17, 1951, and appear in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Henry H. Adams, Jr., which is shown on page 3985, and ending with the name of Harriett E. Tompkins, which is shown on page 3986.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, APRIL 30, 1951

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, our Father, who art always mindful of our needs, we rejoice that in our days of confusion and perplexity Thou art our guide and counselor; in our periods of trial and tribulation Thou art our refuge and strength; and in our times of loneliness and sorrow Thou art companion and comforter.

We pray that these assurances and the abundance of our blessings may never fill us with a sense of independence and self-complacency or make us supercilious and selfishly indifferent to the desperate struggles of others.

Inspire us with an eager longing to relieve the burdens of all mankind and to dedicate ourselves more earnestly to the glorious task of laying the foundation for a better world.

We thank thee for the Christian life and character of Thy servant who labored here so conscientiously and devotedly in obedience to the demands and responsibilities of his high vocation. Grant unto the broken and sorrowing hearts of the members of his bereaved family the healing touch of Thy divine love and the consolation of Thy grace. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, April 26, 1951, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Woodruff, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 3336) entitled "An act to suspend certain import taxes on copper," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. GEORGE, Mr. CONNALLY, Mr. BYRD, Mr. MILLIKIN, and Mr. TAFT to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

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

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

There was no objection.

CONSENT AND PRIVATE CALENDARS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order tomorrow to call both the Consent and Private Calendars.

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

There was no objection.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday of this week be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

THE LATE FRANK BUCHANAN

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER].

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, this is personal. A real man, a real friend, a true servant of democracy, a Representative in the Congress of the United States, passed away on Friday.

You all knew him as a fellow Congressman, FRANK BUCHANAN. I knew him as Frank. His name alone was a tribute to his life and to my enjoyment of his friendship that has been tested through the years.

I must break today a silence of love, for no man tells another through days of association that he loves his friend. Unfortunately, the death of a man breaks that silence, when all the words

in the world are lost in a void, the void of death and the void of loss. We, who remain after our friends depart, call upon memory to acclaim. My memories of FRANK BUCHANAN are as fresh as yesterday's rain.

When such a personal loss occurs, the effect is a lament. But as the hours pass, a narcotic of memory, pleasant and soul-satisfying, disposes the personal hurt and produces a pride for the friendship and the knowing of a friend. Then there is a peace and a joy that follows that would be envied by the world's greatest philosopher.

However, Mr. Speaker, it is not my intent to trespass upon the time of the House by speaking of my personal feelings, for what I want to do and say here in this presence is a tribute to a fellow Member, and again, once again, my friend.

Mr. Speaker, this is fact.

One dies for his country despite battlefields.

One dies for his country as a Congressman. No glory to men who serve by voice.

Your pardon, Mr. Speaker, for injecting another personal tone. But my friend, Mr. BUCHANAN, who lived in the tradition of America, whose life, cut short by an intense desire to serve honorably and unselfishly in a position as servant to our people of the United States, loaded his heart and mind with responsibilities that ultimately caused his retirement to the world beyond. It is not necessary to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that a sacrifice of this sort is an occurrence among us. There are no words in defense of capabilities, extended as they are by the Members of the Congress. The words of a eulogy never repay the sacrifice of Members and their families for the loss of time and comfort and even the presence of the loved one. Occasions such as this make one realize how truly the word "servant" befits us. As the bell tolls the years of our ages, there will always be men like BUCK BUCHANAN who listen not—all in the interests of the people.

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

Mr. EBERHARTER. I yield.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, today we mourn the passing of our dear friend, FRANK BUCHANAN, and we are not only reminded of the brevity of life, but we come to a true realization of the work and character of this fine, clean, outstanding man. Coming out of the city of McKeesport, Pa., where it has been aptly said men make iron and steel for a living, there was something ingrained in this man's nature of strength and durability. He was a fine, consistent, conscientious man; a man of high ideals, who believed in his country and in his fellow man, and had the courage to stand and defend those convictions.

Well educated, a graduate of the University of Pittsburgh and of Columbia University, he gave his early life to teaching the young manhood and young womanhood of his community. As he moved on he became mayor of that great city and he exemplified the highest attributes of civic administration and of a conscientious real duty. Then he came here to serve for nearly 6 years. This country is all the better for FRANK BUCHANAN having lived, and to have devoted himself to public service.

I remember distinctly the strong stand he took on the matter of public housing and the like; and, while we did not see eye to eye on many political questions, I knew that deep in his heart was that conscientious realization that he must do something for his community. He did that to the best of his ability.

So today, as we mourn his departure, we all learn how inadequate and futile are words to convey our inmost feelings, but I am sure every Member of this House realizes today that he has lost a fine friend and that this country has been deprived of the services of a real man all too early in life.

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

Mr. EBERHARTER. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, the passing of FRANK BUCHANAN, our distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania, was, I know, a profound shock to all of us. To me, it is a matter of deep personal grief. He was my friend.

That this diligent and conscientious worker in our ranks should be stricken down in the prime of his career is, perhaps, a sign of the pressures under which we all labor here in these critical times.

Mr. BUCHANAN was relatively young man, yet already he had served his community, his State, and his country. His record of public service as a high-school teacher, as the mayor of McKeesport, Pa., and as a Member of the Congress had marked him as one for whom the future held great possibilities of leadership in the field of statecraft.

Perhaps his greatest contribution to the legislative annals of our day was made as chairman of the Select Committee on Lobbying Activities. He was the author of the resolution creating that committee and pursued the investigation with vigor, determination, and yet with fairness. Respecting the constitutional right of all citizens to petition their Government, Mr. BUCHANAN, at the same time, zealously favored the publication of financial reports by all organized groups seeking to influence legislation.

Despite the burdens of this special undertaking, he continued to carry on with his usual energy and industry his duties as a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the District of Columbia Committee, and the Joint Committee on the Economic Report.

His special field of interest lay in economics and political science as attested, not only by his committee service here but by his record as a student and teacher. He was graduated from the University of Pittsburgh in 1925 with the degree of bachelor of science and pursued postgraduate studies at Columbia University.

In McKeesport high schools he taught civics and political science, and in private industry for a time was employed as an economic consultant.

After a 4-year term as mayor of his native city, Mr. BUCHANAN was elected to the Seventy-ninth Congress to fill the vacancy created by the resignation of Representative Samuel A. Weiss, who became a judge.

Mr. BUCHANAN served the people of the Thirty-third District of Pennsylvania well and faithfully and was rewarded by reelection successively to the Eightieth, Eighty-first, and Eighty-second Congresses.

Always a loyal party member, FRANK BUCHANAN, however, did not permit partisanship to take precedence over the interests of his country. He was a devoted patriot. His support of the Democratic Party sprang from his deep and sincere convictions that its principles best serve the Nation.

Our heartfelt sympathy goes out to the family of FRANK BUCHANAN, his wife, and his lovely twin daughters, in whom he took such pride.

The members of the Pennsylvania delegation have lost a genuine friend, the people of his district have lost a true servant, and the Nation has lost a fine legislator.

We will all miss him greatly.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, a poet once said:

> Not a soul beneath the sun
> But what is precious unto one.

Our late friend, FRANK BUCHANAN, was precious unto countless of thousands of persons. His contributions in this House to the welfare of our people were numerous. It is not my purpose to refer to them on this occasion, but his contributions have now become a part of the history of this great body.

During his living and dynamic prayer this morning the Chaplain among other things referred to our "dedicating ourselves to the building of a finer world," and as he uttered these words the immediate response in my mind was, how true they are in their application to the life of our late friend and colleague, FRANK BUCHANAN. His whole life was dedicated to the building of a finer world by helping the individuals who came in contact with him, and then in the building of character as the teacher; his contribution as a public servant locally, in his State and then on the national level by and through his service in this great body.

Truly can it be said that FRANK BUCHANAN symbolized to the noblest extent humanly possible the character and the individual who during his lifetime made every marked contribution in the building of a finer world. I know of no more splendid compliment that can be paid to anyone than by those who knew him, saying that his life was one that contributed toward the building of a finer world.

I join with the delegation from Pennsylvania in their sorrow, because their ranks have lost a great man and a great American. I extend my sympathy to the people of the congressional district that FRANK BUCHANAN represented so zealously and ably during his period of

service in this body. I have lost a personal friend. I particularly extend to Mrs. Buchanan and her two daughters the profound sympathy of Mrs. McCormack and myself in their bereavement.

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

Mr. EBERHARTER. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I have heard with profound regret of the death of our distinguished colleague, FRANK BUCHANAN.

He was an able, industrious and conscientious Member of Congress. He had a high concept of duty and of fealty to the people he represented. He willingly accepted every opportunity to render public service, however great the obligation incurred. He was chairman of the House Committee on Lobbying Activities in the Eighty-first Congress and a member of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report. He was a hard-working member of the Banking and Currency Committee, and his loss on that committee will be keenly felt. He was a man of sound judgment who kept his feet upon the ground and who was always free from emotionalism and hysteria.

The passing of FRANK BUCHANAN brings sorrow not only to the people of the district he represented and where he had been so greatly honored, but also to the Congress where he was held in such high respect and affection. To his devoted wife and daughters I extend my deepest sympathy.

May the Lord bless him and keep him; may He let the light of His countenance shine upon him and gave him peace.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENNY].

Mr. DENNY. Mr. Speaker, Allegheny County, Pa., will mourn the death of FRANK BUCHANAN. He was a faithful servant of his district and of McKeesport, the city of his birth. He has made a place for himself as a Member of four terms of Congress and he will not be forgotten. He was a man devoted to his work and popular among his associates. His loss will be felt not only in Congress but in western Pennsylvania and our sincere sympathy goes to his bereaved family.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY].

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, words are weak on occasions of this kind; they are almost futile when we come to express our feeling on the passing of a beloved Member, and especially a Member who was a very close colleague.

FRANK BUCHANAN was a good friend of mine. We were well acquainted due to the fact that our congressional districts are adjacent. I knew many of the problems that FRANK BUCHANAN had. I realize the great esteem and respect his constituents had for him.

FRANK BUCHANAN had great ability, he was conscientious, sincere, and he was honest. In my opinion, FRANK BUCHANAN was a statesman. And his contributions in the Halls of this Chamber will long be remembered when our words will long be forgotten.

I express the feeling of my family, as well as my own feeling, because we were well acquainted, and we extend to Mrs. Buchanan and her daughters our very profound sympathy in their bereavement. The few words I have said here are said with a feeling of deep sorrow on the loss of our colleague, a man whose friendship had grown through the years and for whom I had great respect and affection.

Our memory of FRANK BUCHANAN will not soon be forgotten.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SIMPSON].

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, we have all been deeply shocked to learn of the passing of our colleague from Pennsylvania, Hon. FRANK BUCHANAN, who was taken from us in the prime of his life.

FRANK BUCHANAN was a fellow alumnus of mine of the University of Pittsburgh. He earned the respect of his neighbors in McKeesport, Pa., when they elected him their mayor in which office he served from 1942 to 1946. When a vacancy in the House of Representatives occurred, he was elected to fill this position at a special election on May 21, 1946. He was consistently reelected to this office for each succeeding Congress.

His ability was recognized by his colleagues here in the House where he served on the Banking and Currency and District of Columbia Committees, and as chairman of the Select Committee To Investigate Lobbying Activities.

Speaking for myself and for the Pennsylvania Republican delegation from Pennsylvania, I extend our deepest sympathy to the family of our late colleague. In the terrible sorrow of this moment, they can know that their loved one, FRANK BUCHANAN, served well his country and the people of his congressional district.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, we do, indeed, mourn the loss of FRANK BUCHANAN. God placed His finger upon him, and he sleeps. We, in this life, worry and fret and struggle as to what happened yesterday, what may happen today, and what the morrow may bring forth. That is not the case now with Frank. He does not worry or struggle, because as we know death, death keeps no calendar.

Frank's achievements were many. I need not dilate upon them. They are easily demonstrable and well known. We do know particularly that he was soft spoken, that he was kind, that he was gentle and wise, and withal intensely human. I know of nobody who was more human than was Frank. We were always struck with his keen sense of justice. He knew, indeed, I am sure, and agreed with the wise man who said that "Justice is the bread of the nation because all the people hunger for it," and Frank saw to it by ways of justice to answer that hunger. We were also struck with his courage. I believe it was Daniel Webster who, in this very Chamber many years ago, said "one man with courage is a majority," and Frank with his courage was a majority. We can very well say that his chair was a throne because it held a king. We are all the better because he has dwelled among us, because he leaves a good name. We might well say to his wife and dear ones that he does leave that cherished good name, and, as the psalmist says, "Better is the fragrance of a good name than the perfume of precious oils."

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAGUE].

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, it is with a sense of deep personal loss that I have had the word of the untimely passing of our esteemed colleague, the Honorable FRANK BUCHANAN, and I want to be recorded with those who will mourn his departure as that of an outstanding public servant as well as a warm personal friend.

To me the finest tradition of public service is that we do not have to agree with a fellow-worker in matters of policy to appreciate his sincerity, his splendid character, and his zeal for truth and honor. Certainly anyone who knew FRANK BUCHANAN could not help but attest to his possession of these attributes to a high degree and thereby see in his death the removal from the national scene of one who lived in complete dedication to the requirements of his high office.

The futility of mere words is never so evident as when we try to comfort those who are left to mourn the passing of a loved one. Let us rather commend to the bereaved a continuing faith in the assurance that an all-wise Providence who separates us from those we love on this earthly scene will surely reunite us again in that fairer land where there is no more hurt and sorrow but only lasting peace.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN], the Speaker of the House.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, FRANK BUCHANAN was a fine, noble man. He really served his day and generation—the world is richer for his having lived—to his devoted family my deepest sympathy goes out.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. LIND].

Mr. LIND. Mr. Speaker, one of my warmest friends, a Member of this House, has passed away. The death of FRANK BUCHANAN, who represented the Thirty-third District of Pennsylvania, has saddened his many friends here. Frank was active in many phases of civic activity and represented with great ability his district in the House of Representatives.

FRANK BUCHANAN was a good husband, a devoted father, and a warm and loyal friend. He has left to his fine family the heritage of a good name and the achievements of a career upon which the people of his district and the State of Pennsylvania can look with pride.

His home town, McKeesport, the State of Pennsylvania, and the Nation have lost in the death of FRANK BUCHANAN a great statesman and a loyal American.

May his loving wife and his fine daughters be consoled by the fact that FRANK BUCHANAN's life was dedicated to serving his fellow men.

His sincerity of purpose and greatness of character has enriched the lives of all of us who were touched by his fine influence.

To the members of his family, I extend my deepest sympathy in their great sorsow and bereavement. A truly great and a truly good man has passed to his final award.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked to learn of the untimely death of Congressman FRANK BUCHANAN, of Pennsylvania. It was my privilege to serve with him on both the Banking and Currency Committee and the Joint Committee on the Economic Report. He was an honest, able, sincere person. He always kept the public interest in mind and was one of the greatest public servants I ever knew. He was admired and respected by his colleagues for his courage, ability, and desire to make this country a better place in which to live. His passing is a great personal loss, as well as a great loss to the country.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KILBURN].

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, FRANK BUCHANAN was a good friend of mine. We served on the Banking and Currency Committee together for several years and we differed many times on votes and issues. Even so, we were particular friends. I knew I could talk with him about anything and get a straight, honest answer. I enjoyed his company and enjoyed our association. He was a fine American and one of the nicest colleagues that I have ever known. Many times he talked with me about his family and his lovely twin daughters. I know how wrapped up he was in his home life. His passing has been a great blow to me and I know to all of his colleagues. His family can be proud of his memory as we are.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORGAN].

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked and grieved over the death of my close personal friend, FRANK BUCHANAN. I knew him over a period of years and it has been my pleasure to work with him during his service as a Member of the House of Representatives. Since he was elected to Congress in 1946 he has worked untiringly and indefatigably for the people he represented. He was capable and ambitious. Being from adjoining districts we had many of the same problems and I valued his opinions. His sudden and untimely death, in the prime of life, is a personal loss and I will miss him as will his host of friends, his community and the State of Pennsylvania. He was a kind and devoted husband and father and although words cannot ease the grief now suffered by them, I extend to Mrs. Buchanan and his family my profound sympathy and understanding at their great loss and bereavement.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST].

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I rise to pay tribute to the memory of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, FRANK BUCHANAN.

Not many days ago he was here among us; a vital force, an influence for good, an indefatigable worker. Today he is gone.

From the beginning of his service in the Seventy-ninth Congress, FRANK BUCHANAN impressed all of his colleagues with his devotion to duty, his sincerity, and his ability. With the years, as he was returned to this body by the people of his district, our respect for him continued to grow.

FRANK BUCHANAN was an ideal legislator because his whole life interest, even before his election to the Congress, lay in public affairs, in economics, in political science.

In college and in postgraduate work, his studies were along these lines and in public service, in his home community as mayor of McKeesport, and on a national scale, here in Washington, he gave practical application to them.

It was typical of the unselfish spirit and the industriousness of this man that he accepted, additional to his regular duties, tasks which made great demands upon his time and his energies. As chairman of the Select Committee on Lobbying Activities in the Eighty-first Congress he worked hard and many extra hours to perform a conscientious and not too pleasant job.

As a member of the Banking and Currency Committee he was painstaking in the study of details of the highly important legislation that came before them.

With all of these heavy responsibilities, FRANK BUCHANAN still continued faithfully to serve the needs of his constituents.

He lived close by the Capitol to be near his work, yet at every opportunity spent time with his fine family.

I am sure all the Members of this House join me in extending condolences to Mrs. Buchanan and her daughters in this hour of grief.

A devoted husband and father, an earnest, energetic, and faithful public servant, FRANK BUCHANAN has gone to answer the last roll call.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DEANE].

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, there is inscribed above your honored chair these words from Daniel Webster:

> Let us develop the resources of our land, call forth its powers, build up its institutions, promote all its great interests, and see whether we also in our day and generation may not perform something worthy to be remembered.

Mr. Speaker, in FRANK BUCHANAN we have a true picture of those lines that I have just spoken.

Our beloved chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency spoke about Frank's faithful service to that committee. For three and a half years it has been my good fortune to sit side by side with Frank during the long and tedious hearings facing that committee. As our chairman so well stated, I do not know of any individual who was more faithful, who was more alert, who was more anxious to get properly before the committee those facts necessary to develop the important legislation that has come from that committee.

My words are very feeble but they are very sincere when I say that Frank was held in high esteem not only by his colleagues on our side but by those on the other side of the table. We mourn his passing, and I direct to his loved ones my very sincere sympathy.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RHODES].

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I humbly rise to pay tribute and to say farewell to a friend and colleague, FRANK BUCHANAN, of Pennsylvania.

Only last Thursday, the day before his death, I reported on this floor after contact with a member of his family that his condition was good after the operation the previous day. He died last Friday after a turn for the worse.

FRANK BUCHANAN will be missed by all Members of this House. He had a charming personality and a deep sense of fairness and justice. He will be missed by the liberal Members because of his practical idealism, his ability, and his courage.

Frank was not the glib orator or actor who would appeal to emotions. Never would he sink to the level of a demagogue to ride the wave of hysteria. He was too much of a man for that. He would not sacrifice principle and honor to win the plaudits of the powerful and selfish who dominate the major avenues of public information. He was the teacher type. His appeal was always one of reason. His appeal was to fairness and to intelligence. He will be remembered because of the great service he rendered as chairman of the House Committee to Investigate Lobbying Activities. He worked hard and diligently as head of that committee. Someday when the average American learns the whole truth about what this committee uncovered, the name of FRANK BUCHANAN will win far greater respect and far more recognition than it has won today. I feel sure that the hard work he performed contributed to his early death. It had an adverse effect upon the health of this mild-mannered, earnest, and sincere man.

In his death the people of this country have lost a real champion. He was a type of person with high moral character and integrity so greatly needed in American public life today. He was a real statesman. He was a great humanitarian with a deep sense of honor and human decency. He did not openly boast of his great patriotism or deep Christian principles, but he practiced them in his everyday life and in his

activities as a Member of the House of Representatives. He lighted a torch when he exposed some of the evil and subversive practices which threaten our democratic way of life. He left a challenge to us to carry on. I hope this Congress will do so. I hope it will complete the work which FRANK BUCHANAN so nobly advanced. If this Congress will not act some future Congress will when reason, common sense, and justice emerges from the confusion which the forces of blindness, selfishness, and greed have so successfully spread. His great sacrifice will not be in vain. Time and history will bring honor to FRANK BUCHANAN as it always does to men of such sterling character when truth finally triumphs over deception. He will be remembered for his faith and loyalty to the cause of liberalism and true Americanism.

Little that is said here today will bring comfort to his wife and daughters to whom, in closing, I express my deep feeling of sympathy for the loss of a loving husband and father.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. DOYLE].

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I was one of the members of the Select Committee To Investigate Lobbying Activities during the last session. I had the great privilege of sitting under the chairmanship of Hon. FRANK BUCHANAN therefor, for that lengthy assignment. I shall always consider that as one of the high privileges of my life. He was a fine gentleman.

I think perhaps it may be appropriate for me to mention just two or three incidents of my intimate committee work with FRANK BUCHANAN. I think they illustrate the real character that he had. I always felt refreshed after being in his presence. I always felt I had met a gentleman who was trying to continue to be a gentleman. I always felt that I was glad to sit with him socially because he always had a contribution to make that was worth while. I want to say as a Member of the House that as our colleague Frank has passed on from our midst, a thing about him I realized the most from my daily contact with him, so intimate for many months, was that he was outstandingly conscientious on his job, and it was a challenging job. I had occasion to go to California during the recess of sessions of the committee, and I left word with him as chairman something like this—I said, "If you need my authorization to carry through on something that the rest of the committee want to carry through, why, go ahead and use it." I knew that I would be on the move and that he could not reach me on the phone very conveniently. Twice during the few weeks I was in California he called me long distance. He reached me one morning very, very early, before I left my home in California, at 5 a. m., because it was 3 hours earlier here. He wanted to make sure that I knew what the committee was proposing to do on a certain report. He wished to make sure that I, as a member of the committee, had the opportunity and responsibility of also having a voice in the committee report, regardless of the authority I had extended him.

On another occasion, I said to the chairman: "Frank, I would be pleased to receive the printer's first proof of that report. About what time could I have it tomorrow do you suppose?"

He said, "Clyde, I will be here at my office before 8 o'clock tomorrow morning. Your office is just around the hall. If you want to send over, I will have a copy here at my office at 8 o'clock. I will be here." He was there. He was there too often too early during that very heavy chairmanship of the Select Lobby Committee.

I then discovered that his habit was to get to work about the time most of us were thinking of awakening in the morning.

Frank has passed on ahead of us, not because he tried to spare himself in performing his duty but because he was unsparing of himself in performing his duty. He recognized his moral as well as his legal duty; he did this beyond the call of duty.

Another time, I remember during the committee hearings, the question was under consideration as to whom we should ask the House to cite for contempt of our committee proceedings. Being a lawyer myself and knowing that Frank was not a lawyer, I was greatly inspired by the fact that he was asking us to make sure that in our decision no injustice nor unfairness was being done to any man. This was typical of him. He was anxious to see to it that no man should suffer or be harmed a bit. He had no conscious desire to be unjust or unfair.

I wish to pass this on to you Members. I am sure you will agree with me that Frank was a living example of a desire to be fair, just, kind, helpful. I think it is incumbent upon us as his surviving colleagues to be more fair than ever before; to be more kind and helpful to people because we had a living example of a man in FRANK BUCHANAN.

One more incident: I was a member of the majority members on Select Lobby Committee. I am sure that we on the majority, and the minority also, were very conscious of the fair and square manner in which he presided at those hearings. I had a sense of being able to rely on the fact that Frank had prepared the work of the committee in such a thorough way that we, as members of the committee, could be conscious of the fact that the committee was presided over by him, with a dominant desire on his part to see to it that the minority members could also always have equal opportunity to present their views and have their time for questioning witnesses on the committee.

On one occasion Frank came to me deliberately just before the committee began and he said, "Clyde, I know that BROWN of the committee has important questions to ask the witnesses today. Let us see that he and Mr. HALLECK get all the time they need." This was just like him.

I had the pleasure of sitting with FRANK BUCHANAN the last day he sat in this House. It was the day General MacArthur spoke to the joint meeting recently. He deliberately came and sat down next to me. His first question was, "Clyde how are you getting on with the Un-American Activities Committee job?" I told him it was a challenging but important job, much like the Lobby Committee. I thought then that it was quite startling that a man should get up out of a hospital bed and come to that joint meeting of the House and Senate, a really sick man, and then his first question to me was about a problem of Congress.

While Frank never boasted about his patriotism or his desire to protect our form of government, it was just a part of him to be concerned chiefly with the welfare of the people of our great Nation. He was richly imbued with a patriotic zeal to so serve his Nation as to protect it against false doctrines and selfish people and pressures.

I will never forget, JOHN MCCORMACK, and you probably do not forget either, this incident at the joint meeting: You will remember that just that day a jury here in Washington had found one of the men whom we had asked be cited for contempt, Dr. Rumely, by a unanimous verdict, guilty on all three counts of contempt of Congress. JOHN MCCORMACK, just before General MacArthur spoke, leaned over to FRANK BUCHANAN, who was sitting next to me that day, and said to Frank something like this: "I think that jury verdict, Frank, ought to make you feel mighty happy, because it is a compliment to the fine work you as chairman and your Select Committee on Lobbying did."

Then FRANK BUCHANAN said to me: "Clyde, JOHN MCCORMACK never forgets to say a good word for a Member of our House, regardless of which party he belongs to, does he?"

I express my humble but very sincere words of sympathy to his loyal and bereaved wife, and to his daughters. He was brave and they naturally will be in his memory. I am sure we members of the Select Committee and the staff will never forget that after the work was over Frank, on his own, saw to it that the many volunteer members who helped us brief and coordinate our work, because we had many volunteer workers, and we did not have money enough to do all we intended to, had a very sincere dinner. But it was just like him, out of appreciation for very valuable volunteer work well done, to give these volunteer workers and the staff a bouquet of flowers while they could smell them.

Mr. Speaker, some sage has wisely said that the evil that men do lives after them, but the good is often interred with their bones. But the good that Frank lived in his daily life will not be interred with his bones. The amount of good he did was so great and its sincerity and unselfishness so pure that the good he started on its way through life will live for a very, very long time. Regardless of what religious faith we may have; regardless of the details with which we think through the matter of death and

the life hereafter; regardless of whether we believe in a life hereafter or not, the fact is that the greatest tribute we can give to what FRANK BUCHANAN was and did each day amongst us would be to make our own lives habitually a little more sincere and our attitude toward public service a little more unselfish and generous and with a greater abundance of real service to others our daily watchword and practice. In a very large sense Frank's courtesy, kindness, encouragement and appreciation expressed to me in his lifetime I believe will make me a very much better Congressman.

Now, in closing I wish to relate another incident on the occasion of Frank's last sitting on this floor. He leaned over to me and put his right hand on my left hand and said:

Clyde, thanks for sending me that letter to the hospital. It was better than a large dose of aspirin.

And so I thought that because I have, in these extemporaneous, humble remarks, two or three incidents of my association with FRANK BUCHANAN, I would share with you the text herewith set forth of a letter I sent to him on April 1, 1951. It was this letter to which Frank referred:

APRIL 1, 1951.

Hon. FRANK BUCHANAN,
Bethesda Naval Hospital,
Bethesda, Md.

MY DEAR FRANK: I have been missing you hereabouts. Just now I called your office and found that the reason for your smiling face not appearing on the floor and elsewhere during the last couple of weeks—was because you were out there in Bethesda resting up a bit. Good luck to you. You are a prince of a gentleman.

If there is anything in the world I can do for you, let me know; tell your secretaries to let me know. Either my staff or I will be glad to help them.

Cordially yours,

CLYDE DOYLE,
Member of Congress.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES].

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I subscribe in great earnestness to all that has been said here today about FRANK BUCHANAN and his value as a good American, a good Congressman, a good friend, a good husband and father.

There are times when sorrow is genuine and regret is sincere; this is one of those times. We know now how much we need FRANK BUCHANAN and men like him, and how much we shall miss him.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT].

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, like all other Members of this body, I was greatly shocked and deeply grieved on learning of the death of my friend, FRANK BUCHANAN. I met Frank when I first came to the Congress. I learned to love him. When the Select Committee on Lobbying Activities was organized I had the honor of serving under his leadership. I then learned to admire him as I have admired few men in my lifetime. I have never known a man who had more consistency of purpose, more devotion to duty or a greater capacity for hard work than FRANK BUCHANAN. I know his lovely wife and lovely daughters and I extend to them my deepest sympathy in this hour of their bereavement. This country has lost a fine public servant: I have lost a fine friend.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KEARNS].

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I know the Nation today grieves over the loss of a capable legislator. FRANK BUCHANAN was a great man because he was a great humanitarian.

I happened to have known FRANK BUCHANAN many years before he came to Congress. He was a school teacher and we had served on education panels many times that were evaluating educational programs in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. I learned to admire him then and I have always highly respected him since he became a Member of Congress.

I was deeply shocked last Friday night in Pennsylvania when I learned of his death. It was quite a coincidence because early that morning I had been in a little grocery store buying some groceries. The clerk asked: "Do you ever see my friend FRANK BUCHANAN down there in Washington?" I said, "Oh, yes; quite often. He is sick." He said, "Is that so?" He further said: "I had FRANK BUCHANAN in school. He taught me. He was a good teacher and a good friend." He said, "I want to tell you something, Congressman, the reason FRANK BUCHANAN was mayor of the city and then later United States Congressman was because the boys and girls thought there was no one like FRANK BUCHANAN."

So as I humbly stand in the well of the House today paying my last tribute to a great teacher and a good Congressman I, like all of the students who graduated under FRANK BUCHANAN, realize how sorrowfully we mourn his passing.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS].

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I first came to know FRANK BUCHANAN intimately when I served with him on the Joint Committee on Housing. We went over the country together and while FRANK BUCHANAN had definite and strong convictions after due study and deliberation about the type of legislation that committee should recommend, he was always eminently fair in his consideration of witnesses and others who desired to be heard before the committee. As a matter of fact, we worked oftentimes late at night because Frank was insistent that everyone who desired to be heard be given that opportunity.

I think that fairly characterizes his service in this body and to the people of America. He desired at all times to hear all sides of a question, and having reached a decision, he was square and firm in his convictions regardless of what the consequences might be to him personally or politically. He was devoted to his country, to his colleagues here in Congress, to his fine wife, and lovely daughters.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that as long as our Nation is able to produce men of the character of FRANK BUCHANAN and the people are able to elect and send men of the type of his convictions to the Congress, our Republic and its future is assured.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HAMILTON C. JONES].

Mr. HAMILTON C. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I rise to make a few remarks concerning my good friend FRANK BUCHANAN. This is my third term in Congress and I unhesitatingly say that Frank was one of the finest men I have met in Washington. In character he was very strong, but kind and thoughtful. In temperament, he was of that type which is suited for responsibility in the Congress of the United States and for intelligent and consistent decisions. In disposition, he possessed an evenness of temper and fairness to the other man's view which is rarely excelled in public life; in diligence and industry in the discharge of his duties as Congressman. There are very few men who during their service ever worked harder at their job than Frank. This was shown in the masterful way in which he tackled the job of heading the Lobby Investigating Committee. And may I mention as a most valuable asset of his character was his love and devotion for his family consisting of his attractive wife and two charming daughters, to which our heartfelt sympathy is extended.

In public service, he rose very rapidly in the opinion not only of the Members of Congress, but of the people of the Nation. It was quite unusual for a Member of Congress to have attained the prominence and influence and general all around ability acquired by FRANK BUCHANAN since his entrance into Congress in the latter part of the Seventy-ninth Congress.

A splendid future lay ahead of him and it is most disappointing and very sad that his career should have been cut short, at a time when he was so rapidly developing as a great leader in the proceedings of Congress, and especially of those appertaining to his important Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT].

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, so many of FRANK BUCHANAN'S colleagues have told us of his devotion, of his splendid character, and of the far-reaching effects of his life, that I am going to approach the subject today in a different manner. I was thinking of the thoughts that must come to the Speaker as he daily presides over this body of men of whom he is so proud and in whom he is so tremendously interested, as he has told us on many occasions. It must strike him from time to time, as he looks over this group, to wonder which one will the Angel of Death take next from our midst. How many of you would ever have thought, just a few weeks ago, that the strong FRANK BUCHANAN, in the prime of his manhood, with all of his ability, with his apparent fine health and strength would be the next to leave this

body? How many of you hear the call and remember the phrase, "I will come like a thief in the night"? We remember the eternal reward of the good thief hanging on Calvary for a word of sympathy for the dying Christ. "This day thou shalt be with Me in Paradise," was the divine answer to a humble act of charity. When we compare that life with the life of our colleague, closed now, and think of his devotion to the little people of the country, that we heard ever and ever in his remarks on this floor, what a welcome he must have had at his Father's home.

For the spending of one's self for another is the most perfect type of charity, and that was the life of FRANK BUCHANAN.

For us, it might be well to remember those words of the song that once it was my privilege to sing in this room:

Father, be near when my feet are slipping o'er the brink,
For it may be I am nearer home, nearer now than I think.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK].

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I remember distinctly the first day I saw FRANK BUCHANAN in this Chamber. For some reason, something said concerning Daniel Webster came to my mind. The story is told that when Daniel Webster one day walked along a street, perhaps in this city, passing some workmen, the workmen instinctively turned and looked after him, and one of them remarked, "Surely no man can be as great as he looks."

That saying came to mind when I first saw FRANK BUCHANAN in this Chamber. I said to myself, "Can he be as distinguished as he looks?" Although still a young man, he wore that crown of gray hair with honor and a look of distinction.

I was not favored in knowing him so intimately as some who have preceded me today, not being on any committee with him nor working intimately with him, but I watched his conduct here on the floor. He never rose to speak at his desk nor did he take the well of this House without having something worth while to say, and he said it in a forceful and distinguished way.

I was impressed with what his colleague from his home town in Pennsylvania said a moment ago, and it comes pretty close to me. He said that just a few days ago he talked with one of FRANK BUCHANAN's former students. "He was a great teacher," the former student said.

If I on leaving these halls can have my former students say of me that I kept the trust, the faith that they had in me, as this former student of FRANK BUCHANAN's said of him. I shall be satisfied.

Mr. Speaker, we have lost a great man, and I mourn his untimely passing.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SUTTON].

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, it was with a sense of profound shock and sorrow that I heard of the passing of my good friend and colleague, FRANK BUCHANAN. When I came to Washington as a freshman Congressman "Buck," as he was most affectionately known, was one of the first persons I met. One of the most valuable things which I shall cherish from my tenure here in Washington is my association with BUCK BUCHANAN. I wish words would permit me to express my feelings in the loss of my personal friend. But as it has been so well said, "Love is something so divine that description would but make it less. It is what you see and what you feel, but cannot express." Mr. Speaker, those are my sentiments at this time. I lost a true and tried personal friend, a God-fearing, God-loving American citizen. I join with my colleagues in extending my deepest sympathy to his family and loved ones.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANHAM].

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I too was shocked and grieved to learn of the death of our colleague, FRANK BUCHANAN. As a member of the House Select Committee on Lobbying of which Mr. BUCHANAN was the distinguished chairman, I came to know him as I never would otherwise have known him and knowing him better I came to respect, admire, and love him.

He was a fair and impartial presiding officer and, while not a lawyer himself, he did have the judicial temperament and was able to guide the committee in its consideration of the important problems facing it with fairness, efficiency, and dispatch.

As chairman of the Select Committee on Lobbying it fell to his part to supervise and direct the work of the staff. This involved a vast amount of work on his part and I have no doubt this service of his far beyond the call of duty was one of the things that weakened him so that disease struck him swiftly and fatally. He died a victim of his zeal and determination to acquaint the people of America with the stupendous amounts being spent by big business, by labor, and by other pressure groups seeking to influence legislation. His peculiar contribution to the thinking on this subject was his recognition of and emphasis upon the fact that lobbyists and lobbying tactics are changing and that now the lobbyists are more and more turning to the field of indirect lobbying by which I mean that they are seeking to influence legislation by molding public opinion at the grass roots by propaganda that is often biased and one-sided and slanted so as to seek to identify the welfare of the country with the selfish interests of the particular group or groups they represent. He hammered this home in his questioning of witnesses and in the committee's reports on the result of its studies.

He was deeply hurt by the smear tactics of such cattle as Westbrook Pegler, Dr. Edward A. Rumely, recently convicted of contempt of Congress for his failure to supply information requested by the committee, and William A. Patterson, the Negro Communist. He resented their attacks upon the integrity of the committee, and I have no doubt but that the misrepresentation and vilification to which he was subjected contributed to his untimely death. But he refused to be frightened or turned from his course by the tactics of his critics. He kept his courageous course to the end and with St. Paul he could well say, "I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, and I kept the faith."

In FRANK BUCHANAN's passing, the State and the Nation have lost an able and conscientious servant and his family a loving husband and father. My sincerest sympathy goes out to his charming wife and his lovely daughters. They may well be proud of the heritage left them by their husband and father.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask the unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks at this point, and have five legislative days to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the life and services of the late FRANK BUCHANAN.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, along with so many of my colleagues, I desire to pay a humble word of respect to the memory of our late colleague, FRANK BUCHANAN. This distinguished gentleman joined our ranks in a special election, and since we came from different parts of the country, I had no reason to know him intimately until the election of 1948. During the fall of 1948, I was designated by the chairman of our National Democratic Party to speak in several parts of the country. One of many assignments was in Pennsylvania at McKeesport, which in reality is a part of the great industrial city of Pittsburgh. Upon leaving my home in the deep South, I recall how bright and sunny the day was. Later, as we landed in McKeesport, I was impressed with the cloudy, smoky, muggy weather. Congressman BUCHANAN met me at the airport, and soon we were in his attractive home. Upon meeting his beautiful wife and his intelligent, sweet, twin daughters, the clouds outside soon disappeared.

Spending the evening hours with the Buchanans, I was impressed by the dignity and respect of this ideal home. In this day of increasing disrespect for parental influence and lack of regard for marital bonds, it is inspiring to know of homes like that of the Buchanans.

After a pleasant evening meal, we went along to the political meeting and I was not surprised to observe the high respect in which this hard-working, capable, devoted public servant was held by his fellows. FRANK BUCHANAN, as he was affectionately known by his countless friends, in addition to being capable, was so devoted to his work until he thought little of his health or his personal comforts. In his early days here, he was one of the most impressionable figures among us. His well-developed physique, emphasized by his broad, manly shoulders, with his premature gray hairs, was always distinguishable. Only

in recent months could those of us who were with him daily recognize that all was not well. In spite of his failing health, we were unwilling and unready to believe that his illness would prove fatal. It is hard to realize that one so capable, so devoted, should be called so early to his final reward. Thus it is, however, that oftentimes in life the choicest fruit falls first from the tree. Along this highway of life, this outstanding scholar and statesman had scarcely reached midlife. His burdens were too heavy until in weariness he fell by the wayside into dreamless and eternal sleep.

Only yesterday in a conversation with the distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, the Honorable ROBERT DOUGHTON of North Carolina, we observed that age was not the only important factor in life's journey. This fact is now proven since Congressman BUCHANAN was scarcely half the age of Congressman DOUGHTON, who still enjoys good health and, of course, is one of the outstanding leaders of Congress.

On sad and unexpected occasions like these, words are inadequate. Let us each seek to glean from our experiences with this good and noble man those influences which will make us more dedicated to the high trust we bear.

To his attractive companion in marriage and to his unusually beautiful twin daughters go the prayers and sympathy of each Member of the House.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I wish to subscribe to the sentiments expressed by my colleagues with reference to the outstanding service of our beloved friend FRANK BUCHANAN as a Member of the House. It was my pleasure to be associated with him for several years on the Banking and Currency Committee and I developed the greatest admiration for him as a legislator and public servant. His untimely death brings a sense of great personal sorrow to all of us. Death enables us to see in clearer perspective the standards of service and the ideals exemplified by our departed colleagues. We will remember FRANK BUCHANAN not only for his devotion to legislative duties but for the traits of character which endeared him to us.

I am reminded of Tennyson's expression with reference to Arthur Hallam, his young friend in whose honor he wrote In Memoriam, for FRANK BUCHANAN possessed those qualities which must have appealed so strongly to the great poet:

> I would the great world grew like thee
> Who grewest not alone in power
> And knowledge, but by year and hour
> In reverence and in charity.

We mourn with his family the passing of a truly great American.

Mrs. BOSONE. Mr. Speaker, Friday night when I heard Commentator Frank Edwards announce over the radio the passing of FRANK BUCHANAN, Member of this House, I was shocked. I had realized for quite some time that Congressman BUCHANAN was not on the floor of the House, and that I had not seen him and that, as a colleague of his, I greatly missed him. It was not until late last week that I was told he was ill and in the hospital.

I have watched and listened to Congressman BUCHANAN with great interest. FRANK BUCHANAN had every attribute of a gentleman along with intelligence and courage. He analyzed issues, and had the gift of passing on to his colleagues the result of his analysis. He had understanding, and a sympathy with all of the problems that came to his attention.

Congressman BUCHANAN made an outstanding contribution to this Government through the Subcommittee on Lobbying, of which he was the chairman. I have heard the hearings referred to as those which should be read by all of the Members and passed on to their constituents. At all times it appears in these hearings that Congressman BUCHANAN was interested in getting the facts. It may very well be that these hearings will be a living monument to FRANK BUCHANAN.

I wish to share the grief of my colleagues who have expressed themselves on the passing of Congressman BUCHANAN. I sympathize deeply with Mrs Buchanan and her beautiful daughters at this time.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, there was no finer, kindlier, more conscientious man than our colleague FRANK BUCHANAN. He embodied the legendary qualities of the perfect public servant. He was honest, courageous, and able. But beyond those prerequisites he faced his tasks with a high mindedness, a nobleness of purpose, which goes only with statesmanship. When the chips were down he preferred to be right, than to be popular. In these times of national crisis that should be the test. With demagogs to the right of us, and demagogs to the left of us, the country's greatest need is men who through all the clamor can hear, and who have the courage to heed the clear call of duty. FRANK BUCHANAN was that kind of a Congressman. His passing is a grievous loss to the Nation, as well as to us who are his friends. It is the more tragic that he was taken at the full tide of his strength.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, I knew the late FRANK BUCHANAN for a relatively short time but I do not believe that I have ever known a more intelligent, sincere and hard-working man. FRANK BUCHANAN was above all always a great humanitarian. He was a humanitarian because he always fought for the little people, those people who have no powerful organized lobby to represent them here in our Nation's Capitol.

FRANK BUCHANAN'S formal education at the University of Pittsburgh and Columbia University gave him a thorough understanding of the scientific aspects of economics and government and thus made him one of the most effective spokesmen for liberalism that this House has ever had. Nevertheless, his progressive ideals found their ultimate source in his own personal experience, for FRANK BUCHANAN was of humble origin and had grown up among the tragic economic and social problems which are the unfortunate product of our great industrial centers.

This House will miss him, and the working man and woman all over this country will miss him. A great soldier in the battle against ignorance, poverty, and selfishness has fallen.

May I in closing extend my profound sympathy to Mrs. Buchanan and her daughters in this their hour of deep sorrow.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I was privileged to have FRANK BUCHANAN as a dear friend. I am experiencing today a genuine feeling of loss and sadness. The sense of bereavement spreads far beyond this Chamber, I know, for FRANK BUCHANAN was a man who made friends easily and often, and kept them.

It was not my lot to serve in committee with our lamented colleague, but I had frequent occasion to discuss with him the business of the House. Invariably, I found him ready to explore every face of a complex problem. He was not given to snap judgments. His constant concern was the public good, and he worked conscientiously to arrive at decisions which his careful reasoning convinced him conformed to the best interests of the people.

FRANK BUCHANAN was a friendly, considerate man, and we who mourn him today will remember him with great affection for these ingratiating qualities. We shall recall, too, that he had great courage and would not deign to compromise with his convictions. It was an intellectual integrity which garnered respect throughout his public career—now ended in midpassage by the Maker's design. This notable gentleman from Pennsylvania never shunned controversy; neither did he court it. When battle lines were drawn, either in committee or on the floor, he was ready to fight for the right, as he saw it, and his own political fate never colored his resolution.

We shall have to continue here without FRANK BUCHANAN, but it will be neither easy nor pleasant. His generous spirit was a balm; his integrity and vigor formed an inspiration. Our heartfelt sympathy goes out today to Mrs. Buchanan and their lovely twin daughters, and to the people of Pennsylvania's Thirty-third District, for whom FRANK BUCHANAN labored so sedulously and well.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I was stunned by the unexpected passing of our beloved colleague, Hon. FRANK BUCHANAN, of Pennsylvania.

It was my good fortune to know Frank intimately. I had a very sincere regard and warm affection for him, having met him the day he became a Member of this body in the Seventy-ninth Congress as the result of a special election held on May 21, 1946. I soon found that we had many things in common, not only with respect to legislative problems upon which we nearly always agreed but with respect to the social and economic problems which play such a vital part in the lives and welfare of our people in this great country of ours.

He was a real gentleman and always kind and considerate of those with whom he came in contact. I do not ever recall hearing him utter an unkind word on this floor or anywhere else. Such a

tribute can be paid to few men. His attractive personality and disposition endeared him to his colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

I shall always remember FRANK BUCHANAN as an extremely handsome man with a robust physique. He somehow radiated superb health and consequently few of his colleagues could have been aware of the fact that his work here would end so soon.

Perhaps that explains why the news of his passing was such a devastating shock to most of us.

During his tenure in this House, Congressman BUCHANAN rendered valuable service to his constituents and his country. As a member of the House Banking and Currency Committee and as chairman of the House Select Committee on Lobbying Activities, he was an able and indefatigable worker and will be greatly missed by his colleagues and his host of friends in the Thirty-third Congressional District of Pennsylvania and elsewhere. He always championed the cause of the little people, and the record of his achievements shall live on.

I prize very highly my warm friendship with him and shall surely miss him, as will his colleagues in the House. I extend heartfelt sympathy to his devoted wife and his lovely twin daughters. The inspiring example of his life is a legacy that they and each of us shall always cherish.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 213).

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. FRANK BUCHANAN, a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania.

Resolved, That a committee of 10 Members of the House with such Members of the Senate as may be joined be appointed to attend the funeral.

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms of the House be authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the provisions of these resolutions and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as members of the funeral committee the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. WALTER, Mr. EBERHARTER, Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania, Mr. CORBETT, Mr. FULTON, Mr. MORGAN, Mr. VAN ZANDT, Mr. GREEN, and Mr. DENNY.

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the remainder of the resolutions.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect the House do now adjourn.

The resolution was agreed to.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 12 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 1, 1951, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

409. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting the budget for the military functions of the Department of Defense for the fiscal year 1952, containing proposed appropriations amounting to $57,604,254,390, estimates under proposed legislaton of $4,500,000,000, and proposed provisions affecting said proposed appropriations (H. Doc. No. 120); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

410. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a letter relative to the case of Cynthia Kirpalani Farr nee Cynthia Dick, file No. A-6053362 CR 28612, requesting that it be withdrawn from those now before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

411. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a copy of an order of the Acting Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization dated November 16, 1950, authorizing temporary admission into the United States of Displaced Persons, who upon arrival in possession of appropriate immigration visas, are found to be excludable as persons within the classes enumerated in section 1 (2) of the act of October 16, 1918, as amended by section 22 of the Internal Security Act of 1950; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

412. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting statistical tables reflecting the business transacted by the bankruptcy courts and other pertinent data for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1950, pursuant to section 53 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U. S. C. 81); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

413. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the Seventh Annual Report of Operations under the Fort Peck Project Act of May 18, 1938, for fiscal year ended June 30, 1950, pursuant to section 8 of the Fort Peck Project Act of May 18, 1938 (52 Stat. 403); to the Committee on Public Works.

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. THOMAS: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 3880. A bill making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 384). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GARMATZ: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 385. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. GARMATZ: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 386. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. REED of Illinois: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3455. A bill to amend section 4202 of title 18, United States Code, relating to parole of Federal prisoners; with amendment (Rept. No. 387). 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. THOMAS:

H. R. 3880. A bill making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. BENTSEN (by request):

H. R. 3881. A bill to amend section 2 of the Materials Act in order to facilitate the disposal of materials on the public lands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 3882. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to lease withdrawn or reserved public lands in Alaska for dock, wharf, and landing-site purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 3883. A bill to repeal certain laws relating to timber and stone on the public domain; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 3884. A bill to amend the rules pertaining to the display of the flag of the United States of America from a staff in a church or public auditorium; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H. R. 3885. A bill to establish a department of food services in the public schools of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 3886. A bill to increase the salaries of Federal judges and the compensation of Members of Congress, and heads and assistant heads of executive departments and independent agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRIEST:

H. R. 3887. A bill to provide for the construction of a Veterans' Administration hospital and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TACKETT:

H. R. 3888. A bill to provide honorable discharges to active military inductees and trainees who entered the military service by virtue of a "military order of induction"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CRUMPACKER:

H. R. 3889. A bill to amend sections 1505 and 3486 of title 18 of the United States Code relating to congressional investigations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska:

H. J. Res. 245. Joint resolution to limit the taxing and spending powers of the Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REECE of Tennessee:

H. J. Res. 246. Joint resolution to establish a National Commission on Security and Peace; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. DONDERO: Memorial of the State of Michigan, House of Representatives, to enact legislation amending the Federal Income Tax Act with respect to exemptions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANTAFF: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Florida, to petition the Secretary of the Interior of the United States to reconsider and abandon the idea of condemning certain lands owned by the State of Florida or one of its agencies in Citrus County, Fla., to be used as a migratory bird refuge; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

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

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

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

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to oppose any measures to alter the tax status of cooperatives; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BRAY:

H. R. 3890. A bill for the relief of Hormoz Mahmoud; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRNE of New York:

H. R. 3891. A bill for the relief of Paul D. Banning, Chief Disbursing Officer, Treasury Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. R. 3892. A bill for the relief of Milton C. Towner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. R. 3893. A bill for the relief of Eiko Takano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3894. A bill for the relief of Albert M. Goldberg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING:

H. R. 3895. A bill for the relief of Ethel Cristeta Berner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 3896. A bill for the relief of Frank A. Wefel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MANSFIELD (by request):

H. R. 3897. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue to Yellowstone Metals, Inc., patents in fee to certain lands in Meagher County, Mont.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RAMSAY:

H. R. 3898. A bill for the relief of William E. Gillespie, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

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

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

258. Also, petition of Jose Ma. Araneta, secretary, Tagbilaran, Philippine Islands, relative to requesting the release of $100,000,000 appropriation for the payment of war damage claims in the Philippines; to the Committee on Appropriations.

SENATE

TUESDAY, MAY 1, 1951

(Legislative day of Tuesday, April 17, 1951)

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

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

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

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

THE JOURNAL

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

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

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I shall not object to the request, because I know how important it is to have such matters attended to. However, I wish to point out that the bill which is now the unfinished business of the Senate has been dragging on, day after day after day, and our work on the bill has been handicapped because there have been so many meetings of various Senate committees. One of the principal reasons why the bill which is the unfinished business has not been finally passed upon by the Senate is the handicap caused by the meeting of so many committees and subcommittees of the Senate during the course of the debate on this piece of proposed legislation.

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

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me say that if I thought the committee meetings were the real reason why more progress has not been made on the bill which is the unfinished business, I would object to the request which has been made. However, I think the real reason has been the speeches which have been made on other matters.

I think we are going to come to the time when objection will have to be made to having committees, with the possible exception of the Appropriations Committee, meet during the sessions of the Senate, if we expect to end the session at any reasonable time this year. I hope we can do so. I concur in what the distinguished minority leader has said; I certainly hope we can make progress on this bill today.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, in reply to what has been said, I wish to say that I thoroughly agree with what the Senators have stated. However, inasmuch as at this particular time the committee has before it the Deputy Postmaster General, who has been testifying, I have felt obligated to come to the Senate Chamber and make the request, in order that he might be able to continue his testimony. That was the only reason for making the request.

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

On request of Mr. RUSSELL, and by unanimous consent, the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee considering the Treasury and Post Office appropriation bill, was authorized to meet in the hearing room of the Appropriations Committee during the session of the Senate today.

CONFERRING OF POWERS OF STANDING COMMITTEES ON THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS AND THE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES SITTING JOINTLY

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that for the purpose of holding joint meetings in accordance with the order of the Senate of April 25, 1951, the Committees on Armed Services and Foreign Relations be constituted a committee of the Senate with all the powers conferred upon standing committees of the Senate.

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

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators be