S. 516. An act to authorize the furnishing of steam from the central heating plant to the property of the Daughters of the American Revolution, and for other purposes; and

S. J. Res. 97. Joint resolution limiting the application of provisions of Federal law to counsel employed under Senate Resolution 46.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 2 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, April 14, 1947, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

526. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate for the fiscal year 1947 in the amount of $590,000 for the Department of the Interior (H. Doc. No. 190); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

527. A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend section 100 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

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. O'HARA: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 492. A bill to authorize the juvenile court of the District of Columbia in proper cases to waive jurisdiction in capital offenses and offenses punishable by life imprisonment; with amendments (Rept. No. 242). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. O'HARA: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 493. A bill to amend section 4 of the act entitled "An act to control the possession, sale, transfer, and use of pistols and other dangerous weapons in the District of Columbia," approved July 8, 1932 (sec. 22, 3204 D. C. Code, 1940 ed.); with amendments (Rept. No. 243). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 2659. A bill to establish a program for the rehabilitation of alcoholics, promote temperance, and provide for the medical and scientific treatment of persons found to be alcoholics by the courts of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 244). 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. CHELF:

H. R. 3015. A bill to revoke the naturalization of persons who have been discharged from the United States Government service in compliance with Executive Order No. 9835; to deport such persons; and to deport aliens concerning whom the Attorney General knows or has reason to believe their presence in the United States may endanger the public safety or welfare of the country; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAMEY:

H. R. 3016. A bill to amend subsection 200 (c) of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 3017. A bill to provide waiver of premiums on national service life insurance policies for certain totally disabled veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin:

H. R. 3018 A bill to prevent profiteering in time of war and to equalize the burdens of war and promote peace; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. RAMEY:

H. R. 3019. A bill to amend the act of June 22, 1936, so as to permit the construction of public works on the Great Lakes for purposes of flood control, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HARTLEY:

H. R. 3020. A bill to prescribe fair and equitable rules of conduct to be observed by labor and management in their relations with one another which affect commerce, to protect the rights of individual workers in their relations with labor organizations whose activities affect commerce, to recognize the paramount public interest in labor disputes affecting commerce that endanger the public health, safety, or welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MORRIS:

H. R. 3021. A bill to authorize the patenting of certain lands which formed a part of the original Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache Reservation in Oklahoma to the city of Lawton, Okla., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H. R. 3022. A bill to promote the mining of coal, phosphate, sodium, potassium, oil, oil shale, gas, and sulfur on lands acquired by the United States; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. REES:

H. R. 3023. A bill providing for a Federal Employees' Loyalty Act of 1947; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HARDIE SCOTT:

H. J. Res. 166. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the services rendered to the cause of the American Revolution by Haym Salomon; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. REES:

H. Res. 176. Resolution authorizing and directing the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to conduct thorough studies and investigations relating to matters coming within the jurisdiction of such committee under rule XI (1) (e) of the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 177. Resolution providing for the expenses incurred by House Resolution 176; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Illinois, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States with regard to discrimination against taxpayers in States which have not adopted a community-property law; 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. BOGGS of Delaware:

H. R. 3024. A bill for the relief of James W. Taylor 3d; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 3025. A bill for the relief of Robert Ernest Beadie; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MUNDT:

H. R. 3026. A bill for the relief of Simon J. Kirk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NIXON:

H. R. 3027. A bill for the relief of Gertrude O. Yerxa, Mrs. G. Olive Yerxa, and Dr. Charles W. Yerxa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

321. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the common council of the city of Milwaukee, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to a request to expedite the passage of S. 866, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

SENATE

FRIDAY, APRIL 11, 1947

(Legislative day of Monday, March 24, 1947)

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

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

We come in prayer to Thee, Lord Jesus, who never had to take back anything spoken, to correct anything said, or to apologize for any statement. Wilt Thou have pity upon our frailties and deliver us from pitying ourselves.

Bless the Members of this body as they think together and work together in this Chamber, in committee rooms, and in their offices. Help them to stand up under the strains and the tensions of problems and decisions, of meetings and conferences, and the endless demands made upon them. Teach them how to relax and to take time to turn to Thee for guidance and for grace, and thus discover the secret of power. In Thy name we ask it. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHITE, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, April 10, 1947, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 875) to authorize the President to appoint Maj. Gen. Laurence S. Kuter as representative of the United States to the Interim Council of the Provisional International Civil Aviation Organization or its successor, without affecting his military status and perquisites, with an amendment in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 341. An act for the relief of the estate of Reuben Malkin;

H. R. 389. An act for the relief of the dependents of Carl B. Sanborn;

H. R. 400. An act for the relief of Benjamin Gordon;

H. R. 422. An act for the relief of Francesco and Natalia Picchi;

H. R. 437. An act for the relief of Iva Gavin;

H. R. 654. An act for the relief of Lawrence Portland Cement Co.;

H. R. 704. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mary Jane Sherman and W. D. Sherman;

H. R. 722. An act for the relief of Charles A. Clark;

H. R. 723. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Hunter A. Hoagland, a minor;

H. R. 828. An act for the relief of the State Compensation Insurance Fund of California;

H. R. 914. An act for the relief of George Corenevsky;

H. R. 925. An act for the relief of Therese R. Cohen;

H. R. 986. An act for the relief of Leslie H. Ashlock;

H. R. 1064. An act for the relief of Fred E. Weber;

H. R. 1065. An act for the relief of the estate of Thomas Gambacorto;

H. R. 1068. An act for the relief of Pearson Remedy Co.;

H. R. 1091. An act for the relief of Mrs. Georgia Lanser;

H. R. 1092. An act for the relief of Eugene Spitzer;

H. R. 1093. An act for the relief of D. Lane Powers and Elaine Powers Taylor;

H. R. 1176. An act for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth Kempton Bailey;

H. R. 1221. An act for the relief of Eva Bilobran;

H. R. 1318. An act for the relief of Mrs. Fuku Kurokawa Thurn;

H. R. 1393. An act for the relief of Donna L. I. Carlisle;

H. R. 1482. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Gilda Cowan, a minor;

H. R. 1514. An act for the relief of certain disbursing officers of the Army of the United States, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1791. An act for the relief of Dr. Theodore A. Geissman;

H. R. 1844. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to grant easements in lands belonging to the United States under his supervision and control, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2199. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Henry Big Day and other heirs of Catherine Shield Chief, deceased, to certain lands on the Crow Indian Reservation;

H. R. 2248. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to grant an easement and to convey to the Louisiana Power & Light Co. a tract of land comprising a portion of Camp Livingston in the State of Louisiana; and

H. R. 2389. An act for the relief of Harriet Townsend Bottomley.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 241. An act for the relief of Andrew Chiarodo; and

S. 243. An act for the relief of Lillian M. Lorraine.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. EASTLAND. 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	Hayden	O'Conor
Baldwin	Hickenlooper	O'Daniel
Ball	Hill	O'Mahoney
Bricker	Hoey	Pepper
Bridges	Holland	Reed
Brooks	Ives	Revercomb
Buck	Jenner	Robertson, Va.
Bushfield	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Wyo.
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Byrd	Kem	Smith
Cain	Knowland	Stewart
Capehart	Langer	Taft
Capper	Lodge	Taylor
Chavez	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Connally	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Cooper	McCarthy	Thye
Cordon	McClellan	Tobey
Donnell	McFarland	Tydings
Downey	McKellar	Umstead
Dworshak	Malone	Vandenberg
Eastland	Martin	Watkins
Ecton	Maybank	Wherry
Ellender	Millikin	White
Flanders	Moore	Wiley
Fulbright	Morse	Williams
George	Murray	Wilson
Hawkes	Myers	Young

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] are absent by leave of the Senate to attend the sessions of the Interparliamentary Union.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] are absent by leave of the Senate to attend the sessions of the Interparliamentary Union.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] is detained on official business.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. MCGRATH] and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-one Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communications and letters, which were referred as indicated:

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY, OFFICE OF EDUCATION (S. DOC. NO. 43)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Federal Security Agency, Office of Education, amounting to $15,101,739, fiscal year 1948, in the form of an amendment to the budget for that fiscal year (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY, PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE (S. DOC. NO. 44)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Federal Security Agency, Public Health Service, amounting to $1,000,000, fiscal year 1948, in the form of an amendment to the budget for said fiscal year (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

COMMUNICATION PRIVILEGES TO OFFICIAL PARTICIPANTS IN WORLD TELECOMMUNICATIONS CONFERENCES

A letter from the Acting Secretary of State and the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to permit United States common communications carriers to accord free communication privileges to official participants in the world telecommunications conferences to be held in this country in 1947 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

DISPOSAL OF MATERIALS OR RESOURCES ON PUBLIC LANDS

A letter from the Under Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the disposal of materials or resources on the public lands of the United States (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Public Lands.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A petition of the members of the Boynton Beach (Fla.) Townsend Club No. 1, praying for the enactment of the so-called Townsend plan providing for old-age assistance; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina:

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States of America to transfer the selective-service office furniture and equipment to the various counties in this State in which the offices were located

"Whereas during World War II the various counties in this State furnished offices, heat, etc., to the selective-service boards; and

"Whereas the selective-service law has terminated and it is thought that it would be only fair for the various counties to have the office furniture and equipment used by the various boards: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring), That the Congress

of the United States of America, in consideration of the fact that the counties of this State furnished offices, heat, etc., to the Selective Service System, is requested to provide means of transferring to the various counties in this State the furniture, equipment, etc., used by the selective-service boards in the respective counties."

(Mr. MAYBANK presented a concurrent resolution identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.)

JOINT RESOLUTION OF ILLINOIS LEGISLATURE

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference House Joint Resolution No. 11, which was adopted by the House of Representatives of the General Assembly of the State of Illinois on February 18, 1947, and concurred in by the senate on March 12, 1947. This resolution requests Congress to remove the inequality of the personal income-tax burden occasioned by the discrimination against taxpayers in States which have not adopted a community-property law.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was received and referred to the Committee on Finance.

(See joint resolution printed in full when laid before the Senate by the President pro tempore on April 10, 1947, p. 3272, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. McCARTHY, from the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments:

S. 273. A bill to limit the time within which the General Accounting Office shall make final settlement of the monthly or quarterly accounts of disbursing officers under the executive branch of the Government, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 99).

By Mr. MILLIKIN, from the Committee on Finance:

S. 1072. A bill to extend until July 1, 1949, the period during which income from agricultural labor and nursing services may be disregarded by the States in making old-age assistance payments without prejudicing their rights to grants-in-aid under the Social Security Act; without amendment (Rept. No. 100).

SUSPENSION OF CERTAIN IMPORT TAXES ON COPPER—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Finance I ask unanimous consent to report favorably with an amendment the bill (H. R. 2404) to suspend certain import taxes on copper, and I submit a report (No. 98) thereon. I request that the report be printed in the RECORD immediately following my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the report will be received and the bill will be placed on the calendar; and without objection, the report will be printed in the RECORD as requested by the Senator from Colorado.

The report (S. Rept. 98) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on Finance, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 2404) to suspend certain import taxes on copper, having considered the same, reports favorably thereon with an amendment and recommends that the bill as amended do pass.

The purpose of this bill is to alleviate the present acute shortage of copper in the United States by suspending certain import taxes on copper. Your committee has amended the bill as passed the House so as to exclude from the suspension copper sulphate. This would retain the tax on all forms of copper sulphate, including that known as blue vitriol.

Testimony before the committee indicated there was no shortage of copper sulphate in this country. In the last 5 years our total production of copper sulphate has averaged around 200,000,000 pounds annually, and exports for 1946 were around 82,000,000 pounds. In view of this, your committee deemed it inadvisable to suspend the import tax as applied to copper sulphate.

A detailed explanation of the bill (which, except as indicated in footnotes, is equally applicable to the bill as reported by this committee) and the considerations which justify its enactment appear in the House report which is incorporated and made a part of this report as follows:

"REPORT (TO ACCOMPANY H. R. 2404)

"The Committee on Ways and Means, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 2404) to suspend certain import taxes on copper, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without amendment and recommend that the bill do pass.

"GENERAL STATEMENT

"The purpose of this bill is to alleviate the present acute shortage of copper in the United States. It relieves, until April 1, 1950,[1] copper, copper-bearing ores and concentrates, and various articles containing copper, from the import tax imposed under section 3425 of the Internal Revenue Code, but does not in any way change or affect the tariff duties imposed by the Tariff Act of 1930, as modified by reciprocal trade agreements, or transfer any article from or to the free list.

"Appended to this report are sections 3420, 3425, and 3430 of the Internal Revenue Code, as well as the various paragraphs of the Tariff Act of 1930 specifically mentioned in section 3425.

"The import taxes in question are—

"1. Four cents a pound on the copper content of copper-bearing ores and concentrates and of the articles specified in certain enumerated paragraphs of the Tariff Act of 1930;

"2. Three cents a pound on an article not taxable under (1) above, if it is dutiable under the Tariff Act of 1930, and if copper is the component material of chief value; and

"3. Three percent ad valorem, or three-quarters of 1 cent per pound, whichever is the lower, on an article not taxable under (1) or (2) above, if it is dutiable under the Tariff Act of 1930, and if it contains 4 percent or more of copper by weight.

"The committee was unanimous in its favorable report on the bill. Representatives of several Government departments and agencies, Members of Congress, and others furnished testimony at a hearing conducted by the committee, which was conclusive in establishing the critical need for a suspension of present import taxes on copper.

"The current shortage in domestic copper supplies, while only temporary in nature, is nonetheless extremely serious. Copper is vital to the Nation's building program, to automobile production, and to other major manufacturing operations. Curtailed domestic production of copper and a substantial drop in imports over the past years have resulted in exhaustion of Government-owned stocks accumulated during the war.

"In 1946 the production of refined copper from domestic sources totaled approximately 604,000 short tons. This was 240,000 short tons below the amount produced in 1945. Deliveries in 1946 of refined copper to domestic customers totaled approximately 1,261,000 short tons. The difference, namely 657,000 short tons, had to be supplied from Government-owned stocks purchased and stock piled without payment of import taxes. Government purchases were discontinued in November 1946 when copper prices were decontrolled. Government-owned stocks of copper in the hands of the Office of Metals Reserve, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, have been reduced to 55,000 short tons as of March 1, 1947, or to less than one-half of 1 month's domestic requirements. During April 1947 Government stocks of copper are expected to be completely exhausted and domestic consumers will then become entirely dependent upon domestic production and current imports.

"Estimated domestic production of refined copper for 1947 is placed at approximately 950,000 short tons maximum. Domestic consumption for the same period is estimated at approximately 1,400,000 short tons. The minimum estimated deficit of 450,000 short tons must, therefore, come from private imports of copper. Current imports of copper are negligible largely because the world price of 22.85 cents per pound ($22.85 per short ton) exceeds the domestic price of 21½ cents. Foreign producers prefer to sell to foreign buyers at the world price rather than to American buyers who must add to their cost the import taxes levied under section 3425 of the Internal Revenue Code. These increased costs would, of course, be reflected in increased costs to the small, independent fabricator in the United States and in higher prices on articles containing copper.

"Domestic production in the United States is not currently at normal levels largely because copper mines have become depleted at an accelerated rate during the war, and for the further reason that most of the labor force normally employed in development and exploration was transferred to production activities. While basic copper deposits were not seriously depleted, the developed portions of existing deposits were worked down to a low producing level, which leaves the industry with insufficient developed openings to support the heavy postwar needs for copper.

"According to witnesses appearing before the committee it will be several years before domestic production can balance domestic requirements for copper, and considerable time is required to realize on foreign purchase commitments which must be made long in advance of deliveries. It is vital to the Nation's economy, therefore, that everything possible be done to stimulate both domestic copper production and imports of copper in the next few years. Temporary removal of the import taxes for a 3-year period[2] as provided in this bill should clear the way for increased imports of copper while domestic producers are catching up with the domestic market.

"TECHNICAL ANALYSIS OF THE BILL

"Under section 3425 of the Internal Revenue Code an import tax is imposed upon copper-bearing ores and concentrates, upon articles provided for in paragraph 316, 380, 381, 387, 1620, 1634, 1657, 1658, or 1659 of the Tariff Act of 1930, and also upon all other articles dutiable under the Tariff Act of 1930, if copper including copper in alloys) is the component material of chief value, or if the article contains 4 percent or more of copper by weight. Section 3430 of the code provides that this tax shall be levied, assessed, collected, and paid in the same manner as a duty imposed by the Tariff Act of 1930, and shall be treated for the purposes of all pro-

[1] Under bill as amended and passed by the House and as reported by the Senate committee, the suspension of tax would terminate on March 31, 1949.

[2] Under bill as amended and passed by the House and as reported by the Senate committee, period of temporary removal of tax would be 2 years.

visions of law relating to customs revenue as a duty imposed by such act, with certain exceptions.

"The bill reported provides that this tax shall not apply with respect to articles entered for consumption or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption during the period beginning with the day following the date of the enactment of this act and ending with the close of March 31, 1950.[3] The term "articles" mentioned in the bill includes everything that is taxable under section 3425 as above described. If on or prior to the date of the enactment of the act an article has come into the United States but has not been entered for consumption, or if put in bonded warehouse has not been withdrawn for consumption, the tax will not apply if the entry for consumption or withdrawal from warehouse for consumption occurs after the date of the enactment of the act and before April 1, 1950;[4] but an article put into bonded warehouse during the abovementioned period and not withdrawn from warehouse for consumption until after March 31, 1950,[3] will be subject to the tax.

"Under the act of March 13, 1942 (Public Law 497, 79th Cong., 56 Stat. 171), no import tax under section 3425 of the Internal Revenue Code shall be levied, collected, or payable on nonferrous-metal scrap entered for consumption or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption during the period beginning with March 14, 1942, and ending with the termination of the unlimited national emergency declared by the President on May 27, 1941. If the unlimited national emergency is terminated before the close of March 31, 1950,[3] nonferrous-metal scrap to the extent that it is subject to tax under section 3425 of the Internal Revenue Code will still be free of import tax under the provisions of the bill as reported, until the close of March 31, 1950.[3] If the unlimited national emergency has not been terminated before the close of March 31, 1950,[3] the act of 1942 will continue to relieve any nonferrous-metal scrap subject to the import tax under section 3425 from such tax until the termination of the emergency.

"EXCERPTS FROM EXISTING LAW

"For the information of the House there are set forth below certain sections of the Internal Revenue Code and certain paragraphs of the Tariff Act of 1930:

"'INTERNAL REVENUE CODE

"'SEC. 3420. Imposition of tax.

"'In addition to any other tax or duty imposed by law, there shall be imposed upon the following articles imported into the United States unless treaty provisions of the United States otherwise provide a tax at the rates specified in sections 3422 to 3425, inclusive.

* * * * *

"'SEC. 3425. Copper.

"'Copper-bearing ores and concentrates and articles provided for in paragraphs 316, 380, 381, 387, 1620, 1634, 1657, 1658, or 1659 of the Tariff Act of 1930, 4 cents per pound on the copper contained therein: *Provided*, That no tax under this section shall be imposed on copper in any of the foregoing which is lost in metallurgical processes: *Provided further*, That ores or concentrates usable as a flux or sulfur reagent in copper smelting and/or converting and having a copper content of not more than 15 percent, when imported for fluxing purposes, shall be admitted free of said tax in an aggregate amount of not to exceed in any 1 year 15,000 tons of copper content. All articles dutiable under the Tariff Act of 1930, not provided for heretofore in this section, in which copper (including copper in alloys) is the component material of chief value, 3 cents per pound. All articles dutiable under the Tariff Act of 1930, not provided for heretofore in this section, containing 4 percent or more of copper by weight, 3 percent ad valorem or three-fourths of 1 cent per pound, whichever is the lower. The tax on the articles described in this section shall apply only with respect to the importation of such articles. The Secretary is authorized to prescribe all necessary regulations for the enforcement of the provisions of this section.

* * * * *

"'SEC 3430. Applicability of tariff provisions.

"'The tax imposed by section 3420 shall be levied, assessed, collected, and paid in the same manner as a duty imposed by the Tariff Act of 1930 (46 Stat. 590, 672; U. S. C., title 19, ch. 4) and shall be treated for the purposes of all provisions of law relating to the customs revenue as a duty imposed by such act, except that—

"'(a) the value on which such tax shall be based shall be the sum of (1) the dutiable value (under sec. 503 of such act) of the article, plus (2) the customs duties, if any, imposed thereon under any provision of law;

"'(b) for the purposes of section 489 of such act (relating to additional duties in certain cases of undervaluation) such tax shall not be considered an ad valorem rate of duty or a duty based upon or regulated in any manner by the value of the article, and for the purposes of section 336 of such act (the so-called flexible tariff provision), such tax shall not be considered a duty;

"'(c) no draw-back of such tax (except tax paid upon the importation of an article described in sections 3422, 3423, 3424, and 3425) shall be allowed under section 313 (a), (b), or (f) of the Tariff Act of 1930 or any provision of law allowing a drawback of customs duties on articles manufactured or produced with the use of duty-paid materials;

"'(d) Such tax (except tax under sections 3422 to 3425, inclusive) shall be imposed in full notwithstanding any provision of law granting exemption from or reduction of duties to products of any possession of the United States; and for the purposes of taxes under sections 3422 to 3425, inclusive, the term "United States" includes Puerto Rico.'

"PARAGRAPHS OF TARIFF ACT OF 1930 SPECIFICALLY MENTIONED IN SECTION 3425 OF THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE

"NOTE.—It should be noted that the various rates of duty set forth below may have been modified by a reciprocal trade agreement:

"'*Title I—Dutiable list*

* * * * *

"'Schedule 3: Metals and manufactures of—

* * * * *

"'PAR. 316. (a) Round iron or steel wire, not smaller than ninety-five one-thousandths of 1 inch in diameter, three-fourths of 1 cent per pound; smaller than ninety-five one-thousandths and not smaller than sixty-five one-thousandths of 1 inch in diameter, 1¼ cents per pound; smaller than sixty-five one-thousandths of 1 inch in diameter, 1½ cents per pound: *Provided*, That all the foregoing valued above 6 cents per pound shall be subject to a duty of 25 percent ad valorem; all wire composed of iron, steel, or other metal, not specially provided for (except gold, silver, platinum, tungsten, or molybdenum); all flat wires and all steel in strips not thicker than one-quarter of 1 inch and not exceeding 16 inches in width, whether in long or short lengths, in coils or otherwise, and whether rolled or drawn through dies or rolls, or otherwise produced, 25 percent ad valorem: *Provided*, That all wire of iron, steel, or other metal coated by dipping, galvanizing, sherardizing, electrolytic, or any other process with zinc, tin, or other metal, shall be subject to a duty of two-tenths of 1 cent per pound in addition to the rate imposed on the wire of which it is made; telegraph, telephone, and other wires and cables composed of iron, steel, or other metal (except gold, silver, platinum, tungsten, or molybdenum), covered with or composed in part of cotton, jute, silk, enamel, lacquer, rubber, paper, compound, or other material, with or without metal covering, 35 percent ad valorem; wire rope, 35 percent ad valorem; wire strand, 35 percent ad valorem; spinning and twisting ring travelers, 35 percent ad valorem; wire heddles and healds, 25 cents per thousand and 30 percent ad valorem.

"'(b) Ingots, shot, bars, sheets, wire, or other forms, not specially provided for, or scrap, containing more than 50 percent of tungsten, tungsten carbide, molybdenum, or molybdenum carbide, or combinations thereof: Ingots, shot, bars, or scrap, 50 percent ad valorem; sheets, wire, or other forms, 60 percent ad valorem.

* * * * *

"'PAR. 380. German silver, or nickel silver, unmanufactured, 20 percent ad valorem; nickel silver sheets, strips, rods, and wire, 30 percent ad valorem.

"'PAR. 381. Copper in rolls, rods, or sheets, 2½ cents per pound; copper engravers' plates, not ground, and seamless copper tubes and tubing, 7 cents per pound; copper engravers' plates, ground, and brazed copper tubes, 11 cents per pound; brass rods, sheet brass, brass plates, bars, and strips. Muntz or yellow metal sheets, sheathing, bolts, piston rods, and shafting, 4 cents per pound; seamless brass tubes and tubing, 8 cents per pound; brazed brass tubes, brass angles and channels, 12 cents per pound; bronze rods and sheets, 4 cents per pound; bronze tubes, 8 cents per pound.

* * * * *

"'PAR. 387. Phosphor-copper or phosphorus-copper, 3 cents per pound.

"'*Title II—Free list*

* * * * *

"'PAR. 1620. Bells, broken, and bell metal, broken and fit only to be remanufactured.

* * * * *

"'PAR. 1634. Brass, old brass, clippings from brass or Dutch metal, all the foregoing, fit only for remanufacture.

* * * * *

"'PAR. 1657. Composition metal of which copper is the component material of chief value, not specially provided for.

"'PAR. 1658. Copper ore; regulus of, and black or coarse copper, and cement copper; old copper, fit only for remanufacture, copper scale, clippings from new copper, and copper in plates, bars, ingots, or pigs, not manufactured or specially provided for.

"'PAR. 1659. Copper sulphate or blue vitriol; copper acetate and subacetate or verdigris.'"

DIRECTOR AND ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR OF BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT—REFERENCE OF BILL

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on yesterday the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments reported a bill previously introduced by me as Senate bill 28, a bill to supersede the provisions of Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1946 by reestablishing the offices of registers of land offices, and providing for appointment of the Director and Associate Director of the Bureau of Land Management, and for other purposes. The Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments reported the bill without recommendation. I have conferred

[3] Under bill as amended and passed by the House and as reported by the Senate committee, date referred to would be March 31, 1949.

[4] Under bill as amended and passed by the House and as reported by the Senate committee, date referred to would be April 1, 1949.

with the chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in Executive Departments, and it is entirely agreeable to him, as it is also agreeable to the chairman of the Committee on Public Lands, that the bill be taken from the calendar and be referred to the Committee on Public Lands. In view of the situation I therefore ask unanimous consent that the bill be taken from the calendar and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

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

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. Did I correctly understand the Senator to say that both chairmen involved were agreeable to the reference of the bill?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes. I have conferred with both chairmen.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill will be taken from the calendar and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, April 11, 1947, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 241. An act for the relief of Andrew Chiarodo; and

S. 243. An act for the relief of Lillian M. Lorraine.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. TAFT, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

John B. Alsever, Minnie E. Pohe, Carl E. Rice, and Norman F. Gerrie, for promotions in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service; and

Leonard H. Male, and sundry other candidates for appointments in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. CAIN:

S. 1088. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1945, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 1089. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, so as to provide annuities for investigatory personnel of the Bureau of Narcotics who have rendered at least 20 years of service; to the Committee on Civil Service.

By Mr. THYE (for himself and Mr. BALL):

S. 1090. A bill to safeguard and consolidate certain areas of exceptional public value within the Superior National Forest, State of Minnesota, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. MOORE (for himself and Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma):

S. 1091. A bill to enable the Osage Tribal Council to determine the bonus value of tracts offered for lease for oil, gas, and other mining purposes, Osage Mineral Reservation, Oklahoma;

S. 1092. A bill to provide for the granting of certificates of competency to certain members of the Osage Indian Tribe in Oklahoma, and for other purposes;

S. 1093. A bill to provide for the leasing of the lands and real estate of members of the Osage Tribe of Indians in Oklahoma who do not have certificates of competency, and for other purposes;

S. 1094. A bill to enable Osage Indians who served in World War II to obtain loans under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, and for other purposes;

S. 1095. A bill to facilitate rights-of-way through restricted Osage Indian land, and for other purposes; and

S. 1096. A bill to prevent the imposition of restrictions against alienation of certain classes of personal property acquired from the restricted funds of members of the Osage Indian Tribe in Oklahoma, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

AID TO GREECE AND TURKEY—AMENDMENTS

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado submitted an amendment and Mr. BALDWIN submitted amendments intended to be proposed by them, respectively, to the bill (S. 938) to provide for assistance to Greece and Turkey, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

REDUCTION OF INCOME TAX—AMENDMENT

Mr. McCARRAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 1) to reduce individual income-tax payments, which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 341. An act for the relief of the estate of Reuben Malkin;

H. R. 389. An act for the relief of the dependents of Carl B. Sanborn;

H. R. 400. An act for the relief of Benjamin Gordon;

H. R. 422. An act for the relief of Francesco and Natalia Picchi;

H. R. 437. An act for the relief of Iva Gavin;

H. R. 654. An act for the relief of Lawrence Portland Cement Co.;

H. R. 704. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mary Jane Sherman and W. D. Sherman;

H. R. 722. An act for the relief of Charles A. Clark;

H. R. 723. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Hunter A. Hoagland, a minor;

H. R. 828. An act for the relief of the State Compensation Insurance Fund of California;

H. R. 914. An act for the relief of George Corenevsky;

H. R. 925. An act for the relief of Therese R. Cohen;

H. R. 986. An act for the relief of Leslie H. Ashlock;

H. R. 1064. An act for the relief of Fred E. Weber;

H. R. 1065. An act for the relief of the estate of Thomas Gambacorto;

H. R. 1068. An act for the relief of Pearson Remedy Co.;

H. R. 1091. An act for the relief of Mrs. Georgia Lanser;

H. R. 1092. An act for the relief of Eugene Spitzer;

H. R. 1093. An act for the relief of D. Lane Powers and Elaine Powers Taylor;

H. R. 1176. An act for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth Kempton Bailey;

H. R. 1221. An act for the relief of Eva Bilobran;

H. R. 1318. An act for the relief of Mrs. Fuku Kurokawa Thurn;

H. R. 1393. An act for the relief of Donna L. I. Carlisle;

H. R. 1482. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Gilda Cowan, a minor;

H. R. 1514. An act for the relief of certain disbursing officers of the Army of the United States, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1791. An act for the relief of Dr. Theodore A. Geissman; and

H. R. 2389. An act for the relief of Harriet Townsend Bottomley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1844. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to grant easements in lands belonging to the United States under his supervision and control, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

H. R. 2199. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Henry Big Day and other heirs of Catherine Shield Chief, deceased, to certain lands on the Crow Indian Reservation; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 2248. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to grant an easement and to convey to the Louisiana Power & Light Co. a tract of land comprising a portion of Camp Livingston in the State of Louisiana; to the Committee on Armed Services.

PROPOSED TAFT LABOR RELATIONS BILL—STATEMENT BY SENATOR WAGNER

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, on behalf of the senior Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], who is necessarily absent, to have included in the body of the RECORD a statement by him on the labor relations bill proposed by the able Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] for committee consideration.

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

STATEMENT OF SENATOR ROBERT F. WAGNER ON THE PROPOSED TAFT LABOR RELATIONS BILL

The omnibus labor bill offered by Senator TAFT for consideration by his committee has already served a useful public purpose. It has cleared the air of all the sham, pretense, and demagogery of the last few months that the Republican leadership seeks to modify the labor laws only to promote equality in collective bargaining and industrial peace.

The bill would turn the clock back in labor relations, not to conditions that existed before the National Labor Relations Act was adopted, but in many instances to those that obtained more than a hundred years ago when labor had to fight for its right to organize.

The bill is a very thick one, so I can only discuss a few of its high lights. It contains a confused hodgepodge of wholesale rewriting of our labor law, in language so ambiguous and complex that it would require at least another decade of extensive, costly, and exasperating court litigation to determine the full meaning and impact of the legislation. It would be a Roman holiday for high-priced lawyers.

Those who remain under the coverage of the National Labor Relations Act will have only nominal protection, for the heart is cut out of the statute. But under a catch-all definition of supervisor, the bill would exclude from the protection of the National Labor Relations Act foremen and a great many classes of minor clerical employees.

The bill excludes agricultural workers and the other classes of workers now covered. It is a strange way indeed to prove one's faith in the fundamental right of self-organization and collective bargaining by limiting and restricting the number of those who are to enjoy this precious right.

Company-dominated unions which have enslaved labor in the past are to be brought back, for they will be able to participate on the same footing with legitimate unions in an employee election. The employer will again be able to sit on both sides of the bargaining table.

No longer will good faith in intent to enter into an agreement be the test of bargaining. All that will be required will be to meet at reasonable times and confer. How will industrial peace be promoted by a provision which leaves the shell of collective bargaining and cuts out the core?

By substituting the narrower term "working conditions" for the present broader term "conditions of employment," the bill would narrow the scope of collective bargaining to exclude many subjects, such as, perhaps, pension plans, insurance funds, which properly belong in the employer-employee relationship and in regard to which the employer should not have the power of industrial absolutism.

Even when a contract is entered into, the bill would undermine its effectiveness by undermining the position of the union in seeing to it that the contract is carried out in its application to specific cases. This the bill accomplishes by rendering unnecessary the intervention and presence of the union when individual grievances are being settled. The picture of the unequal struggle between the powerful corporation and the helpless individual employee is once more restored.

The real purpose of the bill to break the back of labor is shown also by other provisions. Instead of enacting some guaranties against possible abuses the bill would eliminate the closed shop as a subject for required collective bargaining. How would industrial peace be served when the employer would not even have to sit down and talk the matter over? He is not even now required to agree to a closed-shop contract or to any agreement, for that matter.

The prize exhibit is the attempt of the bill to break up national unions by preventing them from acting as a unit in collective bargaining. This attempt to eliminate industry-wide and regional collective bargaining would play havoc with many industries, such as the needle trades, where this type of bargaining has contributed to industrial peace and prosperity. It is unthinkable that in our economy where businesses are operated on a national scale, a serious proposal shall be made to break up labor unions and put collective bargaining back on the company-union basis so dear to the heart of that colossus of industrial might, the National Association of Manufacturers.

The same purpose to destroy labor's hard-earned rights is apparent in the bill's procedural provisions. I shall mention only two. By placing a limitation of 6 months on the bringing of unfair labor practice charges, the bill rewards the unscrupulous employer who by duplicity and concealment can cover his actions which have deprived his employees of their legal rights. Why place such a premium on illegality?

Another provision of the bill would render the NLRB procedure rather futile, for each fact in each case would be reviewed all over again in the courts. This is achieved by depriving the NLRB of the authority now enjoyed by other administrative agencies composed of specialists, to appraise the evidence and determine the facts, if supported by substantial evidence.

While weakening the NLRB the bill would throw the problem of labor relations into the inexperienced hands of the courts and would revive the widespread use of the labor injunction. Is this calculated to achieve cooperation between labor and management?

No constructive approach to the problem of labor relations is made by this bill. In some respects it is ludicrous. For instance, it prohibits labor organizations from "interfering" with the right of employers to self-organization—as if any worker ever acted to interfere with the incorporation of companies or the formation of trade associations. Would solicitation by a labor organizer to join a union be an interference?

There is no fresh point of view evident in the approach to the problem of the settlement of labor disputes. Reliance is placed on cooling-off periods which our war experience proved to be actually heating-up intervals.

The few proposals that are found in the bill, such as those pertaining to jurisdictional disputes and arbitration of controversies arising under a contract, which have been raised by President Truman and could serve as a basis for deliberation, are so deeply buried under a cluster of antilabor measures that they are lost sight of.

By fostering uncertainty and confusion and narrowing the scope and effectiveness of collective bargaining, this bill would contribute not to the evolution of a just and satisfactory national labor policy, but to industrial chaos, strife, and violence. As such, this bill cannot serve even as a basis for discussion.

This bill constitutes a grand assault on our industrial democracy. It is an attack further to undermine the forces which could help to raise the purchasing power of the people at the very time when business itself is becoming alarmed by the inordinate profits it is reaping.

If the Republican leadership in Congress wants to assist the Communist Party in the promotion of widespread class warfare, industrial chaos, and economic depression in this country, they could not devise a better method of doing so than recommending the enactment of such legislation.

All who are interested in the basic human rights of the ordinary citizen should diligently and vigorously resist such legislation.

MEETING OF APPROPRIATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR AND FEDERAL SECURITY

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Labor and Federal Security of the Committee on Appropriations be permitted to meet at 2:30 o'clock this afternoon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

MEETING OF COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare be permitted to sit this afternoon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, consent is granted.

MEETING OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE OF COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections of the Committee on Rules and Administration be authorized to sit this afternoon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, consent is granted.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF LABOR—STATEMENT BY SENATOR MYERS

[Mr. MYERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement on the Labor Department appropriation bill made by him before the Labor-Federal Security Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE LILIENTHAL NOMINATION—EDITORIAL FROM THE PHILADELPHIA INQUIRER

[Mr. MYERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Lilienthal Debate Ends," from the Philadelphia Inquirer of April 11, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

UNITED STATES OF EUROPE—ARTICLE BY SENATOR FULBRIGHT

[Mr. FULBRIGHT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "United States of Europe," written by him and published in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of April 6, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

NEWSPRINT AND NEWSPAPERS — STATEMENT BY COL. ROBERT R. MCCORMICK

[Mr. BROOKS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement on the subject of newsprint and newspapers, made by Col. Robert R. McCormick on March 17, 1947, before the subcommittee investigating the newsprint shortage, which appears in the Appendix.]

SOCIALISM IN FRANCE AND ENGLAND—ADDRESS BY COL. ROBERT R. MCCORMICK

[Mr. BROOKS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Col. Robert R. McCormick in Los Angeles, Calif., on March 21, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

AMERICA'S TEN LEGAL COMMANDMENTS—ARTICLE BY ALBERT BRICK

[Mr. COOPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "America's Ten Legal Commandments," written by Albert Brick, of Washington, D. C., and published in the April issue of the Public Service magazine, which appears in the Appendix.]

MAJ. GEN. LAURENCE S. KUTER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 875) to authorize the President to appoint Maj. Gen. Laurence S. Kuter as representative of the United States to the Interim Council of the Provisional International Civil Aviation Organization or its successor, without affecting his military status and perquisites, which was, on page 2, line 18, after "State", to insert a colon and "*Provided further*, That Major General Kuter shall not remain in this position for more than 2 years after the date of the approval of this act."

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

AID TO GREECE AND TURKEY

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 938) to provide for assistance to Greece and Turkey.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Mississippi has the floor.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I favor the passage of the pending bill and the granting of the aid to Greece and Turkey which the President has requested, because, in my judgment, if the expansionist policies of the Soviet Union are not effectively checked, then war between the Soviet Union and the United States is inevitable. If the present drift continues, if Russia continues to pursue her avowed objective, which is simply chaos, revolution, and aggression leading to world domination for communism, there can be no peace. If we sit idly by and permit Russia to pick off free peoples one by one, and meet these aggressions with weak, vacillating appeasement, as France and England in their attitude toward Hitler prior to 1939, and as we have met the aggressions of the Soviet Union up to this time, then we permit Russia to become stronger and more powerful with the digestion of each conquest, and the conflict between us will thereby come at a time when we are placed at a great disadvantage.

There is no sense in American appeasement of Russia, because we are the strongest and most powerful nation in the world, much stronger and more able at the present time to wage war than is the Soviet Union. Russia realizes this, and she attempts to weaken us by creating internal strife and discord; and exactly as the Axis Powers did, proceeds to pick off her neighbors one by one, digest their resources, and feverishly build up her industrial capacity to wage war. Her policy is to bide her time, and to become a stronger nation through conquest and preparation at home, until her strength is greater than our own. Our policy of appeasing her will not lead to peace, but is certain to cause war; and therefore I say President Truman's present program to prevent Russian aggression and stop the spread of communism is a program of peace and not of war.

Mr. President, the bipartisan foreign policy which the bill embodies will, if it is possible to do so, avert World War III, which otherwise seems inevitable. It strengthens democratic governments to the point where they can resist aggression. It seeks to build a stable economy under which mankind will prosper. After all, the best weapon against communism is the establishment of prosperous peoples and strong democratic governments. This we attempt to do.

In this connection I quote from an article by Winston Churchill which appears in the current issue of Life magazine:

> It is certainly not strange that American opinion should be greatly influenced by President Truman, General Marshall, Mr. Baruch, Senator VANDERBERG, Senator CONNALLY, and other champions of peace and progress in trying to nip evil in the bud, quench fire at its outbreak, and stop pestilence by timely inoculation.

That, Mr. President, is the wholesome foreign policy of the United States.

Our memory is indeed short if we cannot recall the quiescent policy which was adopted by the leading nations of the world when Italy attacked Ethiopia, and when an upstart Hitler, with his regime in swaddling clothes defied the world and marched into the Rhineland in defiance of the Versailles Treaty. We remember that it was the pacifist and the idealist who adjured the policy upon France and England not to resist this treaty violation. What was the result, Mr. President? Hardly had the cobblestones of the Rhineland ceased ringing with the echoes of Prussian boots when thousands of miles away the Japanese aggressor, taking heart from the weakness displayed by the world powers, attacked China, and World War II had in reality begun.

Yes, at that time the same cry was heard, "This is aggression! This must be turned over to the League of Nations." The League met at Geneva, and the world remembers that, notwithstanding the position of the United States, friends crept to the side of the aggressor within the sanctuary of the League and the rape of China was condoned. The League of Nations met, argued, bickered, and that was all. There was Axis and Communist agression in Spain.

Mr. President, with arguing and shadow boxing on the part of the League of Nations, with the cry of nonintervention in the air, who can say they were surprised when Hitler made his demands on Czechoslovakia? More than that, Mr. President, who was surprised when Munich came, and the capitulation occured? And who was surprised at what happened to Austria and Czechoslovakia? And finally came that grim day when Hitler marched into Poland because of his connivance with the Soviet Union. We all remember a dazed world tolerated the months and months of the phony war. But, Mr. President, that war was not phony. It was merely the Gethsemane prior to the crucifixion; then war in all of its devastating fury burst upon mankind; all of which sprang from appeasement, and the failure to stop aggression before it was too late.

Mr. President, we have now seen what has recently occurred in the Balkan and Baltic countries, in Finland, and in Korea. We have seen the tentative aggression into Iran and, Mr. President, we are today feeling the totalitarian pressure in Greece and Turkey, so that the peace-loving people of the world realize that we are once more confronted with a Rhineland, a Manchuria, an Ethiopia, a China, a Czechoslovakia, and a Poland.

Mr. President, who can deny that today the heel of a totalitarian tyranny is poised upon the boundary of Greece? Overwhelming odds stand pointed today upon the boundaries of Turkey. Pressure constantly maintained, pressure of the threat of invasion, is gradually eating away the economic foundation of those two nations.

Russia's position is simple: "I have a slave economy and because I have slavery I can maintain large armies and create discord throughout the earth." Then she says, "To meet my threats you, too, will have to adopt slavery or perish." This is the battle between Russia and the world.

This threat of war is real. It follows the pattern used toward all those countries which have succumbed within the rigid confines of the iron curtain. Yet again today we hear the same voices which we heard amid the sounds of the Prussian boots in Vienna and Prague. We hear the voices of nonintervention; we hear the voices of millions of good people who hate and detest war, but who persist in living in a world of fantasy and wishful thinking.

Yes, we all want peace; but we should not be timid about its preservation. Peace is not bought at the price of timidity. Peace is a constantly challenging thing and we must pay the price of peace in courageous and realistic action, which alone can assure its realization.

Mr. President, at Yalta, at Tehran, and at Potsdam our country consummated agreements with Russia. It was solemnly agreed, among other things, that the people of liberated areas would be free to set up governments of their own choosing and that there would be no government forced upon them by any other power. One of the great war aims of the United States was to assure that mankind would be free—free from fear; free from tyranny; free from oppression; that all peoples in liberated areas would be free to set up governments of their own choosing, and to go their own way without coercion and without domination by any other power. This was the pledged word of the Soviet Union. Our Government relied upon it and accepted in good faith their promises. Moreover, Mr. President, in addition to formal agreements, Mr. Stalin assured President Roosevelt at Tehran that he desired no territories in Europe; that his own country was only half populated and that Russia would spend her efforts in developing her own country, and would cooperate wholeheartedly with the United States and Great Britain in setting up a well-ordered world where mankind could grow and develop in peace and security. These were the solemn pledges of the Russian Government, and our own Government placed faith and reliance therein. Ah, Mr. President, how that faith was wholly misplaced.

Our Government and people had then and now have nothing but friendship and admiration for the Russian people. We have never sought anything from them. We greatly helped them both during the war and since at great material sacrifices to ourselves. As peoples we are friends today. We desire the continued friendship of Russia, but we demand that the Russian Government cease aggression and the threat of war. But, Mr. President, the conduct of the Soviet Government shows that its word is worthless. Its solemn aggreements are broken at will.

Pope Pius XII wrote at Christmas 1945:

> The indispensable element in all peaceful living among nations—the very soul of juridical relations among them—is mutual trust based on the belief that each party will respect its plighted word.

Of course, Mr. President, treaties, agreements, the plighted word of Communists are worthless because it is part of official Soviet policy to deceive. Lenin revealed in 1920 the real foundation of Communist tactics, strategy, and inter-

national diplomacy when he stated, and set it down as official Communist doctrine:

> We have to use any ruse, dodges, tricks, cunning, unlawful method, concealment, and veiling of truth.

This is the reason why we can never have a binding agreement with the Soviet Union until they prove by actions the integrity of their pledged word. All the proof to date shows that they follow this line of deceit and falsehood set down by Lenin. They heed not the injunction of justice and morality. The will to use superior force is the only power on earth that they heed.

We have the promise of peace, but we do not have peace. We are still face to face with totalitarian aggression; the aggression of the left instead of the aggression of the right. Italy and totalitarian Germany are gone. The menace of totalitarian German and Italian imperialism is gone. In its place there has arisen the expansionist totalitarian imperialism of the Soviet Union. Solely because of Russian predatory conduct, its policies of conquest, its intent of world domination, there is no peace. There do not exist in the world today the conditions by which mankind can develop, can recreate its prosperity, and work out its destiny in freedom. The better world, for which we sacrificed and fought, is not here. The peace of the world, Mr. President, is threatened today by the Communist dictatorship of the Soviet Union just as it was by Hitler. Hitler was no more unscrupulous than the Soviet Government. Of the two Russia is better organized, has greater resources, and more numerous fifth columns. The safety and security of mankind are certainly in as much peril today from Stalin as they were yesterday from Hitler.

What has been the conduct of Russia, Mr. President? Since 1939 the following countries with populations as indicated, were either annexed, occupied by the Red army, or taken over by Soviet Russia through the installation of puppet regimes which are controlled by Moscow and which have been placed by force over their unwilling populations:

Asia:	
North China (area held by Chinese Soviet Red army)	75,000,000
Manchuria	45,000,000
North Korea	10,000,000
Total in Asia	130,000,000
Europe:	
Poland	35,000,000
Eastern Germany	25,000,000
Rumania	20,000,000
Yugoslavia	15,700,000
Hungary	10,000,000
Bulgaria	6,300,000
Lithuania	2,000,000
Latvia	2,000,000
Estonia	1,000,000
Albania	1,000,000
Total in Europe	118,000,000

In addition the following European countries are today under partial control by the Soviet Government, and threatened with complete control by the Soviet Government:

Czechoslovakia	15,000,000
Austria	7,000,000
Finland	3,800,000
Total	25,800,000

Thus 16 nations or parts of nations, inhabited by 273,000,000 people have come under the dominance of the hammer and sickle as a result of recent aggression. Russia has more than doubled her population and tripled her resources. Is it not time to call a halt?

In these vast areas, Mr. President, as in Russia herself, every last vestige of human liberty has been suppressed. Thousands upon thousands of the best people of every class who opposed the imposition of the atheistic, godless Communist dictatorship, and those who sought to preserve their freedom, have been ruthlessly murdered or shipped off to Siberia as slaves. A ruthless dictatorship has been imposed on these peoples by force against their will. Their rights and liberties are denied, and in reality they are held in slavery by the Communist dictatorship. These Communist dictatorships, under the control of Moscow, and by Moscow itself, are guilty of every crime which was charged against the Hitler regime in Germany. Terror and violence hold sway, and the crimes committed are just on as large a scale as those committed by the Axis countries.

Nazi Germany and Soviet Russia are the first nations in modern history which have recognized and practiced the doctrine of human slavery as applied to the white race. Normally, in the prison camps of Russia in the past 15 years there have probably never been less than 10,000,000 men and women working in semistarvation, often in the Arctic north, where the average expectation of life is 6 years. These were citizens of the Soviet Union. Their only crimes were opposition to communism, and the love of liberty and the rights of man. The number of slave laborers is much greater today, due to the millions of slave laborers from what we naively call liberated countries and the nationals of former enemy states. Indeed, there is more slavery on the earth today than at any previous time in the world's history, because communism is the greatest of all enslavers.

In addition to the vast human misery within the fiery furnace of communism, there is the imminent threat of the conflagration spreading; establishment of a puppet government in Iran was attempted by Russia in flagrant violation of her pledged word. Demands are being made upon Turkey. Armed Communist bands equipped by Russia or her satellites are violating the territorial integrity of Greece and attempting to set up a Communist dictatorship there. Russia is demanding the control of Tripolitania under trusteeship. She seeks a base in Eritrea. Throughout the whole Middle East Communist agents work to bring this vast area under the control of Moscow. Civil war inspired by communism flares up in China, and peace is denied this unhappy land. In every country in North and South America Communist agents, under the direction of Moscow, are at work to create strife and discord and to bring those countries within the Russian orbit. Spies directed from Moscow attempt to ferret out the military secrets of friendly states and allies. In France, Italy, the American, British, and French zones of Germany, and in other countries the attempt is being made to infiltrate and to take these countries from within, or to weaken them so that, like ripe plums, they will fall to Soviet Russia. A desperate, hungry people calculate not where they go. Mr. President, the United States is the only power remaining in the world strong enough to prevent Communist expansion, and throughout the whole world their propaganda preaches hatred against us and is attempting to inflame the peoples of the world against the United States.

All of this fits into a common plan. Soviet communism is pursuing its original and fundamental Communist policy—the conquest of the world for communism, the domination of the world for communism, the destruction of the countries of the world. And it is reaffirming its doctrine that war will be resorted to where necessary to carry out this program.

In my humble judgment this is the greatest crisis in the Christian era. Oriental communism directed from Moscow seeks to destroy Christian civilization and western culture. It has made great progress; our danger is greater than at any time in modern or medieval history. This is the third invasion of the west. Vienna has fallen. Eastern and central Europe are occupied. The danger is greater than at any time since Genghis Khan was thrown back in Poland.

Take the case of Greece and Turkey. These are very poor countries without resources. What does Russia want with them? She says she wants the port of Salonika in Greece. But it is economically unprofitable for the Soviet Union to operate this port instead of Odessa. This is not the reason. Greece has military position. The control of Greece would outflank Turkey and the Dardanelles. Air power in Greece would control the entire eastern Mediterranean. Our communications through the Mediterranean would be cut.

Mr. President, what are the reasons for the Soviet desire to control Turkey? The claim that she desires the Dardanelles in order to obtain access to the open seas falls flat when one understands that the control of the Dardanelles would not give her access to the high seas. The Mediterranean would still be controlled by the fortresses of Malta and Gibraltar, and access to the Indian Ocean would still be shut off by the Suez Canal.

Mr. President, Turkey and Greece, poor though they are, have great military significance. He who controls them controls the eastern Mediterranean. Land-based aircraft from those countries would seal off much of North Africa and the Near East. In fact, we would

be shut off from vital oil supplies. If those countries were to fall, the whole Middle East would fall under Communist control and this great area, with vast resources, would fall under the dominion of the hammer and sickle. The Soviet Union would be made stronger for the inevitable final conflict for world dominion which communism decrees. The Soviet Government's attempt to absorb Greece and Turkey is a military plan greatly to weaken the United States and to strengthen the Soviet hand for prospective conflict.

Mr. President, all of this fits into a common pattern. This is all part and parcel of the great objective for which the Politburo is driving. There is no mystery about the ultimate objective of Soviet foreign policy. It is today what it has always been, and that is world domination.

Time and time again the leaders of communism have stated and reiterated that their aim was world communism. The Official History of the Communist Party states:

> Study of the history of the Communist Party strengthens the certainty of the final victory of the great task of the Lenin-Stalin Party: The victory of communism in the whole world!

Mr. President, this is the aim of communism; and the policy and actions of the Communist dictatorship of Russia have always been to carry this program to its ultimate conclusion. It is carried out by infiltration when control can be gained by this method, and if not by infiltration, by military occupation and by war where war is necessary.

Stalin, in his book Problems of Leninism, which is the Mein Kampf for Russia and the Bible of world communism, states:

> The basic fact * * * is that there no longer exists a world-wide capitalist system. Now that a Soviet country has come into existence * * * world-wide capitalism has ceased to exist. The world has been severed into two camps, the imperialist camp and the anti-imperialist camp (vol. 1, p. 369).
>
> We are living, not merely in one state, but in a system of states; and it is inconceivable that the Soviet Republic should continue to exist interminably side by side with imperialist states. Ultimately, one or another must conquer. Pending this development, a number of terrible clashes between the Soviet Republic and the bourgeois states must inevitably occur. (Vol. 1, p. 56, quoting from Lenin, Works, Russian edition, vol. XVI, p. 102.)

I quote from Lenin:

> From the time a Socialist government is established in any one country, questions must be determined * * * solely from the point of view of what is best for the development and the consolidation of the Socialist revolution which has already begun. The question whether it is possible to undertake at once a revolutionary war must be answered solely from the point of view of actual conditions and the interest of the Socialist Revolution which has already begun. (Lenin, Twenty-one Theses, January 20, 1918.)

To give a further insight into their program I quote from a September 1929 issue of Pravda, one of the official Soviet Government publications:

> The world-wide nature of our program is not mere talk, but an all-embracing and blood-soaked reality. It cannot be otherwise * * * Our ultimate aim is world communism; our fighting preparations are for world revolution, for the conquest of power on a world-wide scale, and the establishment of a world proletarian dictatorship.

This is a fundamental Soviet policy, Mr. President. These are the goals to which the Communist hierarchy is driving.

Stalin's statement is that war between the Soviet Communists and the democratic states is certain. All the actions of the Communist Government show that she has embarked upon her program of world-wide conquest, and that when she is strengthened and has had time to digest the resources of the countries which she has overrun, and had time to build up her own shattered economy and industrial capacity, she hopes to carry to the ultimate conclusion her policy of world domination for communism.

On February 10, 1946, in order to reiterate that the policy of Communist expansion had not been abandoned, Stalin stated:

> It would be incorrect to think that the war arose accidentally or as a result of the fault of some statesman. Although these faults did exist, the war arose in reality as the inevitable result of the development of the world economic and political forces on the basis of monopoly capitalism.

No doubt remains of Stalin's determination to persist in his policy of aggressive Soviet imperialism. Stalin believes, and sincerely so, that the only road to permanent peace is the destruction of the democratic states and the conquest of the world for communism. In 1946 he announced as one of the objectives of the new 5-year plan the development of a steel production of 60,000,000 tons a year. This is three times the Russian steel production of 1940 and is greater than the combined steel production of Germany, Japan, and Great Britain in 1940. In addition to this, Stalin now controls the steel production of Silesia, Manchuria, Czechoslovakia, Austria, and Hungary. A nation's steel production is the basic measure of industrial capacity to make war. The Russian people are desperately in need of consumer goods, but giving up the production of consumer goods, the goods of peace, and concentrating on building up a basic industry for war makes plain the Soviet Government's intentions. In addition, it is interesting to note that Russian purchases from abroad are chiefly machinery and industrial equipment to be used in building up basic industry for war. Since 1939 the Soviet Government, without provocation, has waged aggressive war against six free, independent, and sovereign peoples—Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Rumania, and Finland—states which were unable to defend themselves. Her failure to live up to her agreements regarding them and her purpose to dominate by force Yugoslavia, Austria, eastern Germany, Hungary, Bulgaria, Albania, Rumania, and northern Korea are aggressions which show her purpose to dominate the world. In fact, she intends to control by force all areas which she has occupied and ultimately to make them a part of the Soviet Union. Her aggressions are larger than the aggressions of Germany. She is truly an enemy of civilization.

Mr. President, the argument is made that we should turn the Greek-Turkish question over to the United Nations, and that if aid is given it should be supervised through the instrumentality of that organization. The charge is made that President Truman in his recommendations to Congress has bypassed the United States organization. Let us not be naive. What is the cause of present conditions in Greece and Turkey? It is Communist pressure on those two countries. It is armed Communist intervention in Greece. This is a condition which must be met at once. I do not think anyone can seriously say that at the present time the United Nations could solve any great question. Of course, the United Nations today is weak and ineffective. It could not even fix the blame for the placing of mines which took the lives of 44 British sailors. It could not place the blame because of the veto by Russia. It could not place the blame because to do so would be contrary to Communist policies. We are in the same situation here. Our Greco-Turkish policies run head-on into Communist policies. To be perfectly frank, the United Nations cannot be a great factor for peace until Russia desires peace, until Russia stops aggression, and through the United Nations organization cooperates for stability and peace. The United Nations cannot be effective until the Soviet Union stops sowing strife and discord and permits the peaceful recovery of the world. When that condition arrives, questions of this nature can and should be referred to the United Nations. At the present time, however, to refer this question to that organization would be playing into the hands of Soviet Russia, because it is evident that Communist obstructionist tactics in the United Nations organization would delay the program until communism attained its ends in Greece and Turkey.

Mr. President, throughout all the vicissitudes of the foreign policy in the development of our Nation from 13 remote Colonies on the shore of the Atlantic seaboard to the greatest power in the history of the world, a country to which most of the world looks for guidance and hope in all the problems that beset the world, Americans have always considered that whatever differences may divide America, those differences cease at the water's edge.

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

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. If the Senator's statement is correct—and I agree that it is—if communism finally reaches Greece and Turkey and overruns both of those nations, what next will happen, in the

Senator's opinion, so far as concerns nations on both sides of Turkey and Greece?

Mr. EASTLAND. I think that aggression feeds upon aggression, and that Russia will take the next nations in her schedule until she controls all of Europe and a large part of Asia, and then she will want us.

Mr. LUCAS. Is it not true that at the present time Communist elements in France and Italy are virile and active?

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes.

Mr. LUCAS. And once Europe comes under the domination of Communist influence, it seems to me the same influence will spread in both directions, until eventually it probably will reach South American countries as well, and will become more active here in the United States.

Mr. EASTLAND. What the Senator from Illinois has said is true. If the Communist activities become greater in France and Italy, the Communists probably will come to control those countries and also other countries of Europe, even including Spain, and eventually there will be Communist control of western Europe, which President Roosevelt time after time said would threaten this country.

As I have said, Mr. President, the people of the United States, a country to which most of the world looks for guidance and hope in all the problems that beset the world, have always considered that whatever differences may divide America, those differences cease at the water's edge. Throughout our history I think one of the greatest manifestations of that historic policy is the present bipartisan foreign policy of the United States, so thoroughly exemplified through the coordination of the leaders of the two great parties which make up our political system. It is a patriotic policy. It is a policy worthy of the finest traditions of American history.

America has grown and thrived upon the political differences of its citizens. It is the earmark of the stability of our system that it can withstand differences of opinion and contrarieties of thought. Any American citizen, be he proud or humble, great or small, is privileged to criticize, vociferously if he will, any policy of the American Government; but, Mr. President, I want to bring to the attention of the Senate and the country that I do not believe that our history records an instance of a man who has been honored by the people of the Nation to the extent that the former Vice President of the United States, Henry A. Wallace, has been honored, who has flown to a foreign country, and has attempted to induce the friends and allies of his country to desert her. No American citizen has the moral right to conspire with foreign peoples in order to undermine and to weaken the hand of his country. The least that can be said is that Mr. Wallace is performing a grave disservice to the American people when he attempts to induce Great Britain to desert the United States and thereby force us to sail the perilous seas alone. Everyone admits that the foreign policy which this bill represents has grave implications, that, while it is the least dangerous, it has its hazards. The fights between Americans should be at home; and the American citizen, whoever he may be, who attempts to induce our friends abroad to leave us, and who attempts to prevent a united front to a common foe, to say the very least, is not serving the best interests of his country. Mr. President, no American has the right to attempt to array foreign peoples against his country. We know that conditions in France are delicate; yet the statements and activities of Mr. Wallace are in accord with the principles and policies of the Communist Party of France; and it is interesting to note that one of those who invited Wallace to visit France was Duclos, the leader of the Communist Party in France, the man who is reputed to be the head of the Third Internationale, and who was strong enough to dethrone Mr. Browder as head of the Communist Party in the United States and to establish in his stead Mr. Foster.

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

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. In no sense do I wish to interrupt the Senator's speech, because I think he probably would prefer to make it without interruption——

Mr. EASTLAND. That is quite all right.

Mr. PEPPER. But since, from the Senator's remarks, one would infer that Mr. Wallace went to France only by the invitation of Mr. Duclos——

Mr. EASTLAND. I said Mr. Duclos was one of the men who invited him to France. That statement is true, as reported in the Daily Worker.

Mr. PEPPER. That is correct; but all I wish to say upon this point is that on Saturday, before he departed for England on the following Monday, Mr. Wallace told me that he had had invitations to visit France from the heads of all the French political parties, including Mr. Leon Blum, the head of the Socialist Party, and also the head of the M. R. P. Party, the Popular Republicans. So although the Senator is incorrect in that Mr. Wallace was also invited by Mr. Duclos, yet I am sure the Senator would not want us to infer that Mr. Wallace did not have invitations from the other parties and groups that compose the French Government and the French political parties.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, by the furthest stretch of the imagination, no one could infer that from what I have said. I said that Mr. Duclos was one of those who invited Mr. Wallace, and I also say that the policies that he advocates are in keeping with the policies advocated by the Communist Party in France.

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

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator from Mississippi also would want the RECORD to show, I am sure, that the Communist Party is officially represented in the Government of France at the present time.

Mr. EASTLAND. I am sorry to say that is so. That is all the more reason why Mr. Wallace should not go to France and attempt to undermine the hand of his country.

Mr. President, the people of England and France do not realize that Mr. Wallace does not enjoy the confidence of the great majority of American citizens. By his attempts to make it appear that there is grave division in the United States, Henry Wallace weakens the hand of those who seek to retain the great French Nation within the orbit of western civilization.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me once more, and then I shall not interrupt him further?

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes; I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I think we might remember that Mr. Winston Churchill came to the United States and spoke at Fulton, Mo., at a time when he formally had been adjudicated not to have the political confidence of the Parliament of Great Britain or of the people of Great Britain.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, he has the confidence of Great Britain, and I am proud to say that he has the confidence of the people of the United States, and that his speech at Fulton, Mo., mobilized this country to such an extent that the Turkish Government says, so I am informed, that that prevented an invasion of that country by the Soviet Union. Mr. Churchill is a great man, one of the leaders for human liberty in the world.

Mr. President, as I was saying, the people of England and France do not realize that Mr. Wallace does not enjoy the confidence of the great majority of American citizens, that his policies have been repudiated in this country. Mr. President, to use an old proverb, if his activities are not inspired by the devil, they serve him equally as well.

Mr. President, it has been stated on the floor that this is an expensive program and will cost the Nation a great deal of money before we are through. But what is the alternative? I can see none except even greater expenditures later if we fail to act now. If we had stopped communism at Yalta, it would have cost us nothing. If we had stopped communism at Potsdam, it might have cost us no more than a stiff assertion of our rights. If we had stopped communism before the present Red government took over Poland, it would have cost us less than it will today. The bigger we let the communistic tiger grow, the more it is going to cost us to stop him. Since we cannot turn back the clock, let us seize what remains of our opportunity, and, without grieving at the expense, act boldly now.

I accept this program of aid to Greece and Turkey because it will cost less in the long run than any other program that is available now, or that will be available in the future. Mr. President, I fear the ultimate cost of further appeasement of Russia if we fail to act now. That cost in blood and treasure may even surpass the cost of World War II.

What is more, what shall we say about the cost of maintaining huge standing armies and the loss of world trade behind the iron curtain if we fail to stabilize the world?

Another criticism that has been leveled at this plan is the charge that there is no use in stopping communism in Greece and Turkey if we aid it elsewhere.

With this statement I emphatically agree. I hope we have heard the last of efforts by our State Department to unseat the governments of Argentina and Spain, because those governments are doing a fine job of combating communism. I hope the effort now under way to clean out the Reds who have infiltrated into our government will proceed apace. I want to see an end of left-wing directives from a certain clique in the State Department for our foreign wards, like Korea, the American zone in Germany, and Japan. I want to see communism resisted on every front in the world, but the points of greatest importance to the United States are, just at this moment, the Greco-Turkish sector, and right here at home. There is no reason why we should not be true to American interests everywhere. There can be no compromise with communism, because one cannot compromise with death.

Mr. President, the American people have a historic decision to make. We must either stop Russian imperialism, or submit to it. We have no other choice. Their object is plainly world domination. We cannot get off this planet. We must either stop aggression or submit. When we permit Russia to pick off areas piece by piece, absorb them, absorb their resources, and grow stronger and stronger, we make inevitable the day of armed conflict between us. If we permit her to take over Europe and a large part of Asia, our doom is sealed. We cannot stand against the whole world. The Western Hemisphere cannot stand with a Communist world arrayed against it.

I support the pending bill because if Russia is not stopped, war between Russia and the United States is inevitable, and to stop her effectively now is the only preventive of World War III. We must learn from the errors of the 1930's. Appeasement failed then. If Hitler had been stopped when he marched into the Rhineland, the great tragedy of World War II would not have occurred. God has placed within the hands of the American people the sole power to cope with atheistic communism. Our country is not worth its salt if we fail to protect our civilization, our culture, and our way of life. Our task is a double one: to stop aggression, and to turn the present uneasy armistice into a lasting peace.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the Committee on Foreign Relations in the stand it has taken, and I shall support the bill as it has been amended. I cannot refrain from saying that I am sorry, exceedingly sorry, at the way in which the matter has been handled from the beginning. I do not refer to the time since it came to the Senate; but since the President of the United States delivered his message, I think the American people have had to attempt to live down many of the statements made by columnists and by radio commentators concerning what we were about to do. I do not agree with many of the things which were said before the President spoke. In fairness to myself and to everyone else, I must say that I do not share the view that America is merely stepping in to continue the policy of Great Britain. We have a policy of our own, and we are going to carry on in accordance with that policy.

I regret that after the passage of the Reorganization Act, and the creation of a Policy Committee, which was established primarily to furnish counsel for the President, that committee was not consulted in the earlier stages of this development. I think much of the trouble—and I am sure much of the need for amendment—would have been overcome had we heard the whole story, had we gotten a real understanding of the facts from the beginning.

Mr. President, I shall support the bill primarily because the first thing we need in the United States, above all other things, is unity. The President has spoken, and the President's words are in the minds and hearts and understandings of all mankind. He spoke for his country. I deem it our duty to stand by the President in what he has said, and it is for that reason that I have gone to the trouble of trying to work out what I think is a consistent background for what the President has said.

I stand by the President, and I want unity in America for another reason. In the first place, no treaty has yet been ratified or consummated. We are in a state of war. The shooting war is over, to be sure, but we are in what the aftermath of the last war taught us is the most deadly period. We are in the time of the riding of the Four Horsemen.

It is necessary for those nations which have some stability, which have real control of their affairs, which have won the war, and therefore laid down certain propositions for the world, to stand as a unit to assure the fulfillment of those propositions.

Wherever I look in the world I can see tremendous danger if there is not some place where nations that are weaker, that have lost faith, that have lost property, and have become completely discouraged as the result of the destruction wrought by war, may turn for guidance and understanding I believe that today America stands as a beacon, as she has always stood, for those who are seeking opportunity to develop their own natures and to promote their own welfare. It is well that we keep leadership.

Mr. President, as I have said, no treaty has been ratified and no boundaries have been determined following the upsetting of the old boundaries by the war. But the establishment of boundaries does not mean peace. There will always be two kinds of war. At the present time we are faced by ideological warfare which has followed actual warfare. The boundaries of ideological warfare are not set; they cannot be set, and they never will be set. I do not know of very many kings who have been overthrown as the result of actual warfare, but I know that the progress of democracy has been certain, the notion of popular sovereignty has developed; and I know that nothing can stop the ideological trend of the world.

Today Russia, the political entity, in spite of changed ideology, is carrying on in international relations in much the same way and with much the same ideals as existed under the czarist regime.

Russia has embraced the concept of communism; and connected with communism is the political theory and the political fact of the single will dominating the proletarian dictatorship, and dominating the political actions of the state, and, therefore, all citizens within the state. In referring to Russia, then, we think of the political entity, we think of the concept of communism, and of a form of government subject to a single will. So far as America is concerned, she need not be antagonistic to political Russia; but, if she adheres to what have been her fundamental ideas, she must be antagonistic to communism, and, so long as her Constitution endures, she can never submit to the concept of the single will.

It is strange, and yet it is proper, both from the standpoint of military strategy, which has been mentioned here this morning, and from the standpoint of politics, that Greece and Turkey should be bound together in the same bill. That could not always be said, although there was a time when Greece and Turkey were one. It should be pointed out that one of the reasons for now linking the two nations, in spite of the fact that they were antagonistic in the war, is that after World War I a working arrangement between Greece and Turkey was consummated, and there was a virtual alliance between the two; a rather happy alliance, because it resulted in more friendly relations, better trade, rising standards of living, and the actual saving of life.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] yesterday eloquently referred to the traditional Greece, the idealistic Greece, the mother of western democracy. It might be well to extend the idea further and to suggest that the fact that Greece and Turkey are linked together in this bill is perhaps a symbol, as it should be, of a new world, of new ties.

To leave Turkey out of consideration, Mr. President, would be to break down the theory in regard to nations working together; because one of the fundamental concepts back of the United Nations is that nations stand out as complete, independent entities. It is our duty to support those independent entities which have already been recognized and which form a part of the sisterhood of the nations; otherwise, there will be utter confusion in the world, and it will never be possible to reduce to practice the theory of the United Nations.

With reference to military missions, may I, as the author of the Chinese military-mission bill, say that I still believe in that bill? I think that, had General Marshall had the benefit of the provisions of that bill in the beginning of his negotiations in China and in the beginning of his sojourn there, he probably would have achieved a greater degree of

success. The Senate did not see fit to pass the bill.

The general military-missions bill, dealing with missions in South America, is a bill which I think Senators generally should support. Had there been more time, the general military-missions bill, which was before the Committee on Foreign Relations at the last session, would undoubtedly have been passed. It is a bill which I think is exceedingly constructive, in the light of the extension of international understanding and the hope of lifting standards throughout the world.

There are military missions and military missions. A military mission does not mean a military expedition. It was pointed out by the Senator from Texas yesterday that under the pending bill we are not going to send military expeditions to either Greece or Turkey.

Mr. President, let me here say a word about intervention. It is not intervention to enter a country at the invitation of its government. It is technically erroneous to use a word which has a definite meaning, so loosely as the word "intervention" has been used. Technically, it is not planned to intervene in Greece or Turkey. If a loan is made or if a military mission is sent, it is by an understanding with the existing governments. Of course it is said that the purpose in doing this would be that democracy might be extended in the world. It happens that probably two of the worst illustrations of what we consider a good democratic government have been chosen. There is theory, there are ideals, there is history, and there are a number of other things which should be kept in mind in considering what constitutes true democracy. Sometimes there is a deliberate attempt to get away from democracy both in theory and in practice and sometimes there is a deliberate attempt to adhere closely to democracy in both theory and practice. The intent of other countries should be recognized in a proper evaluation of democracy. The United Nations stands today, and we are its greatest sponsor. The retreat from collective security in 1919 brought on World War II.

It has been said by some that we have bypassed the United Nations in the present case. Of course, the amendments which have been adopted show that that is not the case, that the American Government declares that it is ready to fit into the scheme of the United Nations when it can become operative.

What if the United Nations had attempted this great task, in order to keep alive what ultimately would be two of its members, and had failed? Wherein would the United Nations have become strengthened? Is it not better that the United Nations should follow the leadership of one of its strong members in support of the fundamental theory upon which the organization is based and which makes it an acceptable institution, rather than to attempt to aline the United States in support of a program which might not be practicable? There is a place for the small nations in the United Nations; there is a place for the great nations in the United Nations. If the United Nations is to succeed and become strong it must always recognize that there is a place in its organization for both great nations and small nations.

Conflicting theories exist, of course, within the United Nations. America faces a dilemma with respect to these conflicting theories. America stands as the leader of the democratic forces in the world and also as the chief architect of an international structure in which nations living under opposing systems, democratic, totalitarian, autocratic, monarchial, are members. But can we not find an answer to the dilemma? We cannot choose our neighbors. We cannot assume that all members of a community of states shall always be in agreement with us. Under the American theory we cannot insist that there shall always be agreement.

Mr. President, we have lately had presented to us in a striking manner the American theory of what we consider our democracy to be. It may be of interest from the ideological point of view to call attention to the real conflict existing between the two theories which underlie and support the two greatest and strongest nations in the United Nations. In theory they can never agree and work together because they are so completely diverse, and will remain so at all times.

I shall not try to lay down the fundamental doctrine of the "single will" states, or the fundamental notion of communism either as an economic theory or as a political concept, but I wish to present two contrasting statements. I have chosen what I think are quotations which illustrate exactly the position in which we now find ourselves. The Communist who writes and thinks about his system in contrast with the democratic system says:

> Capitalism separates countries in order the better to exploit them, but communism unites them, the better to defend them.

That is the theory on which the ideological approach of communistic conquest must ultimately rest.

Lenin had such faith in the extension and the universality of the acceptance of his theory that at one time he wrote:

> No matter if three-quarters of mankind disappear the important thing is that what is left should finally be incorporated in communism.

Mr. President, it is extremely encouraging to an American to be able to turn to a last-minute definition of what constitutes our ideals. This definition is found in the words uttered by the spokesman of America who is today in Europe, our Secretary of State, General Marshall, who echoes and reechoes the words of the founding fathers when the American system was erected, when the American theory had its origin. General Marshall as late as March 14 told the representatives of the only other independent great powers left in the world, sitting in conference in Moscow—and listen to these words and see if as Americans we do not thrill under their influence—

> I realize that the word "democracy" is given many interpretations. To the American Government and citizens it has a basic meaning. We believe that human beings have certain inalienable rights—that is, rights which may not be given or taken away.
>
> They include the right of every individual to develop his mind and his soul in the ways of his own choice, free of fear and coercion—provided only that he does not interfere with the rights of others. To us a society is not democratic if men who respect the rights of their fellow men are not free to express their own beliefs and convictions without fear that they may be snatched away from their home and family. To us a society is not free if law-abiding citizens live in fear of being denied the right to work or deprived of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Mr. President, if General Marshall never utters any other words, those words will mark him as one of the greatest of Americans. Every American heart will respond to that statement made by him. We Americans who read it realize that we are represented by a true spokesman for us in the councils of the world.

At this point it will be interesting to point to a bit of history, the first bypassing of the League of Nations, and to show the difference between what happened in the case of the League of Nations and what some now call a bypassing of the United Nations. One who will take the time to read about the Corfu affair will realize that it is not now proposed to bypass the United Nations; that everything that has heretofore been done or that is proposed to be done will be in harmony with the fundamental wishes, hopes, and aspirations of the United Nations.

The seed of defeat for the idealized procedure created under the League of Nations Covenant for keeping world peace was planted in 1923—the year of the celebrated Corfu incident. For it was in handling this so-called incident as it did that the League proved in practice a disregard for the equal rights of small nations seemingly preserved inviolate in the terms of the Covenant.

The Corfu incident arose out of the activities of the commission appointed by the conference of ambassadors to fix the frontiers between Albania and Greece. The commission was headed by an Italian, General Tellini, who was accused by the Greeks of deciding all disputed points in Albania's favor. On the morning of August 27, 1923, Tellini was murdered near the village of Janina, on Greek territory. The Greek Government expressed its profound regret to the Italian ministers in Athens and pledged itself to do all in its power to apprehend and punish the culprits. Patriotic indignation in Italy reached white heat. Here was an opportunity for the Fascist regime, not yet a year old, to play a strong hand by proceeding from sword rattling to action. On August 29 Mussolini sent an ultimatum to the Greek Government expressing Italian demands, several of which were so severe as to provoke the reply that these particular demands were an infringement on Greek sovereignty and injury to the honor of Greece. At the same time the Greek Government addressed an appeal to the Secretary-General of the League to bring the matter before the Council. And there was a real test, Mr. President.

Almost immediately the Italian Government rejected the Greek reply as unsatisfactory and ordered its naval forces to occupy the Greek island of Corfu, situated near the mouth of the Adriatic. The occupation was completed only after a bombardment in which a number of Greek and Armenian refugee children on the island were killed or wounded by the exploding shells. Italy's honor was thus happily vindicated, from the standpoint of those who constituted the new Fascist regime.

Greece notified the Council through its representative that it was ready to accept and execute in good faith any proposal the Council might make to give Italy full satisfaction. The Italian representative presumptuously contested the jurisdiction of the Council over this matter, on the ground that Italy had not intended to commit an act of war.

The British representative answered this contention with the observation that there was no tenable distinction between the bombardment of Corfu and an act of war. Although that seems an appropriate assessment of Italy's act the Council nevertheless proceeded to enforce the Italian demands on Greece. There was no decree of indemnity to Greece for the loss of life and destruction of property at Corfu. The Italians did evacuate their forces from the island.

Peace had been preserved and territorial conquest averted. But Greece was obliged to bow to superior force. By this exercise of grotesque self-deception the League had set a course for war because, as Vanzetti has said, men were not sufficiently heroic for a life which does not need war.

When the expression "bypassing" is used, those who remember a real bypassing and a real spirit of utter contempt for what the world was trying to do in organizing itself cannot help thinking of that incident and note the difference. I do not think any serious student will ever purposely speak of the action of America in the Greek-Turkish affair as a bypassing of the United Nations.

Mr. President, in a situation of this kind some constructive things must be done. There must be a continuation of the organization of the world to implement and make stronger the United Nations. One such continuation has been suggested by a resolution introduced in this body. It is an old idea, an idea advocated 25 years ago, following the last war, by Briand, in his suggestion for the creation of a United States of Europe. Many suggestions have been made in the making of the peace which might bring about such a happy situation. One such suggestion deals with the waterways of Europe. If we could honestly tackle the problem of the waterways of Europe, we could probably bring about unity in Europe. Control of the waterways furnished one of the reasons for the meeting of the First Constitutional Convention, so that the waters which touched various States might be controlled to the advantage of all the States. The world has an opportunity now, not only in relation to the Dardanelles and the changing of the treaty with respect thereto, but also in connection with waterways. Something ought to be done. If it could be done, and if some agreement could be arrived at which would be lasting in its effect, it would be possible to transport wheat by water, without touching the Mediterranean, practically all the way to northern Europe, through the Danube, the Ludwig Canal, and the Rhine. There has been an effort throughout the years to bring about arrangements under which the waterways would be internationally controlled, thereby creating the beginning of a United States of Europe. If that were done, that which is called western civilization in Europe might be saved, even if the worst comes to the worst, and even if, as was suggested by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] a few moments ago, the start of the conquest of Europe is now well under way.

There are those who point out that in ideological warfare the world will ultimately be divided into three parts, following the various ideologies. They give control of all of Europe to the Russian states. They leave with us North and South America and most of the commonwealth states. Then they forget the mass of the world so far as population is concerned, and leave that as a unit by itself. My feeling with regard to the future world depends upon the unit which is left. I think the future world will be formed and judged primarily on the basis of the actions of the great Asiatic nations of the world.

I should like to repeat the statement that keeping America united until there is a peace should be our great objective, both for our own sakes and also for the sake of the world and especially for the sake of the entity of the United Nations. The community-of-states idea is one which must prevail in the world; and the community of states must lay down the standard for individual states. Then we shall have decent, respectable, and proper international law. The policy which America must follow must always be an American policy.

I come now to a series of quotations which I wish to read. I shall try to point out that what has been recommended by President Truman is a natural growth and continuation of what has been American policy almost from the very beginning. In order to do so I think we must lay down certain simple morals of history in order to understand why nations fall into certain ways and habits. If we study the history of nations throughout the ages, we discover that, first of all, if they are to last, there must be, as Oppenheim says, "an equilibrium, a balance of power, between the members of the family of nations."

One of the aims of the President of the United States is to continue that equilibrium.

Second:

International law can develop progressively only when international politics are made the basis of real state interests.

If we accept the theory and the philosophy of the previous speaker the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], surely America never faced a greater problem than she is facing now, and never did she need a better background of her own original policy and its expansion.

Third:

The program of international law is intimately connected with the victory everywhere of constitutional government over autocratic government.

We can never have a successful community of nations until governments actually speak for the people. That is the aim, and ultimately it will come; otherwise we cannot go forward with the United Nations to a successful consummation.

Fourth:

The principle of nationality is of such force that it is fruitless to try to stop its victory.

That is a moral of history that we ought to respect at this time. We cannot curb the growth of ideas; and ideas which are followed by better living conditions and happier people will encircle the world.

Wherever a community of many millions of individuals who are bound together by the same blood, language, and interests, become so powerful that they think it necessary to have a state of their own, in which they can live according to their own ideals and can build up a national civilization, they will certainly get that state sooner or later.

Fifth:

That every progress in the development of international law wants due time to ripen.

Sixth:

That the progress of international law depends to a great extent upon whether the legal school of international jurists prevails over the diplomatic schools.

The school of expediency and self-satisfaction. Law must take the place of expedient action.

Seventh:

That progressive development of international law depends chiefly upon the standard of public morality, on the one hand, and, on the other, upon economic interests.

In that case we go into Greece and into Turkey with clean hands, for the benefit of the world, the benefit of the two countries, and the benefit of ourselves.

Is President Truman's policy recommendation an expression of American policy? I desire to take some time to discuss this question, Mr. President, because I believe we have in President Truman's recommendations and the action which is to follow one of the most splendid natural enlargements of American policy that has been presented for a long time. This little essay may seem tedious to those who know their American diplomacy and their American history, but I believe it to be worth while for us to have it in the RECORD as the opinion of at least one Senator. Here I should say that I am in hearty agreement with the stand which the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] took yesterday, and especially with his words when he said that he spoke only for himself. I hope, nevertheless, Mr. President, that while in this statement I speak only for myself, there may be an echo or two in the hearts and aspirations of the average American citizen who believes in the growth, the development, and the purposes of his Government.

Our famous Secretary of State, John Hay, once described our foreign policy as being summed up in the phrase, "The Monroe Doctrine and the Golden Rule." The latter rule is one which should modify the foreign policy of all members of the so-called family of nations. And with regard to the change that this Nation has not adopted a principled, consistent foreign policy an examination of the extent to which the Monroe Doctrine has influenced our course of international action may be in order.

The celebrated doctrine enunciated by President Monroe was a natural outgrowth of the situation in which the young American Nation found itself in the early part of the nineteenth century.

Here let me pause long enough to say that if those who wrote that the President of the United States was adopting an extension of the Monroe Doctrine, and glibly and quickly named it the Truman Doctrine, had given attention to all that Monroe said and had paid attention to the first parts of Monroe's pronouncement, it is likely that many things which have been said would not have been said regarding the meaning of the President's proposal. Monroe was very careful to point out that his doctrine must have the support of the people. He went so far as to talk about popular sovereignty in such a way that it is indeed worth while for us to read his words now:

> The people being, with us, exclusively the sovereign, it is indispensable that full information be laid before them on all important subjects, to enable them to exercise that high power with complete effect. If kept in the dark, they must be incompetent to it. * * * To the people every department of the Government and every individual in each are responsible, and the more full their information the better they can judge of the wisdom of the policy pursued and of the conduct of each in regard to it. * * *
>
> Their interests in all vital questions are the same, and the bond, by sentiment as well as by interest, will be proportionately strengthened as they are better informed of the real state of public affairs, especially in difficult conjunctures. It is by such knowledge that local prejudices and jealousies are surmounted, and that a national policy, extending its fostering care and protection to all the great interests of our Union, is formed and steadily adhered to. A precise knowledge of our relations with foreign powers as respects our negotiations and transactions with each is thought to be particularly necessary.

Mr. President, that part of the Monroe Doctrine should be read and reread by everyone in authority in connection with international negotiations conducted for the American Government. A proposition has been presented to the Congress of the United States and action by the Congress is requested. Why does it come to the Congress? Because of constitutional provisions. The President cannot act in certain matters without instructions. He cannot spend the people's money, and so forth. But, Mr. President, if the Senate or if the Congress has the last word, why should we not develop the idea that the representatives of the people may have the first word once in a while and act in unity, a condition we are trying to bring about in this instance.

The celebrated doctrine enunciated by President Monroe was a natural outgrowth of the situation in which the young American Nation found itself in the early part of the nineteenth century.

We were as yet comparatively weak and were conducting in the New World an experiment in democracy, the success of which might be endangered through becoming embroiled in European political quarrels. Jefferson declared in 1808 that one of the objects of our foreign policy should be to exclude European influence from this hemisphere. I refer briefly to Jefferson in order that the theory may be better understood.

In a message to Congress in 1811 President Madison advanced the idea that it was the paramount interest of this Nation to resist imperialistic encroachment. Congress thereupon passed a resolution expressing cognizance of the threat posed by a foreign power and providing for the temporary occupation of adjacent territory to countermand the threat. President Madison's idea was not one-sided. The territory which we then occupied was later acquired through peaceful negotiations, and it is essential at the outset to recognize that the Monroe Doctrine has never served as a cloak for territorial aggrandizement.

It also should be pointed out here, Mr. President, that the whole philosophy of the Monroe Doctrine, as announced some 12 or 13 years after that time, was incorporated both in Jefferson's pronouncement and in Madison's recommendation to the Congress and in the resolution which the Congress passed.

When he spoke in 1823, President Monroe added to the elements of isolation and paramount interest the principle of non-intervention, to constitute the famous doctrine that bears his name. The essential import of the declaration was to advertise this Nation's assistance for the smaller nations in the hemisphere in resisting the imposition of despotisms. Although the doctrine was intended to meet a particular emergency, it was couched in general terms, and was thus broad enough to state our position whenever encroachments of a particular character might be threatened in the Western Hemisphere. The smaller American nations were thus assured of respect for their sovereignty on a plane of equality with the larger nations of the world. That is one of the theories that President Truman is working on as he moves into the Mediterranean sphere.

In 1845 President Polk declared, in his annual message to Congress, that—

> it should be distinctly announced to the world as our settled policy, that no future European colony or dominion shall, with our consent, be planted or established in any part of the North American Continent.

That is probably a better statement than the Monroe Doctrine itself, insofar as the average layman's interpretation of that doctrine is concerned.

In one respect that this was narrower than the Monroe Doctrine, since it did not include South America; but it was broader than the Monroe Doctrine in another respect: It prohibited the voluntary cession of American territory to any European power. Such cession could not be made with our consent, regardless of whether the territory in question was already under the control of some other European power or belonged to an independent American republic.

A case of the latter sort was that of Yucatan, one of the provinces of Mexico, which, on account of an Indian insurrection, offered itself to Spain, England, and the United States. With reference to the offer to the other powers, President Polk declared in a message to Congress of April 29, 1848, that—

> according to our established policy, we could not consent to a transfer of this "dominion and sovereignty" to either Spain, Great Britain, or any other European power.

A bill was introduced in Congress enabling the President to "take temporary military occupation of Yucatan;" but before anything could be done, the collapse of the insurrection brought the incident to an end.

In the disputes over the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty in the fifties, the principle of the Monroe Doctrine was invoked against the British colony in Honduras, on the ground that it was an extension of European influence.

Secretary Seward, undoubtedly in accord with President Lincoln, from 1861 to 1865 warned the French not to force a foreign empire upon unwilling Mexicans; and in 1865, Seward gave formal notice that the French must leave Mexico, and that was backed up by a display of military force on the border. Though Seward avoided mention of the Monroe Doctrine, he applied its principles very effectively.

President Grant in 1869 repeated President Polk's earlier warning by announcing that no territory in America could be transferred to any European power, regardless of whether the inhabitants were willing or unwilling.

Secretary Fish in 1870 proposed that the United States should take the lead in a general political and commercial policy for the republics of America. That was the first distinct statement of a policy of leadership by the United States, but it was undeniably in the minds of President Monroe and John Quincy Adams at the time when they were formulating the message promulgating the Monroe Doctrine.

Secretary Evarts in 1880 was the first American statesman to see the relation of the Isthmus Canal to the Monroe Doctrine. He claimed "paramount interest" for the United States in any land or water communication across the American isthmus. President Hayes added the significant declaration that any interoceanic canal would be virtually a part of the coast line of the United States. Secretary Blaine in 1881 made the position of the United States more precise by stating that for any European power to share in the construction and control of the canal would be an introduction of the European political system. He then drafted for the Pan-American Congress of 1889 the statement that the "principle of conquest" should not be considered as admissible under American public law. That was intended to apply to the wars between Latin-American powers, and also to foreign invasion.

Its significance in relation to the matter presently before us is the declaration

that we recognize a political and an economic reason for the actions we take, and that such actions can be taken against political or economic ideologies.

That series of utterances, along with others of a similar tenor, clearly show a steady growth of responsibility and authority in American affairs. The mandate of the Monroe Doctrine had been developed sufficiently by 1895 to enable President Cleveland to assert its principles in definite and unequivocal terms, despite the fact that he was virtually without an army to back him up. The fact that Great Britain paid respect to the stand of President Cleveland and acceded to his request was a great tribute to the Monroe Doctrine, which had determined his course of action.

When we go further, to the writing of the Treaty of Versailles and the incorporation in that treaty of the concept of the Monroe Doctrine, we find that it became universally accepted by the nations of the world. It is that sort of procedure which brings about a peaceful acceptance of an idea which makes for better understanding between nations, and develops, of course, the possibility of world peace.

The interpretation and application of the Monroe Doctrine, with which President Cleveland's name is associated, was occasioned by a dispute between Venezuela and Great Britain in regard to the boundary line between Venezuela and British Guiana. That dispute had dragged along for many years without attracting any popular interest or attention either in England or in the United States, when, in 1895, it was suddenly brought into the limelight by the determined stand which President Cleveland took in declaring that the dispute should be submitted to arbitration. In July of that year his Secretary of State, Olney, sent to London a dispatch in which he argued that if, as Venezuela alleged, Great Britain was encroaching upon Venezuelan territory under the guise of a boundary dispute, such aggression was an attempt to extend European power and control over American territory, and therefore was clearly a violation of the Monroe Doctrine. He suggested that an investigation of the conflicting claims be made as the only way of determining whether Great Britain was within her rights or was seeking to extend her territory. He declared that Great Britain had thus far refused to arbitrate the controversy except on condition that Venezuela renounce a large part of her claim, and pointed out that the great disparity of strength between the two countries left Venezuela no hope of establishing her claim, insofar as it was just, except by peaceful means.

Here is another fine expression of the sense of the Monroe Doctrine that in legal contemplation all independent states are regarded as equal, and that the rights of each are not deemed to be dependent upon the possession of power to insure their enforcement. Mr. President, to have that principle recognized at that time was an exceedingly great step forward in the establishment of international understanding and international law throughout the world. Chief Justice Marshall may have been expressly cognizant of this aspect of the new doctrine when he gave voice to the famous legal pronouncement in an admiralty proceeding before the Supreme Court in 1825. Chief Justice Marshall said:

> No principle of general law is more universally acknowledged than the perfect equality of nations. Russia and Geneva have equal rights. It results from this equality, that no one can rightfully impose a rule on another. Each legislates for itself, but its legislation can operate on itself alone. A right, then, which is vested in all by the consent of all can be divested only by consent.

Mr. President, if we have to assert a right which we have not yet had to, and which no one has asked us to assert, in regard to the President's prounouncement, I think we will find it can be justified, and justified completely, by a law which has been on our statute books for much more than 100 years, and what was law long before that in international society.

So far as the relation of Great Britain to American affairs was concerned, the assertion of the Monroe Doctrine by President Cleveland and Secretary Olney was successful. Great Britain took the lesson to heart, accepted the arbitration with Venezuela which was thrust upon her, and the findings of the arbitrators, and prepared to give up that joint control of the Canal which was embodied in the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty of 1850. During the Spanish War of 1898, Great Britain made it clear that other European powers must not interfere with the American policy of the United States. The next step was for Great Britain, in the first Hay-Pauncefote Treaty of 1900, freely and without consideration to give up joint control over isthmus transit. The Senate insisted that there should be a formal abrogation of the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty, and Great Britain gave way and accepted the second Hay-Pauncefote Treaty of 1901, by which the United States was left free to control any isthmus canal that might be constructed and to "neutralize" it in her own way.

President Theodore Roosevelt transformed the Monroe Doctrine from a negative into a positive policy. By his construction of the doctrine the United States assumed the positive responsibility of maintaining stable conditions in otherwise turbulent Latin-American States so as to avoid any excuse for European intervention in violation of the Monroe Doctrine. Prior to this time our Government did not maintain that armed collection of private debts contravened the Monroe Doctrine, in the absence of any occupation of territory. President Roosevelt, however, at the time of the Venezuelan affair of 1902, came to be of the opinion that such armed intervention directed against a Latin-American State would substantially involve a violation of the Monroe Doctrine, and consequently we could not permit European powers to exercise force in the collection of debts in Latin-American countries. Here, again, is an assertion of the equal rights of small nations. At the same time, we could not deny that debts properly contracted ought to be paid. We could not allow any country to hide behind us so as to avoid the discharge of their just obligations. In various speeches and messages, and particularly in his messages to Congress in 1904, President Roosevelt declared that the Monroe Doctrine was intended to be one of peace, and that to keep the peace the United States might be forced in flagrant cases to "the exercise of an international police power." This is the so-called "policy of the Big Stick."

President Taft inherited the Roosevelt principles. He endorsed the latter's positive interpretation of the Monroe Doctrine, and applied it to new situations arising in the Caribbean region. He summed up as follows the doctrine underlying American intervention in that region:

> Now when we properly may, with the consent of those in authority in such governments and without too much sacrifice on our part, aid those governments in bringing about stability and law and order, without involving ourselves in their civil wars, it is a proper national policy for us to do so. It is not only proper national policy but it is international philanthropy. We owe as much as the fortunate man owes aid to the unfortunate in the same neighborhood and in the same community. We are international trustees of the prosperity we have and the power we enjoy, and we are in duty bound to use them when it is both convenient and proper for us to help our neighbors. When this help prevents the happening of events that may prove to be an acute violation of the Monroe Doctrine by European governments, our duty in this regard is only increased and amplified.

Mr. President, that doctrine is up to date. That is, what we are doing today is merely an enlargement of the same philosophy and the same idea.

In 1912, under the lead of Senator Lodge, the Senate itself took the initiative in adopting a new interpretation of the Monroe Doctrine. The new policy was embodied in a simple Senate resolution, and did not receive the formal support of the Taft administration. The resolution asserted that—

> When any harbor or other place in the American continents is so situated that the occupation thereof for naval or military purposes might threaten the communications or the safety of the United States, the Government of the United States could not see without grave concern the possession of such harbor or other place by any corporation or association which has such a relation to another government, not American, as to give that government practical power of control for naval or military purposes.

The adoption of the resolution seems to have been due to newspaper reports that a Japanese corporation was attempting to secure control of land on Magdalena Bay in Lower California, Mexico. This resolution differs from previous interpretations of the Monroe Doctrine in extending it to a "corporation or association" under the practical control of a non-American government, rather than to the government itself. This seems to be logical extension where, as in this case, it is thought that the corporation is a mere disguise or subterfuge, and is really acting on behalf of the foreign government. The Doctrine is thus interpreted as preventing such a government from doing indirectly what

it could not do directly without violating it.

Truly the Monroe Doctrine has not been a static affair: it has been growing. It has evolved from time to time, rather consistently. But it has been since the great pronouncement of Woodrow Wilson at Mobile in 1913, when what is now called the good-neighbor policy had its origin, that the foundation was laid for the Monroe Doctrine as it is understood today. For at that time the United States, by the words of its Chief Executive, announced to the world that the day of aggression, the day of advantage taking, was gone, and could no longer obtain condonation. Emancipation for the small nations was his keynote.

Referring to President Wilson's statement at Mobile, President Roosevelt said in 1933:

> It therefore has seemed clear to me as President that the time has come to supplement and to implement the declaration of President Wilson by the further declaration that the definite policy of the United States from now on is one opposed to armed intervention. The maintenance of constitutional government in other nations is not a sacred obligation devolving upon the United States alone. The maintenance of law and the orderly processes of government in this hemisphere is the concern of each individual nation within its own borders first of all. It is only if and when the failure of orderly processes affects the other nations of the continent that it becomes their concern; and the point to stress is that in such an event it becomes the joint concern of a whole continent in which we are all neighbors.

From that time on the Monroe Doctrine ceased to be a unilateral affair. It became a multilateral understanding, and from that day on it has moved more and more into that sphere.

This Nation follows neither a policy of conquest or imperialism, nor does it condone such a policy on the part of other large nations. The straightforward manner in which this Nation honored its agreement with the Philippines to assist in establishment of independence definitely militates against the possible supposition of an imperialistic policy.

There need be no suggestion of exploitation with regard to this proposal to extend economic aid to Greece. Nor should there be the insinuation that this Nation will thereby shoulder the burden of furthering the imperialistic policy of Great Britain. Both ideas are in derogation of this Nation's consistent policy. But it is quite consistent with the policy of this Nation to go to the aid of a smaller nation, to lend its aid in enabling that nation to maintain its political independence by solidifying its economic position. This is America at her very best. The nations of the world are neighbors today, and much more so now than in the time of President Taft we are the international trustees of the prosperity we have and the power we enjoy. We cannot make the world over, but we can advance that which is in the American interest whenever it is our right or our privilege to do so.

Mr. President, the good-neighbor policy, based upon the fundamental theories of the Monroe Doctrine, is not an affair which merely extends north and south; it is a policy which ultimately and actually extends east and west as well.

In relation to the feelings of our country toward the areas of Europe and Asia in which we have now become so interested, it is well worth while to emphasize what the Senator from Texas so well pointed out yesterday—that our action in going to the aid of Greece can be a new light on the road to the coming of a better world.

It is interesting also to note, in connection with what I said in the first part of my remarks, that if we separate, instead of mixing up the words "Russia," "communism," "single will," "proletarian dictatorship," and so forth, and confine ourselves to the real matters to be discussed, it is interesting to note how old the rivalry has been around the eastern part of the Mediterranean. We are all, of course, familiar with what Napoleon said about that section of the world, and I think everyone who has read a textbook on history and the conflict of nations realizes what it would mean if these states could not survive as independent entities.

I have said at other times, and I said at the beginning of these remarks, that I do not think our action in going to the aid of Greece and in giving aid to Turkey means the assumption of the responsibilities of any other nation. It does not mean the continuation, through adoption and use, of any policy practiced by any other nation. My whole thesis in this discussion has been devoted to showing that that which we are doing is consistent with what has been American policy from the very beginning and will remain American policy so long as we have America.

Mr. President, I ask permission to have inserted in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a statement concerning rivalry between Russia, Greece, and Turkey in the 1840's and the 1850's.

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

RUSSIA, GREECE, AND TURKEY (1840–50)

When the western powers, under the influence of Canning, intervened on behalf of Greece in 1827 Russia proposed that, instead of creating one free Greece there should be created a number of independent Greek provinces—a proposal to which Canning replied: "The support of this country should never be given to any scheme for disposing of the Greeks without their consent."[1]

In 1833 Czar Nicholas I favored Greece as a possible heir to the European possessions of Turkey, although he was far from wishing a sudden dissolution of the Turkish Empire. "The Turkish Empire," said Nicholas to the Austrian Ambassador Count Ficquelmont on February 18, 1833, succeeded to the Greek Empire by means of conquest. Its roots do not go deep; the populations of the provinces of the old Greek Empire, even on the Asiatic side of the Bosphorus, are mostly Christian. When the Turkish Empire destroys itself by its own incapacity, why should we not try and reestablish a Greek Empire? There are the beginnings of a Greek state. I do not know King Otto; I do not know if he is able to support such a destiny. I see for my part nothing better to do." The Greek Empire was presumably to include the small kingdom of Greece, Macedonia, Thrace, and both shores of the Bosphorus.[2]

By 1840 Greece was abandoned by the Czar. His attitude in the forties to Greece and Turkey was best expressed in his conversation with Lord Aberdeen in 1844 during the Czar's visit to London. Nicholas said: "Turkey must fall to pieces. Nesselrode denies this, but I for my part am fully convinced of it. We cannot preserve its existence, no matter how hard we try. I do not want a single inch of Turkish soil, but I shall not permit any power to alienate Turkish territory. Among the powers there are only two which are able to play a truly tutelary role: Those bordering on Turkey. I do not want Constantinople. But if the Ottoman throne falls by its own fault, if it succumbs as a result of its lack of vitality, in a word, if the empire is dissolved, never shall I permit Constantinople to fall into the hands of England or France. Nor would I favor the reconstruction of the Byzantine Empire. It is Austria which, in the general interest, must fall heir to European Turkey. If the English, French, or any others wish to take Constantinople I will expel them; and I do not think expulsion would be a hazard, for I would be on the ground before either of these forces. Once in Constantinople I shall never leave!"[3]

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. There was another time when Russia again figured in the economy of nations and in a conflict to which we were a party.

I have pointed out time and time again, and I now repeat that what I am saying is about Russia, not about communism, not about the "single will" theory of the state, or anything of the kind. Russia has a foreign policy which is based upon the position of Russia in the world. That policy of a nation with the population of 190,000,000 will find its ultimate fulfillment as surely as the policy of other great nations have found fulfillment. We cannot stop the destiny of 190,000,000 people, in trying to find a place for themselves in the sun.

I repeat what I said in committee, and it must never be lost sight of that until World War II, Russia—and I am talking about Russia, not about communism, not about the "single will," not about Stalinism or Leninism—has not won a war for more than a hundred years. All the previous wars resulted in what Russia deemed an unjust peace. She has been hedged around. She has sought a place in the sun. She has wanted an outlet into the Atlantic, an outlet into the Mediterranean, an outlet into the Indian Ocean, and an outlet into the Pacific Ocean. She has been deprived of all those things. It was glibly stated by French authorities when the League of Nations was set up that it was a League against Russia. The plan of French alliances was aimed to stop Russia. Japan was given her place after the last war, very much along the same principle, although Russia herself had collapsed. Russia did not have the outlet into the Atlantic, the outlet into the Mediterranean, the outlet into the Pacific, or the outlet into the Indian Ocean.

In World War II, Russia is a victor, one of the greatest victors from the

[1] G. F. Abbot, Turkey, Greece, and the Great Powers, London, 1916, p. 333.

[2] Harold Temperley, England and the Near East, London, 1936, pp. 68–69.

[3] Vernon John Puryear, England, Russia, and the Straits Question, 1844–56, Berkeley, 1931, pp. 48–49.

standpoint of accomplishing things, throwing off bonds, and allowing herself "elbow room," as she would call it. She has won the greatest victory of all victories. Ultimately, therefore, Russia will be in the Pacific, or have access to it; she will have free access to the Mediterranean, she will have free access to the Atlantic. She will be a party to an arrangement, which must be had, that will enable her to get into the Indian Ocean.

The day of buffer states is gone. The day of drawing up anti-Comintern pacts or their equivalent is gone. The notion of bottling up nations is gone, even if it should be attempted by military force or by agreement. It cannot be done now because Russia has two great allies, allies which know no boundaries.

Her concept of communism thrives upon distress, and upon conditions which grow, as they alway have and always will, whenever the four horsemen are loosed upon the earth. So her objectives will be accomplished in one way or another. She has been recognized as an equal by all the nations of the world, and responsibilities must be placed upon her.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have insert in the RECORD at this point a statement prepared by the Legislative Reference Service, showing Theodore Roosevelt's attitude toward Russia and Japan during the Russo-Japanese War 1904–05. I think the statement has a bearing upon what we are discussing today. The day of choosing sides merely for the purpose of talking is gone. The day has come when we must stand for principles because they are a part of life, a part of our national experience. In order to illustrate my point, I ask that the words of Theodore Roosevelt, as contained in the statement I present, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

THEODORE ROOSEVELT'S ATTITUDE TOWARD RUSSIA AND JAPAN DURING RUSSO-JAPANESE WAR, 1904–05

Prof. Edward H. Zabriskie, in his study "American-Russian Rivalry in the Far East, 1895–1914" (Philadelphia, 1946), calls the American policy during the Russo-Japanese war 1904–05, "Roosevelt's policy of balanced antagonisms."

In a letter to Cecil Spring-Rice, British Ambassador at St. Petersburg, dated December 27, 1904, Roosevelt expressed freely his unflattering opinion of the Russians and his doubts of the Japanese. "Russia, for a number of years," he wrote, "has treated the United States as badly as she had treated England, and almost as badly as she has treated Japan. Her diplomatists lied to us with brazen and contemptuous effrontery, and showed with cynical indifference their intention to organize China against our interest. * * * I should have liked to be friendly with her; but she simply would not permit it." * * * "The Japanese, as a government, treated us well. * * * But I wish I were certain that the Japanese at bottom did not lump Russians, English, Americans, Germans, all of us, simply as white devils inferior to themselves * * * to be treated politely only so long as would enable the Japanese to take advantage of our various national jealousies, and beat us in turn * * *." Roosevelt, summing up the matter at the end of the letter, decided the course for the United States was "to trust in the Lord and keep our powder dry and our eyes open."

However vigorous President Roosevelt was, especially in the early stages of hostilities, in expression of both his official and unofficial anti-Russian bias, he at no time favored Japanese predominance in Manchuria. His purpose, as shown at an early stage of the war, was to give Japan a free hand in Korea, to render her assistance, both morally and financially, in her fight to loosen the clutch of Russia in Manchuria, with its menace to American commercial and industrial interests, to prolong the war for a sufficient length of time to exhaust both Russia and Japan, and to leave a weakened Russia and a strengthened Japan facing each other at the end of the war, thereby equalizing the Manchurian balance of power.

In a conversation held with the German Ambassador von Sternburg on March 21, 1904, during the second month of the war, Roosevelt, as reported by the Ambassador, stated that "it is to our interest that the war between Russia and Japan should drag on, so that both powers may exhaust themselves as much as possible and that their geographic areas of friction should not be eliminated after the conclusion of peace; and that, as regards the limits of their spheres of influence they should remain opposed to each other in the same way as they were before the war. This will keep them on a war footing and reduce their appetite for other territories."

During the war Roosevelt's attitude toward Russia and Japan underwent several changes. At the beginning of the war Roosevelt's sympathies were with Japan. "Between ourselves—for you must not breathe it to anybody," he wrote to Theodore Roosevelt, Jr., on February 10, 1904, "I was thoroughly well pleased with the Japanese victory, for Japan is playing our game."

Later in the war, when the balance of power which Roosevelt sought in the Far East was threatened by the sweeping Japanese victories, his sympathies shifted somewhat to Russia. He considered the "complete exclusion of Russia from the Pacific Ocean most undesirable in general, and particularly unwelcome to the United States." He was ready for the war to end and accepted the role of a peace-maker.

However, on August 29, 1905, the day of the final session of the Portsmouth Conference, he wrote to W. W. Rockhill: "I was pro-Japanese, but after my experience with the Peace Commissioners I am far stronger pro-Japanese than ever."

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I repeat what I said previously respecting the dilemma in which America finds herself. The American dilemma today is that we find ourselves standing as the leader of the democratic forces of the world, and also as one of the chief architects of an imposing international structure intended as the bulwark of peace. In this structure the opposing systems of democratic and totalitarian systems are supposed to work together. The clash of these opposing systems is the chief source of weakness in the foundation we are helping to build for the United Nations Organization.

But because the United Nations Organization is young and weak is not an excuse for using it as a refuge for isolationistic thinking. It is intended only as the working ground for the internationalist. At the present time, however, the issue raised over the proposal to extend economic aid to Greece demonstrates that it is not enough for us to belong to the United Nations and to participate in furthering the purpose of that organization. Our future in the world neighborhood is dependent in large part on the proper functioning of the United Nations Organization, but our membership therein need not preclude our continuing to act as an individual Nation at a proper time and for a proper cause.

We are in a period of profound struggle. A serious contest of ideas is being promoted by apparently incompatible systems of government. However, these clashing forces have never met before. If we were to convince ourselves that the struggle we are now engaged in is the only kind of war we are going to fight for years to come we could adapt ourselves better for taking it in our stride and give greater effect to the work for peace.

We in the United States may be too much afraid of communism, Russia, and war—in the sense that too much fear usually inspires misdirected thinking and unwise action. Today, more than ever before, we need careful thinking to make our determined course of action proper in the national interest, which must be coincident with propriety in the international interest.

To repeat, Mr. President, the world is still at war. There has not been a single treaty consummated. We are passing through the aftermath of the shooting war and into the midst of the talking and ideological-conflict war. American unity is, therefore, the prime necessity. To fail to follow the leadership of our President at this time would be a backward step for America to take. What we do must be done in accordance with American policy. Ideological controversy is probably the most striking.

According to one Communist, the progress of America in her one-hundred-and-sixty-odd years of growth, was too rapid for stability. Yet he speaks of a new measure of time of which the world must become conscious; thousands of years must be seen as an hour or two in the new "rhythm of time." At the same time, he speaks of the history of Russia as having covered a hundred years in the last decade or two in her efforts to catch up with the advancement of America and the rest of the Western World. He says that during this period Russia not only caught up with America and the western civilization but also developed the technique which will eventually pervade the whole earth and bring world stability, but that this stability will only be brought about through the processes of another war, the constructive war, which according to him, we must now prepare ourselves to execute. Those are the words of the most idealistic writer I know of concerning the present mission of communism in the world. Can it be forgotten so soon that the world has already fought one war to end wars, only to be followed by another war within a single generation, a war instigated and waged by an ideology permitting the domination of a single will.

There can be no peace and stability in the world unless there is a desire for peace and stability in the hearts and minds of men. There can be no peace unless there is faith in the ideal of peace. There can be no peace unless there is faith in the human race that it has the

potentiality and ability through proper education and development of ideals to produce a whole world-citizenry with a social conscience. A faith which admits that necessity is its only law is nothing more nor less than the old forced salvation idea, which, from the beginning of time, has been the great provocator of war; it is nothing more than the means for the establishment of the single will, of which the world so recently grew weary. Faith in mankind based upon the power of the machine leaves the spirit of man cold, and that thing we call the milk of human kindness will be skimmed to a very pale hue under its influence. What is the difference between the caste mentality and caste spirit of India, and the mass mentality and mass spirit idea of Russia, if individualism in the mass mentality and mass spirit is denied expression. Limitations, other than those endowed by nature, would remain the same. Single-will dominance will always prevail until mankind, individually and collectively, learns the technique of molding many wills into a single wish. That is the theory upon which our Government operates—liberation, and then understanding.

The process of deliberation and discussion which brought into existence the greatest country in the world, uniting 48 small States into one great unit, creating a peace-loving nation, a country sought as a haven for the oppressed peoples of the earth, a nation abhorring war since its inception, yet a nation which surprised the world with her ability and speed to wage a successful war against an aggressor enemy, is decried by Communists because they claim that such a process is too far removed from human misery and hardships. Yet, through this process, America established the highest living standards for the greatest number of people anywhere in the world. America does not yet claim to have reached her zenith in growth and development, but history gives us America as the classic example of a land where men have worked out a technique of living in peace with one another. Differences we have it is true, but at least one does not see tanks in our streets, nor their design for immediate production in our factories, nor does one hear the roar of gunfire the day after an election to obliterate the man who had the strength of his convictions.

To say that idealism has no place in human affairs, that we are weary of dreamers and idealists, is not only folly but stops short any hope for a better race. If America had ignored the force of idealism we would have still been chasing individual Japanese in foxholes and burning them up man by man, and we would never have obtained a surrender from Japan. That is, surrender definitely came as a result of the recognition of the fact that they, as a nation, were bad in having forsaken their past ideals in becoming followers of false leaders. Surrender in Japan, despite the fact that the Emperor said it came as a result of the atomic bomb, could never have come without the unity of the autonomous generals in the field. It came about through our efforts in psychological warfare, constantly sending radio messages to the people of Japan themselves, giving them the truth about themselves—that they had betrayed their heritage in their adoption of apostate leaders.

As I see it, we are indeed staying with first principles, probably returning to basic American theory; rushing, as it were, to the defense of democratic freedom and for the preservation of dollar democracy in the world. Liberty without property is a vain hope. To have and to hold are the bases of true liberty. There may be a mingling of political thought and economic theory, but it is a healthful mingling. From it all the earth may have a new baptism of freedom. In this battle we must win. Freedom, liberty, and private property are the stakes. America, therefore, cannot stand by without going back on her destined leadership in the world.

Mr. LODGE obtained the floor.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for the purpose of suggesting the absence of a quorum?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hayden	O'Conor
Baldwin	Hickenlooper	O'Daniel
Ball	Hill	O'Mahoney
Bricker	Hoey	Pepper
Bridges	Holland	Reed
Brooks	Ives	Revercomb
Buck	Jenner	Robertson, Va.
Bushfield	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Wyo.
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Byrd	Kem	Smith
Cain	Knowland	Stewart
Capehart	Langer	Taft
Capper	Lodge	Taylor
Chavez	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Connally	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Cooper	McCarthy	Thye
Cordon	McClellan	Tobey
Donnell	McFarland	Tydings
Downey	McKellar	Umstead
Dworshak	Malone	Vandenberg
Eastland	Martin	Watkins
Ecton	Maybank	Wherry
Ellender	Millikin	White
Flanders	Moore	Wiley
Fulbright	Morse	Williams
George	Murray	Wilson
Hawkes	Myers	Young

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-one Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I should like to take a few minutes of the time of the Senate to say a very few words in order to keep the record clear, because I think if we are going to clarify this question, we must all mean the same thing when we use certain words.

I have noted that there seems to be a good deal of confusion about the word "military." I have heard some Senators in the last few days tell us they favor relief aid to Greece but that they are opposed to military aid, as though relief aid is necessarily good but when it has the word "military" in it, it is necessarily bad.

So I think we must have an understanding as to what we mean by the word "military." If by that word we mean the setting up of a force consisting of large units which are capable of undertaking combat operations on an international scale, we mean something which can be very dangerous indeed. But if, on the other hand, by the words "military aid" we mean the equipping of Greek personnel, which is equivalent to a constabulary, so that it can keep order, put down banditry, prevent highway robbery, and other forms of illicit interference with vital communications, and patrol the borders, we mean something beneficial and, incidentally, something without which no relief at all is possible.

It is my understanding that the military aid to Greece which is contemplated in this bill consists entirely of furnishing equipment to the Greek Army and teaching them how to use it—largely a supply function. I understand that there is no training whatever in the accepted sense of the word "military"—no maneuvers, no field exercises, no tactical problems, and nothing which in any way suggests large units or combat operations. When we see a group of uniformed men armed with pistols or rifles going down the road in an armored car, we are undoubtedly seeing a military activity. But if those men are protecting a convoy which is bringing milk and other foodstuffs to women and children, we are seeing something beneficial. On the other hand, if they are the advance elements of a battalion engaged in hostile activities, then we are seeing something entirely different.

Secretary Patterson, in his statement to the committee on March 24, pointed out, for one thing, that about one-half of the Greek requirements would consist of civilian type supplies. He stated:

> The proposed assistance will enable the Greek Government to procure equipment and supplies not obtainable in their own country, as well as assistance in the training and instruction of key personnel in operation and maintenance of equipment so procured. The material required is principally repairs and gasoline for airplanes, weapons and ammunition, vehicles and fuel, clothing and food. In money value, weapons and ammunition account for about one-third; vehicles, fuel, clothing, and food for another one-third; the balance would go for such items as engineering supplies, communications equipment (such as radios, telephones, and wire), mules and horses for use in the mountains, and miscellaneous supplies.

To be specific, when it comes to training, our American military personnel in Greece will instruct the Greeks largely in the use of signal equipment—"the walkie-talkie" and all other types of radio equipment, which, as all who have been in the service know, is usually the most complicated thing that the soldier has to learn. It would be my guess that three-fourths of their time would be taken up with that kind of instruction.

There may be some instruction, of course, in maintenance of vehicles and in the mechanical handling of weapons.

So far as the Navy is concerned, Secretary Forrestal, on the same day, said this:

> As regards Greece, preliminary departmental studies based on the limited information now available indicate that Greek naval needs will consist principally of certain types of amphibious vessels such as tank landing ships, personnel boats, tugs, and other minor

craft. There also appears to be a requirement for minesweepers and mine-sweeping gear to sweep mines from coastal waters to clear the way for coastal shipping needed to support the Greek economy.

It is perfectly evident from that quotation that there is nothing at all in such a naval contribution which could in any way involve offensive operations of any kind. It would be purely supplementary to the constabulary activity which is what we mean when we talk about military aid in connection with Greece.

We can, therefore, safely conclude that there is nothing whatever in this bill which involves the United States in combat operations in Greece or which by any stretch of the imagination could put Greece in a position to undertake offensive international action.

Now let us consider Turkey for a moment. In the case of Turkey also a great part of the American contribution will be in civilian type supplies, such as transportation equipment, telephone and road-building equipment, and materials for the improvement of railway and port facilities. All those things have military value, but they also have economic and general value. Some weapons which are surplus over here, such as antiaircraft artillery, may be made available; but, of course, none of that can possibly be construed as American participation in the formation of large units trained for offensive combat operations on an international scale.

Mr. President, I have already made a general statement on this subject, so I shall not further detain the Senate by another general statement at this time, particularly in view of the fact that the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee has covered the subject so admirably and so completely. But I wish to point out that we always run into trouble whenever in considering international policies we try to draw a sharp line between what is political and what is military. It is like trying to cut a pail of water in two with a knife, because the fact is that the two factors are constantly merging. There were times in the Army when I felt strongly that our professional soldiers were not sufficiently aware of this inter-relationship and tried constantly to treat the military as something utterly separated and unrelated.

I remember an instance during the war which illustrates this point. An order had been given to fall back, and one of our ablest staff officers had proceeded to draw on the map the exact line to which the troops were to withdraw. The line was drawn in accordance with the best military thought, taking advantage of natural obstacles, winding along rivers, using the cover of forests, the high ground afforded by mountains, and the strong holding positions made possible by using defiles and mountain passes. Another officer, one who was much less well informed from a military standpoint, watched the line being drawn on the map, and noticed that a withdrawal to that line meant that a great and famous city which had been conquered a few weeks earlier would have to be abandoned to the enemy. That city was a symbol to the French people, who for years, when Germany occupied it, bemoaned its loss. It was also somewhat of a symbol in the reverse sense to Germany. For the Germans to reenter that city would have far-reaching effects in depressing French morale and in reviving German spirit—all of which would be damaging to the Allied cause. When that was pointed out to the professional staff officer who was drawing the line, he remarked that those were political considerations which should not have a place in a decision of that character; that he knew what the best defensive line was; that he had selected it on the map; that for us not to evacuate the famous city would leave a difficult salient, and so forth, and so forth.

That was an instance in which the political and military factors were merged. If the city had been allowed to revert to the Germans, incalculable military harm would have been done. The general, a wise man, decided to hold the city. A few weeks later the advance began and was never stopped.

It is true, of course, that the pending bill is not an ordinary relief bill. It is not a bill for economic revival. I think that "strategic" is as good a word as any to describe it, if we had to describe it in one word.

It is undoubtedly not the last action of its kind which we may be called upon to take. We shall have to meet future challenges to our security as they arise; and I trust that we shall not only have the intelligence and the ability to do so, but that we shall also have the material resources which are necessary to preserve our national existence in this troubled world. We are already a "have not" nation in many important respects. Our wealth and our power are not inexhaustible, and we must husband our resources.

Our President pro tempore, the able Chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee; the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] was wholly right, in my opinion when he said that this action does not constitute a new doctrine, in the sense of the doctrine enunciated by President Monroe. In this country we have always been interested in our own self-preservation, just as we have always been interested in bringing about conditions in which all nations can live their lives in peace and freedom, or, as the President said in his message, "a life free from coercion."

After all, Mr. President, I am speaking of the Mediterranean. The marines landed at Derna, in Libya, in 1805. So there is nothing alarmingly new about the pending proposal. It is one thing, however, to proclaim these purposes; it is another thing to serve them intelligently.

I hope that in the future we shall not be caught by surprise and forced into action without enough time for full deliberation.

I trust that our American diplomats will not interpret this policy as meaning that the United States automatically joins and supports any force in Europe, no matter how degraded or squalid it may be, provided only that it is anticommunist, because, very frankly, Mr. President, these elements are often just as obnoxious—although from another standpoint—as the communists themselves. We would certainly be doing our country a very bad turn indeed if we were to get it lined up with the forces of European reaction whose cynicism, intellectual brutality and indifferences to human values is as great as that of the Communists.

Mr. President, I think Americans must always be "pro" rather than "anti." We are a constructive people. That is how we have achieved what we have achieved, and we must always approach foreign problems in a constructive spirit.

Finally, I hope that in the future we will seek to achieve permanent results by our expenditure of money and effort as the result of forethought and far-reaching plans, and not be constantly surprised by a succession of expensive rescue parties in which we simply pour money down a rat hole and achieve no basic improvement. For example, I believe that in western Europe there are many people who would like to see some sort of integration among the nations of that unhappy region. There are some who would undoubtedly go as far as the Senator from Arkansas who, in his able speech, came out categorically for a United States of Europe. There are surely many more who would favor a less overt and comprehensive type of integration.

It would be my hope that, without, of course, forcing anything, our good offices could be used to encourage such a step, without which no basic revival of economic life in Europe is possible. I give that as an illustration of how we might achieve concrete gains as a result of our effort, and not merely throw good money after bad. There is not sufficient money in the world, and there is certainly not sufficient money in the United States, to pursue such a course.

By being foresighted, and by keeping ouselves strong, we can have some real hope for the future.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to ask my colleague one question which I have been very anxious to ask some member of the Committee on Foreign Relations. At this time, as my colleague has just stated, the Members of the Congress, and perhaps the people of the country, have been caught by surprise at the speed of the action of our President. One reason, and a very fundamental reason, which influences me in voting for the pending bill, as I expect to do, is that it will maintain the prestige of our country in the eyes of the other nations of the world.

My question is, Is there any method, either formal or informal, by which it is possible for individual Members of Congress to discuss with those in authority in the executive branch such a question as that now before the Senate before, so to speak, it is sprung on the Congress?

This is not a question of declaring war, it is a question of action in peacetime, and it seems to me that it would be far wiser for the Executive, if it were possible, in some way, formally or informally, to

get the advice of leading Members of Congress before action is taken.

I should like to ask my colleague if that question was discussed at all in the committee, or if he has any opinion as to how such a course could be followed?

Mr. LODGE. I think that question has been discussed a great deal. I believe there is a general feeling that in situations affecting foreign policy we in Congress are often placed on the horns of a dilemma, and have only one of two choices, either to go along and support the President, or to repudiate him before the whole world—and the latter, of course, to me is unthinkable.

Mr. President, I have never liked to see this country or its representatives in a position where they have only two alternatives. I think that is one of the vices inherent in the European conditions, namely, that nations there can go in only two directions. It is like troops caught in a tunnel. They can go forward or back, and the machine guns will get them whichever end they come out. In this country we can go around, or in any other way we wish. My colleague has put his finger on an important point. It it not satisfactory for us to be on the horns of a dilemma, as I think we are somewhat in this case.

While I am not well-advised on this point, I think the President might well take into his confidence the senior Members of this body, and I think he has done so in some cases; indeed, it is a matter of public knowledge that that has been done in many cases. I share my colleague's hope that it will be done, and that the American people will be left as much freedom of action as possible.

Mr. LUCAS and Mr. COOPER 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 Illinois. Then I shall yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. LUCAS. Before I propound my inquiry to the able Senator, I desire to congratulate him on going into the military and naval phases of the bill, because there is no Member of the Senate who is better qualified to discuss those two features than is the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. LODGE. I thank the Senator from Illinois very much.

Mr. LUCAS. As I understand, one condition that exists today is that Great Britain has between ten and fifteen thousand troops in Greece at the present time. Under the program laid down by Great Britain, she being unable financially to rehabilitate herself, as I understand, she will soon withdraw all those troops. Does the Senator understand that to be the proposal?

Mr. LODGE. That is the plan.

Mr. LUCAS. The British have had at least ten or fifteen thousand troops, and probably more, in Greece since the war closed in Europe, and she had them there for a purpose. Great Britain proposes now to recall those troops from Greece, and what we are proposing is to send 40 or 50 or 100 technicians to take the place of all those troops. Is that what the able Senator understands the situation to be?

Mr. LODGE. Broadly, yes. The plan is that the Greeks themselves shall take over the burden of keeping order.

Mr. LUCAS. That is correct; the Greeks do have an army at the present time, and all we propose to do is to give the Greek Army certain military equipment which will aid them in keeping order in Greece.

Mr. LODGE. I think that is correct.

Mr. LUCAS. The point I wish to reiterate, and which I think exceedingly important, is this: Great Britain has had her soldiers in Greece before and since the close of the war. Russia has never protested, at least so far as I know. Now we do not propose to send any combat troops into Greece to take the places of British combat soldiers who are now there, but all we propose to do is to supply certain military equipment to Greece, and to send certain technicians there to see that the military equipment is properly operated and understood, so that if we should send a tank some inept soldier would not drive it into a tree or into a creek.

Mr. LODGE. As a matter of fact, I do not think it is planned to send any tanks.

Mr. LUCAS. I merely used that as an example.

Mr. LODGE. I think the largest weapon planned to be sent in is mortars, but of course the Greeks will need some instruction as to the manipulation of those weapons, otherwise they will be blowing their own hands off.

Mr. LUCAS. I agree with the Senator, and I used the tank only as an example. I do not know what is to be sent to Greece, but if whatever is sent there is new and modern, and the Greek soldier does not know anything about the use of such equipment, it would obviously be foolish to send it without at the same time sending someone to provide instruction as to how to use it.

Mr. LODGE. Most of the training is going to be in radio. I do not know whether the Senator comes to the Senate Office Building in the morning in a cab equipped with a radio. Of course, radio installation is very useful to a police force, constabulary, or any military group that is trying to put down a disturbance of the peace. Most of the training is to be in radio.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator for his last contribution. I was not certain exactly as to the purpose for which the technicians were to be used. I want to emphasize as strongly as I can that we are sending a very few men, and no combat troops, and that as we send technicians into Greece to operate the new military equipment, the British are at the same time withdrawing at least 10,000 or 15,000 combat troops that have been there from the beginning, and that during all of this time I have never heard Russia make one protest because of the presence of British troops.

I do not view this as many people do. In my opinion, it is not at all a step toward war. In my humble opinion, it is a step toward peace. What is the alternative if this step is not taken? The alternative is to permit, not Russia, perhaps, but communism, let us say, to go into Greece and Turkey, and allow Greece and Turkey to sink in the communistic mire. When they do that all of Europe and Asia will go down with them.

Mr. LODGE. I thank the Senator. I think he has made a good point about the withdrawal of the British troops.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President——

Mr. LODGE. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. I should like to say that I have great respect for the opinion of the Senator from Massachusetts, because his opinion is based not only upon study but upon his personal experience with these people while he was in the military service and his knowledge of their countries. I was greatly interested in the statement made by the Senator, which seems to me to have been unique in this debate. As I have heard the speeches made, it seems to me that in nearly every speech it has been said that there is a possibility of achieving democratic stability and democratic government because of achieving economic stability. I think I just heard the Senator say that in the long run there is not much possibility of achieving economic stability without achieving democratic stability. I believe there is a great danger that any money spent will go down the rat hole unless there is the possibility that democratic stability will be achieved.

I should like to ask the Senator, from his own experience and study, and from his own knowledge of these countries and his service with their people during the war, and from the hearings which have been had, if he is convinced that in Greece there is a real desire and a real effort on the part of the people and of the government to work toward and to achieve democratic stability and democratic institutions?

Mr. LODGE. I believe there is a real desire to create conditions under which a certain minimum standard of decent living will be possible. Of course, a country which has been completely ruined, as Greece was by the Germans, with all its bridges out and every conceivable installation destroyed and its people hungry, is not at first going to be so much interested in democracy or in the niceties of life as in trying to grab something to eat, and there will be a dog-eat-dog attitude. So the first thing to be done in order to make democracy possible is to bring about such a state of things that the people will be able to obtain food.

Mr. COOPER. I understand that, but I understood that in the course of his remarks the Senator also argued that as another condition there must be an underlying desire and effort to achieve democratic institutions.

Mr. LODGE. Yes, I think that is so, and I believe we must try to use our good offices to promote that desire. I was referring particularly to the crazy quilt of Europe, all the countries speaking different languages and hating one another, which has already caused World War I and World War II. Like one who in rebuilding an old tenement house constructs the same kind of firetrap, we

run the risk of the same old fire if we do not try to work with the people in Europe who are undertaking at least to break down the economic walls and to bring about a measure of unity which will enable them to have an economic life that may possibly support them. If that is not done, then we shall be pouring money down a rat hole, in my opinion.

Mr. COOPER. Then, let me ask the Senator another question. From evidence which came before the committee in the course of the hearings, does the Senator have any assurance that the people of Greece and the Government of Greece actually desire and are working toward a live democratic institution?

Mr. LODGE. We heard our Ambassador to Greece, we heard some other very well qualified witnesses, and I think I report correctly when I say they gave me the impression that the Greeks would like to work toward that end. They cannot do it alone. They cannot even organize. If we were merely to supply the goods, the personnel of those countries has been so decimated that they could hardly organize delivery. They want our help, but I am convinced that they do want to move in the direction of the kind of living we have here, where there is respect for individual rights and respect for the integrity of the human being. I think they want to move in that direction.

Mr. COOPER. I thank the Senator.

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

Mr. LODGE. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. I think the Senator will agree with me that the evidence shows that those who were in charge of the elections in Greece last year have said definitely that in their opinion the elections which resulted in the installation of the present regime were free elections. But, be that as it may, the Senator knows, as everyone else knows, that liberty was practically born in Greece. She has been a liberty-loving country throughout the ages, and if there is any place in the world outside the United States of America where it would be possible to build a democracy, in my humble opinion, it is Greece. All the Greeks want is the opportunity to go forward again, to rehabilitate their condition. As the able Senator has said, those who have been in Greece know what the Nazi army did to Greece and to her economy and her transportation system, in fact, to her way of life. She is struggling to get on her feet and to become a democracy again. It is my humble opinion that if the Greek people can have the opportunity to rehabilitate themselves through the medium of this proposed loan, administered under American supervision, they will again move forward along the path of liberty and democracy according to American ideas of those terms.

Mr. LODGE. I think that is an interesting observation. I shall not say anything either in extenuation or in derogation of the present regime in Greece, but I certainly agree with what the Senator says about the Greek people. In the population of Massachusetts there are many who who were born in Greece. I know some of them very well. I have great faith in their love of liberty and love of democracy and in the high price they set on human rights. I have noticed that in the Old World when a country has experienced the horrors of a dreadful war, with its destruction, devastation, and death, inevitably there ensue poverty and bitterness, and the country is quickly split up into two factions, neither of which gives one a great deal about which to enthuse; but as things get better, the constructive forces of the community usually get under way. I hope that will happen in this instance.

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

Mr. LODGE. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to ask my colleague one other question which perhaps may have already been answered. As a member of the committee, who listened to the testimony before the committee, does my colleague entertain any feeling that there is involved a moral or an implied commitment to afford military or economic or any other kind of aid to any other country in any other section of the world, if we now commit ourselves to extend assistance to Greece and Turkey? In other words, will not each case be considered by itself afresh?

Mr. LODGE. Certainly there is no commitment at all to go outside the terms of the bill, and I do not think there are any hidden meanings in the bill. Every Senator must decide for himself, but so far as I am concerned this particular case stands on its own merits, and other cases that come along will have to stand or fall on their own merits. That has been our policy right along.

Take the question of military missions. We have sent military missions to Latin America, to the Philippines, and to China. We have not made any classification of places or areas where we would or where we would not send them. I think that is the realistic, intelligent way to go about it.

So far as I am concerned, this is not a doctrine in the sense of the Monroe Doctrine at all. This is a continuation of our effort toward self-preservation, a continuation of our effort to help create world conditions in which people who respect the Christian concept of the dignity of man will have a chance to live.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I plan to vote for the loans to Greece and Turkey. They can be and should be effective in pushing the possibility of war farther and farther away. Those who deny the possibility of war are living in a dream world—a dream world from which twice within the memory of every man on the floor of this House we have had rude awakenings. We must not dream again. We must keep awake. We must be alertly awake. We must be actively awake. The proposal we are considering requires alertness and gives an opportunity for highly useful activity.

While the loans will have my vote—and I believe a vote of the majority of my fellow Members of the Senate—the support which we give them should not be uncritical. Our restraining doubts and our hopeful suggestions should, both of them, be fully expressed. Not to express them would be unfair to the Chief Executive who, by our Constitution, is charged with the conduct of our foreign relations. Should he fail properly to estimate the temper and state of opinion of the legislative branches of the Government, he might well find himself at some point asking for authority which would be denied him. That is the negative service rendered by a free expression of opinion on this floor. In addition, there is the positive service which can be given to the future development of policy by the expression here of divergent opinions derived from wide ranges of experience.

The administration does initiate and execute foreign policy. For much of that foreign policy responsibility is shared with the Senate. At other policy levels the responsibility is shared with both Houses of the Congress. While recognizing this I, for one, find it difficult to go all the way with the senior Senator from Michigan in his masterly presentation of this undertaking to the Senate 2 days ago. If I understood him correctly, he was suggesting a degree of subservience to administrative policy which was almost complete. He compared this particular situation with a request from the President that the Congress vote a declaration of war.

I submit that the two situations are not the same. A declaration of war comes after a long series of events of which the public has been continuously kept apprised. More and more the whole mass of citizens of the Nation have seen the inevitability of war in advance of the declaration. In our most recent declaration the steady build-up of public support was given a sudden definiteness by the event of Pearl Harbor. That crystallized a sentiment which already was becoming more and more definite.

This situation is different. We are embarking on a long, new adventure. We have set out to achieve peace actively, rather than enjoy it passively and precariously. We must shed on this long, new adventure every ray of light which can be gathered from every source. Those rays of light must be directed onto the dim, difficult path which lies ahead.

What is the situation we face? Putting it briefly, we are trying to halt the progress of a new totalitarian power bent on expanding its rule to the furthest limits possible and using communism as its principal means for so doing. This great power is telling its own people, and has been telling them for years past, that communism and free enterprise cannot live peacefully together on our globe. The limits of its expansionist ideals are the uttermost bounds of the earth.

Communism is not the primary enemy. It is only a tool for world domination; but it is a dangerous and effective tool. The possessor of this tool is seeking domination, so far as possible, by political rather than military means. Communism is the inexpensive, pervasive, destructive infection by which the great totalitarian power seeks to effect its ends.

Communism, as practiced by the great country of Russia, has undergone radical changes in the period between the two

wars. It would not now, in fact, be recognized as communism by the old-time leaders who developed the doctrine. Old-time communism went out when Trotsky was banished from Russia. What is left is a national socialism of the type best adapted to military offense and defense. It is the ideal form of government for a militant nation.

What happened when Trotsky was exiled was shown by the experience in Russia of engineers employed by the company with which I was for many years connected until I resigned to take my seat on this floor. In the Trotsky-Lenin days our machine tools shipped into Russian plants were operated at an incredibly low degree of efficiency. Our engineers, sent over there to train Russian supervisors and workmen in their use, found that only a small percentage of the average workman's time was devoted to production. Every man in the plant was concerned with production but he had another important concern as well. He was a member of a committee which ran its part of an industrial establishment.

The problems of running such an establishment were very great. Decisions and policies had to be made by the workmen themselves. Hours of oratory and endless discussions were required for an agreement. Meantime the machinery stood idle.

Our men soon learned to use women operators on their machines. The women were patient, strong, and tireless. For generations they had listened to the endless conversations of their menfolks, while going about their work in the house or on the farm. They continued to go patiently on with their work in the factory, and were fully the intellectual equals of their more voluble mates.

Trotsky was exiled and conditions were changed. In an astonishingly short time the old industrial organization of Russia was reshuffled so that it was directed from the top. From the 5-year plan in Moscow the orders went out to the heads of different industries. From there they went to the individual production plants. From the head of each the word was passed down to superintendents, foremen, subformen, and wage-earners. This is national socialism. It is more effective than the old communism. That old communism is retained for the export market and is not practiced at home.

Now let us look next at the situation in Greece. We have here a people who throughout their history have been willing to fight for their freedom. Their history is one which the world must admire, whether it be that of ancient times or the history of the last century and a half. The passion for freedom in Greece is a fierce passion.

Greece made, on our side of the war, proportionately greater sacrifices than those made by any other of our allies. She fought on her boundaries. She fought on her beaches. She fought on her plains. She fought from her rugged and inaccessible mountain ranges. She asked for and received no reward in new increases in territory. She fought for her own freedom and for the cause of freedom the world over.

The war ended and she found herself impoverished and disorganized. Much of her resistance had been underground in the cities and concealed in the ravines and caverns of the mountains. These groups, separated from each other, had hard work coming to a common understanding or working peacefully together with each other when freedom was achieved. There is nothing strange in this. It was the well-nigh universal experience in invaded and looted nations. A strong endeavor was made to find out the will of the people of Greece. Elections were held there about a year ago to choose a government which would bring internal peace and order. The elections were held by secret ballot under the administration of a foreign commission of which we were members. The present Greek Government was elected by a large majority, with only the Communists refusing to vote.

Last fall a second election was held to determine whether the Government should operate as a republic or as a constitutional monarchy. The voting again revealed a heavy majority, and this time for the monarchy. In this election the Communists did not abstain. Much has been written and more has been said with regard to the fairness of this election. It was not held under the supervision of outsiders. It was held under the observation of other nationals. There are reports that the ballots were taken under conditions which rendered secrecy difficult. It is reported, for example, that voting for the monarchy could be done by making a simple mark, while the longer time required to write out an alternative form marked the voter as not having voted for the monarchy. It is also reported that the ballots were required to be put in envelopes, the walls of which were so nearly transparent that the will of the voter could be plainly observed. Yet with all of this, it is not unfair to assume that there was a strong sentiment for a constitutional monarchy.

It is not true that the people of Greece have had foisted upon them an undemocratic form of government. The form is democratic. The king reigns, but does not rule. It closely resembles the British model. So far as the form of government is concerned, the people of Greece can make it do anything which they agree on as being what they want.

The form does not assure the reality. Had the elections turned out in favor of a republic, the opportunity for that republic to become an oligarchical tyranny or a police ridden and controlled state was just as possible—no less, no more—than is the case with the constitutional monarchy which was selected. Let us cast aside without hesitation the assumption that the form of the Greek Government precludes the freedom of the Greek people.

The trouble lies not in the form of government but in external and internal conditions which are the aftermath of the war.

Guerrillas infest the northern border—the mountainous range which separates the fertile fields of Macedonia from Yugoslavia and Bulgaria. No one can doubt that these guerrillas are inspired by the Russian-dominated countries in their rear. There can be little doubt that they are financed and equipped by them. There can be little doubt that the intention is to disrupt the production of the most important agricultural region of the country and to extend the poverty and confusion which that country is suffering from, so that communism and its supporting great power may penetrate ever deeper and deeper into the unhappy lives of the Grecian people.

But there is another group of guerrillas who cannot so easily be classified as being supported and inspired from external sources. These bands control the central mountains. East of them are the plains of Thessaly, the only other rich agricultural region of the country. The evidence is that these bands are disaffected Greeks, not primarily or originally Communists but susceptible of becoming so. These bands are the remnants of irregular troops whom the whole combined might of Italy and Germany was unable to subdue throughout the long years of the war.

The endeavor to assimilate them has been put in military terms. That endeavor has reduced the democratic form of government of Greece to a close approach to what may be called a "police state," in which the rule is not by the duly constituted authorities but by a large police force acting on its own and directed from a centralized and irresponsible authority.

Almost all the news from Greece sustains this point of view. Reference may be had, for instance, to the article on page 6 of the New York Times for Tuesday, April 8. Raymond Daniell, a correspondent in Greece of that journal, writes:

> Greece has the appearance of a democracy, but the appearance is deceptive. It would not be fair to describe her as a police state, but under the stress of domestic crisis and foreign threats a large measure of the freedom associated with a democratic state has been suspended.
>
> But while the major leaders are unmolested, lesser persons who are followers, including many who are not Communists, are persecuted, terrorized, and deported without trial, and sometimes even killed. Not even liberal newspapers, let alone Communist ones, can be distributed in some areas where rightist sympathies are strong.
>
> Under the security decrees now in force, open-air public meetings are prohibited without a permit, and citizens can be deported without trial on police denunciation. There is no protection against search and seizure without a warrant. The security police, which functions under Gen. Napoleon Zervas, Minister of Public Order, has used methods reminiscent of the Gestapo.
>
> Members of the Government publicly deplore such conditions but assert that they are necessary for the present for the security of the state. However, the fires of civil strife are being fanned by excesses of both sides, including the extreme right wing, which seems to have immunity from punishment even when it resorts to murder, as it did recently in Gythion, where a rightist band, as a reprisal for the killing of a rightist leader, raided a jail and slaughtered thirty-two prisoners who were suspected of being Communists.
>
> The spirit of intolerance seems to be increasing. The Government seems to tend to the belief that all who are not actively for it are its enemies. Consequently, the civil service is being purged of all dissenters,

as the Army and the gendarmerie have been. According to Themistocles Sophoulis, Liberal leader, officers have begun to dictate what newspapers their soldiers can read.

Our task is complicated and difficult. We cannot indefinitely support the Greek population by donations of the necessities of life. They must be put in the way of gaining their own living through the normal processes of agriculture, industry, and trade. This they cannot do until they are free to live and work on their land and in their villages. This in turn they cannot do until they are assured of security from attack or arrest in their homes and on their land.

What makes the task difficult is that in the present political atmosphere there is no hope this can be accomplished by arms alone, except at a cost and with a fullness of military action on our part which we should not be willing to undertake. We might pour into the military situation many times the amount of the loan which is sought. There would still be no peace, no production, no relief from distress, no protection from the communism which thrives in distress and no resulting safety for us or the rest of the world.

Is not our task of another sort than the simply described provision of relief and military assistance? Will we not have to interpose in the government of Greece? With the enormous good will which is our greatest asset in that unhappy country can we not bring about a cessation of hostilities between the Greeks themselves, leaving only the outside disturbers of the people on the northern border to be dealt with in a military way? We must change the attitude of the police. We must seek to heal rather than to liquidate. We must see to it that the amnesty offered is a real amnesty. We must insist that the Government be composed of officials representing the whole of Greece and working together for its best interests.

We must make these internal reforms the price of our assistance. Our right to do so rests on the fact that our assistance has been asked for. Should we fail in effecting these internal reforms, we must recognize that our main task is beyond our powers. The promise of our administration that we will not concern ourselves with the political conditions of Greece is a promise based on shallow and untenable optimism. Wednesday, the Greek representative to the United Nations made constructive suggestions looking toward this necessity.

This undertaking is the testing point of our ability to intervene successfully in the affairs of the world for the good of the world. This testing ground presents no difficulties which are not present elsewhere. It has the great advantage of a population which looks up to us with faith and hope. If we fail here, we can win nowhere.

This leads us to another serious thought. Should we undertake the support of Turkey at this time? The case is by no means so clear. While her military organization is a heavy drain on her resources, she is not economically in anything like as serious a situation as that in which Greece finds herself.

Furthermore, and most important of all, there is no active band of invaders hanging on her borders, making forays into her thickly populated areas and threatening, at a moment's sign of weakness, to overrun the country.

Our support of Greece is logical and necessary. Our position with the United Nations in rendering that support, if given along the lines here suggested, is correct in every particular. It is made doubly so by the suggestion made by the chairman of our Foreign Relations Committee, that the United Nations hold a veto over our activities there.

Is the case anywhere near so clear so far as Turkey is concerned? Instead of appearing in the defense of a weak country actually in the initial process of invasion, we find ourselves furnishing military support to a nation which is not being openly threatened. This, to my mind, comes dangerously near the border line of provocative military action. This is a dangerous invasion of a responsibility which we are morally bound to leave under the authority of the United Nations.

In view of this, should we not make clear our intentions in the Greek situation, indicate that they are applicable to the Turkish situation should similar occasions arise, and then hold ourselves in readiness to act, instead of rushing forward in advance of the actual necessity? If we do so, our record is that much more clear and, in the long run, the effects of our policies will be that much more sure and less costly. I leave this thought with the administration.

What about Russia? We are placing ourselves in open opposition to her. We must continue to do so on grounds which have the approval of that part of the world which is not dominated by Russia. She has certain great advantages over us in the pursuit of her policies. A principal one is the cheapness of her strategy in terms of money, material, and men. It is far cheaper to support guerrillas and foment disorder than it is to put down insurrection and establish peace and prosperity. She can cause far more trouble in the world as a whole, at far less expense, than we must incur in curing a single trouble spot which she has generated. It is the expensiveness of the direct action on our part which leads to the great necessity for us to deal so far as possible with the intangibles, with the methods of government, with the reservoirs of good will—the methods which are here proposed for dealing with Greece. Only thus can we compete in putting out the fires which even an impoverished Russia so easily can start.

It is also possible for us, at little expense, to organize an effective counterpart to Russia's pervasive ideological infiltration. We have no quarrel with the Russian people. Our interests do not clash. Our interests are identical. We both want peace. They do not know that we want peace. They are not allowed to know that we want peace. They are not allowed to know that we have no policies, no projects, no ambitions for anything that is not equally to their advantage and ours.

Rather than putting all of our defensive and offensive preparation into military terms, let us practice something of the economy of means which the Russians use to generate so much trouble for the world. Let us find a similar economy of means for reducing the hostility—for putting further and further off the prospects of war.

One means for doing this, at a minute fraction of the cost of military preparation, is by means of the radio. In the last months of the war and after its end, Russian soldiers looted every available radio in the territory which they overran and occupied. These radio sets are scattered all over that vast country. We have in them a means of talking to the people in the great cities, in the industries, in the provincial towns, in the villages and on the collective farms.

It would be useless for us to beam to them propaganda in the ordinary sense of the word. We can, with growing skill and wisdom, provide them with programs which will interest and inform them; which will give them a more clear picture, which will tend to bring our two peoples together rather than divide them. This undertaking is a part of our new project of waging peace as actively and skillfully as we wage war.

Waging peace is a new undertaking. We are having our first try at it in the endeavor to get in touch with the Russian people on one hand and to bring relief and economic and political strength to Greece on the other. If these projects are bungled, we will be led into an endless succession of enormous expenditures without useful results. Unless we can successfully carry out our present undertakings, we had better withdraw from them and conserve our resources for inevitable war. This is the terrible alternative.

We must not bungle this waging of peace. We must watch this critical enterprise. We must, on the floor, keep in touch with it and give it helpful suggestion and criticism. If it succeeds we must encourage it. We must be generous in support and praise.

To this project of waging peace must be brought every intellectual and spiritual resource of this Nation as well as her material resources. Men must be as ready and willing to go to distant places under disagreeable conditions and sacrifice themselves for their Nation's good as they were ready and willing to make these sacrifices in the waging of war.

If we can work out this problem successfully, we will have been working toward a strengthened and more effective United Nations, which, in the years to come, can carry a large share of the burden which the special circumstances of this time make it necessary for us to carry alone.

ARE THE POLITICAL PRODIGALS RETURNING TO STAY?

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, we have just witnessed in Washington a sudden and great mass political conversion. Not that there has been an old-fashioned soul cleansing, nor a serious confession of error, but from those highest in government down to the little "me too" boys there has come an admission that communism has entered into the sacred precincts of the innermost councils of our Government. These come-lately con-

fessors charge that this infiltration has saturated the Department of State, the Department of Labor, the Department of Agriculture, and the Department of Commerce. Their charges indicate that the doctrine of Stalin's totalitarianism has had a happy home in the executive branch of this Government, lo these many years. I can add that there are some of us, in and out of Congress, who have long believed that this fifth column should never have been tolerated in our Government in the first place. Repeatedly we have shouted the alarm from the housetops.

Time after time I have warned the people of this Nation, over the radio, through the press, and on the floor of the Senate, that this country was being destroyed from within; that our Government had been salted down with Communists and fellow travelers to the point where, should we be forced into war with any country supporting the communistic ideology, our whole defense activity could easily and quickly be sabotaged by insiders. The situation has become comparable to that of France when she was fatally crippled from within by a fifth column of Communists and Nazi sympathizers so Hitler could unleash his hungry war dogs to swarm across the Maginot line to pillage and murder helpless men, women, and children from Sudan to Dunkirk and the English Channel.

History informs us, Mr. President, that a mere handful of revolutionists overthrew the Czar and raised the red flag over Russia. Revolutionists are always a decided minority, but what they lack in numbers they make up in zealousness, and thus are able completely to destroy established government. In Russia today the Communist Party is but a trifle in numbers in comparison to the noncommunists, but the Communists have the guns and the determination to use them. They have killed millions of inoffensive Russian citizens; and the moment they seize power in other lands, they indulge in these terrible blood purges until they have wedged fear into the hearts of every human being within the sphere of their activity.

Mr. President, I did not rise especially to talk of the bestialness of the egomaniacal Communist doctrinaires, but, if you please, to welcome back into the ranks of those of us who love the United States Constitution these brethren who strayed from the house of our fathers into strange and fearful byways. We who have kept the faith have often prayed long and soulfully that before it was eternally too late these brethren would recognize the error of their way and would return to the fold, contrite and duly humble.

So, Mr. President, I want to inform this great deliberative body, the United States Senate, that when I read in the daily press that President Truman was to launch a campaign to dislodge the disloyalists from the Government pay rolls, a great peace of mind came over me, for I felt sure that we stood at the portals of the new utopia.

And then, day after day, the confessions came fast and in multitudinous proportions. They packed the daily press until, I am sure, every top hand in the executive department had made public his determination to rid the other fellow's department of all red termites. Today, these Government modern Diogeneses with their gum-soled shoes and lanterns are furtively peering into every crack and crevice of this Capitol's catacombs in search of that honest Communist who will admit he is the holder of a hammer and sickle card. If one of these subterranean gnomes flashes a lamp in your face, Mr. President, have no fear, for it is possible that he is simply putting on an act for the benefit of the press and radio. He may hiss and recoil from you, but be not afraid; he will disperse into thin air, and you will see him no more.

So, Mr. President, today we have the prodigal sons of the New Deal trekking home after a long and fateful hibernation with the "pinkos," Reds, and all breeds of synthetic Communists. Of course, we, like the fond father of Biblical times, bid them welcome home. But I am just wondering whether we should clasp them to our breasts with fond embrace ere we have been convinced that their contrition is sincere and not for the purpose of distracting our attention from some overt act they may have committed during their feasting and riotous living far from the parental roof.

Therefore, I suggest, Mr. President, that we take them in on probation. They should not be denied communion, nor should they be kept from our councils; but it might be well for us to keep one eye on them, lest they stray again. In the past they succumbed to political amnesia, and when in that sad state they fell easy victims to alien ideologies. We must watch over them tenderly and make every effort to guide them away from the shoals of wasteful spending and nonproductivity. We must remove from them all temptation to seek security from those who will sell out to the highest bidder. We must fumigate them and make them immune to Kremlin propaganda.

For years, those few of us who dared to stand here in these Halls and denounce such fraternization by public officials with the enemies of this Republic were made objects of attack by the domestic smear bund of hate. Our names were held up for derision by collaborating columnists and radio blabbercasters, and our every act came under the attack of an occupant of the White House and his stable of propagandists.

Into the inner circles of the War Department, into the braid and brass of the services, were gathered the "pink" of the fellow travelers. They were placed in swivel chairs, propped up in front of typewriters, and leashed to microphones. Few, if any, crawled on their stomachs up Iwo Jima, or swarmed over the beach of Normandy, or rolled in the muck and mire of the Belgian Bulge. They fought the battle of the Pentagon or the battle of Hollywood, or gained a beachhead in the night clubs along Broadway. That is where these "pinkos" and fellow travelers bared their breasts. In Washington they hid behind the secret files in the executive department. They rummaged in top drawers and carted off State secrets; and for their treasonable perfidy they received a citation for bravery and were admonished "to go and sin no more." In Russia, the country for which they were stealing, for such an offense they would have been purged and their ashes thrown to the winds of the steppes.

Mr. President, I am sick and tired of hearing American citizens continually refer to the Communists as a miserable minority, and not dangerous to our way of life. I say to you that they are dangerous. They are extremely dangerous.

Mr. President, a few days ago a representative of the American Legion testified before the House Un-American Activities Committee that there are at least 100,000 first-line Communists in this country. It may be said that that is not so many for a Nation of 140,000,000. That may be true; but when those 100,000 Communists are able to infiltrate every branch of this Government and intrench themselves in our labor unions to the point where they are in absolute control of some of our biggest unions, it seems to me it is high time that we in the Congress, the representatives of the people, should sit up and take notice. Remember that Hitler with 30,000 Nazis took control of Germany's millions.

Back in 1941 I thought it was time to take notice of the Communists and their treasonable activities. Even before that date, when I was Governor of Texas, I set about to bring into being legislation which would take care of Communists working inside labor unions to gain places where they could practice sabotage. Since coming to Washington I have continued my fight upon Communists and their comrades, the labor-leader racketeers of this Nation, but here my efforts have been blocked at every turn. I wish to say here and now that most of that blocking was done by some of our present ranting prodigals who now scream to high heaven, "Let's do something about the Communists." These prodigals, however, were not so vociferous on the side of "let's do something about these Communists" when the late war President was opening the armed services to Communists and their fellow travelers, people who had, but a few short months before, denounced the President and the American Government from every quarter. In fact, some of them even picketed the White House bearing signs denouncing the late Franklin D. Roosevelt as a warmonger.

About that time the Daily Worker, the leading official Communist publication in the United States, called upon the comrades to join the armed services to fight for the democracies, which, of course, meant Russia, England, the United States, and all our allies. Ponder, Mr. President, the ridiculousness of placing Russia, England, and the United States in the same category, when Russia is a totalitarian nation if there ever was one, and England was then slipping into a totalitarian socialism.

The Daily Worker has often admonished the Communists to join up with the armed services so that they could take revolutionary control and conduct propaganda and agitation from within the Army, Navy, and all branches of our

military service. This miserable publication was the first to agitate a program to abolish disciplinary punishments and the necessity of saluting. What a different picture is presented when we turn to look upon the armed forces of Russia. There the strictest discipline is maintained. There is no fraternizing between officers and enlisted men. In addition to this, the Russian soldiers are poorly paid in comparison with the enlisted men of our American forces. The Russian soldiers do not enjoy the liberties granted to the men of our armed forces, yet the Communists infiltrate our armed forces to agitate for things for which they would face a firing squad in the Russian service. The Communists have also infiltrated some of our veteran organizations. They have been rebuffed by the American Legion and other loyal groups. Yet we find them in control of alleged veteran groups whose main mission in life seems to be the destruction of all organized government and authority.

FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover has warned against martyrizing these low-bred humans. I find myself in accord with the Hoover sentiment, for there is nothing a fanatic enjoys more than to be martyrized. The "Commies" thrive on small martyrdoms, hence we should do nothing to heroize these hoodlums, but we should deny them fraternization with honest and upright men.

And, Mr. President, we should stop doing their bidding here in Congress. And here in Congress we should also speedily repeal all the communistic labor laws which have set up a super-kingdom which is more powerful than our Government and is ruled by the iron hand of communistic labor czars who completely control the production line of our Nation and hold the destiny of our people in the palm of their hand. If the returning prodigals are completely cleansed and sincere they will promptly join us in purging our statute books of this putrid un-American class legislation.

Our Republic is a government of laws, and not a government of men. The citizen is the master, the public official is the servant. We must repeal these labor slave laws and honor the working men and women of our Nation by elevating them to the position of master, and demoting their union officials to the humble status of their servant.

Yes, Mr. President, we need something more than a purge of Communists who have infiltrated our governmental departments. We need also to purge our lawbooks of all communistic legislation that has been enacted during the past 14 years by the left-of-center prodigal sons who are now returning for their share of the fatted calf.

According to published statements, the FBI has from time to time submitted names of various Federal departments and agencies where Communists and their fellow travelers hibernate. I have a file in my office which shows that these Communists are holding top jobs. One, I find, is a big-time attorney in the Rural Electrification Administration. These high-ranking jobs have been passed out to enemies of our Government in practically all the departments. What is to be gained by firing the little file clerks and stenographers who are caught in the act of reading the Daily Worker and retaining the big shots on the job to put other Communists in the places of those fired? It is a joke, Mr. President.

When I was a boy on a big cattle ranch I learned that I could not mess around with skunks without getting some of their highly perfumed musk on my clothes. I also learned that until I had thoroughly cleansed myself and had removed all odor I remained an outcast so far as my family was concerned. So should be, I believe, our practice in dealing with our prodigals now clamoring for readmission under the parental roof. We should know positively that they have cleansed themselves of all stinkish-pinkish aroma.

I am unable to see the necessity for the enactment of additional laws to regulate the American Communist. Instead of enacting new laws, we should repeal the old ones. In the first place, no Communist, outside of a few who manipulate the party's machinery, will admit membership. To deny their affiliation is one of the tenets of their atheistic philosophy. So I say let us see to it that we place men and women in public office who consider their oaths to uphold and enforce the laws of this country as binding obligations. The treasonable acts of the despicable Communist ingrates can be easily traced. When found guilty they should be given the punishment that is justly due traitors.

Now that some of our prodigals are back at our front gate asking to be enlisted under the banner of constitutional government, let us first resolve to purge our Nation of all communistic sympathies. Let us further resolve to desert that famous track "just a bit left of center" which would surely precipitate us in a headlong pitch into the bottomless pit of bankruptcy, heathenism, and world war. Let us hear no more defense of an ideology that spreads the virus of imperialism across the face of the earth. Let none among us rise to exhort in defense of a nation that lives by chicanery, deceit, plunder, and murder, but let us unite in promotion of the virtues of constitutional government. Let us return to the fundamentals of our government as set up in the Constitution and be done forever with the foreign "isms" of those who promote only the rule of the sword.

If the returning prodigals are sincere, communism, like its counterparts, socialism, nazism, and fascism, is headed for the fate that overtook its counterparts. Molotov, the hammer head, and Joe Stalin, the sickle-grinder, are on their way to join their plundering pals, Hitler and Mussolini.

Our form of government has survived to this date because it has recognized the dignity of man and the supreme power of God Almighty. So, let us return to the fundamentalism of the Constitution, and live by its precepts. If we continue to run off after false gods, we will wind up in the same pitiable condition in which all Europe finds itself today.

We cannot be half Communist and half constitutionalist. These ideologies will not mix. They are incompatible, and when brought together become highly explosive. So, I want Joe Stalin and his ungodly hordes to stay in Russia, and let peoples of other nations alone to choose the kind of government they prefer. We cannot appease Communists any more than Chamberlain was able to appease the Nazis. Let us stop appeasing, stop spending and wasting our resources, and begin now to build up our domestic economy so as to make ourselves invincible. This, Mr. President, I believe to be the best example we can place before the people of the world as to why they should forsake the rule of the jungle for government of law—laws enacted for the people, by the people, themselves.

The most terrible threat to our existence as a Nation of free people, Mr. President, is not the atom bomb, but instead it is our lop-sided communistic labor laws, our confiscatory tax laws, our crushing public debt, and our habit of meddling in the affairs of other nations.

When President Truman asked for authority to send $400,000,000 across the Atlantic to Greece and Turkey, it was reported we had discovered that Old Joe Stalin was pouring his sons of hate into those states and preparing to take over. England had sent our State Department word that even by using our money the load was too heavy and she was going to have to pull out of the Mediterranean-Red Sea area. Mr. Bevin's government expressed the fear that the instant England backed out Stalin would back in, buckle his belt around England's life line, and choke John Bull to death. So, it looks as though the United States will go on guard in the Mediterranean to keep the Communists pushed back beyond the Black Sea.

But hardly had the ink dried on the press release from the White House before the people of the United States began asking the question: "Yes, Mr. Truman, but if it is good to check atheistic communism in the Balkans, how about checking atheistic communism on the home front?" Mr. Truman came up promptly with the right answer. We would fight communism on two fronts—at home and abroad. It was then, Mr. President, that we began to see the prodigal sons returning to the fold. Also, in bitter anguish these prodigals cried out against their former chums. Now they want no more of their former Red pals, either in high places of state or in the councils of the party. But let us be cautious. Are they sincere, or are they only fooling?

I say, let us examine the record and ascertain whether or not there has been a true confession by these backsliders from the faith of Washington, Jefferson, Lincoln, Theodore Roosevelt, and Woodrow Wilson, before we trust them out of our immediate sight.

Followers of the Kremlin line are afraid of a "witch hunt," when and if the administration begins to hunt out the Communists. Well, I am not afraid there will be a witch hunt, but I am afraid that a few "Little Red Ridinghood" clerks and stenographers will be pitched headlong into the street while their sanctimonious superiors still hold down the red-plush seat jobs. What I am

wondering about is, will the Army textbook writers remain at their posts pouring out literature designed to destroy a love for our American form of government in the hearts of our boys wearing the uniform?

Will we see an evacuation of the State Department by those titled boys with the stiff shirts and striped pants who spill inside information to the left-of-center columnists—those gentlemen of the press who head the legion of smear?

Will the big-shot desk executives in the Labor Department, who spend an hour or so each day of the Government's time in reading the uptown edition of the Daily Worker, remain at their desks to dish out a steady stream of anti-American propaganda?

Will the solons of the Kremlin-hue of this Congress, who get their orders from Moscow, be carefully investigated with the aim of severing the pipe line that flows their daily political diet to them from the heart of the Communist world?

These are some of the questions that should be definitely answered before our prodigals are received back into full communion by us who dwell in the house of the founding fathers. This is a serious proposition and should be treated as such.

Mr. President, I want my country to be friendly but firm in all its dealings with other nations, great or small. I want the United States to be so strong that no other power or combination of powers can successfully strike at us and escape a swift and merciless defeat. But we cannot have such a country if we keep wasting our substance upon alien people, who carry revenge in their hearts and look forward to the day when they can strike back at an adversary, even if in so doing they again plunge the world into war.

Theodore Roosevelt gave voice to a great truth when he said:

> We cannot permanently shape our course right on any international issue unless we are sound on the domestic issues.

Now, before we take our truants back to a table loaded with the meat of the "fatted calf," let us be sure that they are not denouncing communism right now during the preelection season, only to backslide after the election is over and they are safe for another term. Such a scheme could degenerate this Nation into a complete collapse such as is now being experienced by socialistic England. Communism does not feed and grow and expand upon prosperity, but it does thrive and fatten upon the putrid carcasses of decadent nations, undermined from within by treachery. Therefore, I say we must be sure of ourselves and know that we are not being deceived by tricky politicians. Every move we make must guaranty the safety of our Republic and insure peace and tranquillity for our people.

I say to you, Mr. President, we need no apologists for our form of government. There is no form of government on this globe that can surpass ours in any way, shape, manner, or form. It did not grow by accident, but it came to greatness because of careful planning by the wise forefathers who gave to us our Constitution and our Bill of Rights. It came to fruition because they believed in their own strength. They knew that it had integrity because they, themselves, possessed integrity. And, not until the coming of the soothsayers of the false doctrine that "the Government owes every voter a living" did we swerve from the precepts of our founding fathers. The people of the United States want to get their Government back upon the Constitution, and only last November they spoke in no uncertain terms against the rule of bureaucrats, spendthrifts, and regimenters.

Constitutional government is the beacon light to the oppressed of the world. It has ever been so since its adoption March 4, 1787, and America will continue as the haven of free men if we will shun foreign isms of the Old World. But, if we continue sapping the resources of our land, tolerating defamation of our Christian philosophy, and continue ravaging our public treasury and mortgaging our unborn posterity, we will inevitably crumble and fall apart. President Washington never feared the foe from without, but he did express grave fears that some day we might bring about our own destruction through internal decay.

Several years ago internal decay started. Foreign ideology worms began to bore at the roots of this Republic. A second world war was thrust upon us and the communistic worms emerged from the underground roots and began boring into the innermost sanctums of high Government offices. This has long been known by our people and recognized by some Members of Congress, but we sat here in Congress and did nothing about it because we were outnumbered. We could have stopped this boring from within long ago if a majority of the Members had desired to do so. It seemed to be the popular thing to do, however, to take these worms of alien hate into our Government. Once in, they soon buried their filthy heads in every bureau and agency of any considerable importance.

When some of us protested against this infiltration we were scoffed at by most of the prodigals who are now proclaiming their anticommunistic protestations from stump, radio, and press.

If communism was good for us in 1941, why is it bad for us in 1947? I said in '41 that it would destroy our Nation if we did not clean house. I repeat, in 1947, communism will destroy our Nation if we continue to accept its missionaries in our governmental councils.

Time after time I have inveighed against the New Deal's embracement of communistic and totalitarian ideas. A few other Senators also did; but where did we get? We got nowhere; and not until last November 5 did the people of this Nation get a fair chance to demand a house cleaning. They spoke then in no uncertain terms, and I hope that there will be no betrayal by those in whom they placed confidence. Yet, Mr. President, we see signs of such a betrayal, and I fear ere the cock crows thrice on election morn of 1948 there will be many, many more betrayals. If there be—and mark these words well, Mr. President—the house cleaning of last November 5 will be but a firecracker in comparison to the political bombs that will be dropped on November 2, 1948.

So I say let us welcome the return of our prodigals who ran off after false gods, welcome them back into the fold, but let us not forget the fire and brimstone we have gone through because of their defalcations. I have a thorough distaste for anything or any "ism" that is un-American. I despise alienisms, regardless of name or brand. They all nurse the same milk, for they are of the same spawn. There is no place in constitutional government for such foreign "isms," but room only for Americanism. There is no place in American government for dishonesty, deceit, or deception, but room only for decency, honesty, truth, and justice.

Our constitutional government was founded upon God's word as contained in the Holy Bible. Therefore, the milk and honey which flows freely in this great Christian Nation will not mix with the Vodka of atheistic communism. Let us keep our Government clean from here on out. If we do this, our Republic will be safe, and will survive, God willing.

AID TO GREECE AND TURKEY

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 938) to provide for assistance to Greece and Turkey.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I rise to support Senate bill 938 which is described as a bill to provide for assistance to Greece and Turkey.

All of us here in the Senate on both sides of the aisle are, I am sure, more concerned about keeping world peace than we are about any other single subject. Therefore, in whatever discussion we have in regard to these proposed aids to Greece and Turkey, I hope we will constantly keep that in mind. I hope that we will constantly keep in mind that we are all Americans seeking to preserve our national security by preserving the peace in the world. Whatever suggestions are made, or whatever amendments are proposed in regard to this aid, I hope we will, each of us, objectively apply two questions to each proposal. The first is, will that suggestion or proposal lead to a better chance of continued peace? The second is, will that suggestion or proposal lead to a better chance for national security?

I believe that by now we are almost all convinced that in this modern world we cannot isolate ourselves from other nations. As soon as war breaks out in any part of the world our own national security is immediately threatened because that conflict can spread to us through modern weapons with incredible swiftness.

As we all know, the United States has in the past gained a reputation abroad for having inconsistent partisan foreign policies. We have, here, tried in the last 2 or 3 years to make it clear to the peoples of the world that we are no longer going to act in international affairs as a Democratic Party or as a Republican Party—that we are going to act as a Nation.

This proposed aid to Greece and Turkey has come to be called by some the Truman Doctrine. I think that is most unfortunate for two reasons. This

should be presented to the people of the world as an American doctrine. More than that, it should be presented to the people of the world as a doctrine motivated by the American people through their representatives. Therefore, I would like to propose that whatever action we take be hereafter known as the American doctrine.

I think there is another good reason for that. The original proposal by the President had in it some indication of lack of due consideration for the United Nations. The American people immediately made it clear to all of us that they were deeply concerned about that phase of the President's action. We, on the Republican side of the aisle, and I speak particularly of the senior Senator from Michigan, have proposed certain changes that shift the emphasis of this proposal—that make it clear that, not only are we interested in boistering the United Nations to take over this obligation, but we are insisting that action be taken to give the United Nations greater authority and greater strength. I say we Republicans proposed those changes. I think they could have just as well been proposed by the gentlemen on the other side of the aisle, since they were the reflection, not of party thinking, but of American thinking. Therefore, because of the danger of the peoples of Europe misinterpreting our action in this matter as partisan, and so not taking seriously enough our intent, and because the President's original proposal has been fundamentally changed, I sincerely believe that it is to the best interests of all concerned that even the official name of this action be changed further to emphasize our unity and our determination.

As Americans we stand for freedom—for freedom of religion, and of speech, and of assembly, and of enterprise, and of opportunities. We believe that these freedoms belong as his right, to every man, whether he be born in America or in some other country. These freedoms belong to every man because they give to him his rightful dignity as a human being, as an individual, as a son of God. We do not strive to enforce our ideas about freedom upon the rest of the world by the strength of arms, of economic power, or intrigue. We do strive to perpetuate freedom, and all it means, by our own example of the rightful exercise of freedom. As we cherish it for ourselves, we hope that all men may achieve it. We believe that freedom, perpetuated through the processes of democracy, can make the world safe for peace.

This policy has, as its true basis, the preservation of our own independence and our own freedom. It recognizes the independence and freedom of all nations large and small. It has, as its purpose, the prevention of aggression and the keeping of the peace. It was in that spirit that we gave aid to Britain and to Russia. We did not question their internal institutions. Those institutions belong peculiarly to their people to maintain, or to change, as they might see fit. But we did want to preserve the sovereignty and independence of both Russia and England because we believed that preservation essential to peace—peace which is so essential to the world and to us.

The policy we have adopted with reference to Greece and Turkey is not new. We have always believed these things. The loan to Greece and to Turkey is merely an implementation of this basic American policy. For that reason alone we cannot call this policy anything but the American doctrine.

Another point that has bothered me about this proposed aid to Greece and Turkey is in connection with the danger of our becoming involved in local political disputes. It seems to me it would be very easy for us to get into the same position in Greece, particularly, that caused us to withdraw from China recently. For myself, I am prepared—right now—to say "a plague on both your houses" to the extreme elements in Greece. It seems to me we must give serious thought to insisting that the Greek Government show its good faith by demonstrating immediately its desire for civil peace. I am not prepared to see our money used for the relief of only those starving people who will agree to aline themselves politically on the side of the monarchy. Nor am I willing to see our assistance used in the payment of interest on a national debt to some other nation or some other group, or for any other purpose that we do not intend. I do not go along with the philosophy that we can stop the spread of communism only by bolstering reaction. Neither extreme is consistent with our philosophy and republican form of government. Both seek to rule by minorities, and both seek to take away the rights and privileges of the people. If we seek to preserve peace, which is what we intend to do, we must also see to it that political conditions in countries we assist are such that a civil war is not either actively going on or pending.

Another point that bothers me about the proposed aid to Greece is in connection with the actual money. I do not propose that we should try to save money at the risk of war. But it seems to me that there is another consideration that we have so far ignored. I believe we will all agree that while this four hundred million will be given partially as humanitarian relief for a needy people, it is essentially and substantially a move calculated to preserve our national security and world peace. Which departments of our Government are concerned with national security? The Army and the Navy. Therefore it seems to me that we should inform the Army and the Navy that since we will provide them with a very large budget for the purpose of maintaining security, they are expected to use that budget for that purpose. I have great faith in our Army, Navy, and Air Force. But I think past history has demonstrated there is a great deal of unproductive spending, and I personally propose to do whatever I can to discourage that kind of spending. I believe, therefore, that we should extract from the budget proposed for the Army and the Navy about 10 percent, to be set aside for such purposes as Greek and Turkish aid. In the President's proposed budget approximately eleven and a half billion was provided for this purpose. Ten percent of that would be a little in excess of a billion dollars. From that billion dollars, or from 10 percent of whatever sum is appropriated, should be taken the four hundred million for aid to Greece and Turkey, since we agree that this is a security matter.

It seems of tremendous importance to me how the mission to administer aid to Greece and Turkey is to be composed. Is it to be merely an executive agency? Is it to be an agency of the State Department alone? Is it wise to make it an agency of the Congress as well? The Congress must provide the money. The Congress must stand responsible before the American people for adopting this policy. The Congress must have all the facts. It seems to me, Mr. President, that Congress should choose some representation on these missions so that the report of the activities and effect of the mission may be made not only to the State Department, but to the Congress itself through the respective Committees on Foreign Relations in both the Senate and the House. If we are to take the leadership in world affairs which has come to us—indeed, which seems to have been thrust upon us—then we must develop a new technique, an American technique, in diplomatic dealings. We have seen the tragic failings of the old diplomacy in two World Wars in a generation. It is high time to deal openly and frankly, with all the cards on the table face up, as the able Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] has already said. Since the lives and fortunes of all the American people are at stake in every war, and most assuredly will be at stake in any war to come, it is time that all the people of our Nation should have the opportunity of knowing what our purpose is, and what the program is to put that purpose into effect. We ask the same frankness and the same candor from all our neighbors in the world.

I believe that this development has opened our eyes to the lateness of the hour. It has made us uneasily aware that war can easily come again. Several hundred thousand American young men spent their lives on what may turn out to have been a futile effort to preserve peace. In gratitude we can at least do everything in our power to continue the peace. We have all agreed that the United Nations is today the only real hope for peace. Isolationism, appeasement, power politics, have all proven failures. We cannot afford another war; but another war will surely come if we and all other nations do not do more than talk about peace. I have been deeply impressed by the arguments of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] who has proposed that we lay our cards openly on the table in regard to real international cooperation and then see who objects to continuing the game—and a deadly serious game it is. Moreover, there is a real danger of the United Nations building around itself a sealed wall and so becoming like the League of Nations—just another debating society. If the United Nations is to work, it must become a part of our daily living. It must become more important to us than any other matter we might

discuss on the floor of the Senate. To keep ourselves constantly aware of its difficulties, its problems, and its developments, I believe that we must establish a closer liaison with the United Nations. We represent the people of America. We have had representatives assigned to the United Nations conferences, and I think their work has been eminently able. I say, in no disparagement of them, that we must have more regular representation and more frequent reports from the United Nations. The activities of the United Nations must become our daily problems if we are to prevent war through that Organization. We represent the most powerful nation in the world today. If we will take upon ourselves the responsibility of making the peace by enforcing the strength of the United Nations, other countries will follow the example set by us. Our strength, our size, give us that responsibility. I am far more concerned about failure of the United Nations to act in the preservation of peace than I am about the failure of most bills to pass in this body.

God give us the knowledge, the courage, and the faith to help a discontented and doubting world achieve freedom and peace.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I am anxious to speak this afternoon, but the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] has stated that he would like to have the Senate take a recess at approximately 5 o'clock. I can speak for a while, hoping that I may again obtain the floor to complete my remarks when the Senate reconvenes.

Mr. President, when the Allied armies were beginning to beat down the wall of Hitler's Fortress Europa, Goering threatened that if Hitler and his men had to leave the scene, they would slam hard the door behind them.

This was one boast which the Nazi leader was able to make good. Europe today, almost 2 years after VE-day, remains a shambles. Her people are homeless and starving, families are scattered, and children wander the highways and the byways in search of lost parents. Hunger, ignorance, superstition, want, and immorality are everywhere.

President Truman has called our attention recently to the particular needs of Greece; and Greece certainly is a country whose plight deserves our consideration and generosity.

Insofar as the President's proposals are designed to alleviate that human suffering and to eradicate its causes, I am in full agreement. But his proposals go further than that. They would create a completely new doctrine in American foreign policy: armed intervention in the internal and external affairs of another country. They involve yet another grave departure from our present foreign policy. They would bypass the United Nations as the instrument for the settlement of international disputes.

I may say, Mr. President, that I do not believe that any amount of amending of this original proposal can remove the injury which has been done to the United Nations. Only turning this over to the United Nations can remedy the injury. In fact, I feel that amendments simply tell the United Nations what we will permit them to do; and I feel that they should have higher authority. It is simply adding insult to injury, in my estimation.

They call upon us to take unilateral military and economic action rather than to use the machinery of the United Nations, which has already successfully solved similar disputes in Iran, Lebanon, and Syria.

I may say, also, Mr. President, that the United Nations did not do a great deal to solve those disputes. The fact that they were referred to the United Nations seemed to have almost in itself a magical effect. The parties concerned hastily put their houses in order, withdrew their troops, and ceased their meddling, simply because of the moral prestige of the United Nations. I hate to see our country take any steps now to undermine that moral prestige, because certainly the United States is the predominating factor behind the success or failure, the prestige or lack of prestige, of the United Nations.

I feel, Mr. President, that this new doctrine—call it the Truman doctrine or the American doctrine or whatever we will—will seriously weaken the authority and prestige of the United Nations.

Public opinion polls indicate that the American people are aware of this and strongly prefer action through the United Nations to unilateral action.

Frankly, Mr. President, I feel that the action which we are about to take may be the beginning of the end of all hope of reconciliation in the world. It may be the beginning of tensions in this atomic age which will eventually lead to the complete collapse of civilization in a great atomic holocaust.

Let me give my reasons for opposing this new foreign policy:

First, the State Department admittedly has as one of its purposes the preservation of the monarchy formerly represented by the late King George of Greece, and now by his brother, King Paul. I am opposed to that monarchy as are the people of Greece, his unwilling subjects. Paul, like his late brother, George, does not have one drop of Greek blood in his veins. He comes from one of Europe's perennial royal families which was foisted upon the Greek people in one of the typical intrigues which characterized nineteenth century diplomacy. The full family name is Schleswig-Holstein Sonderburg Glucksburg. The late King George was deposed in 1923 because of his pro-German intrigues in the last World War. In 1935 with the help of British politicians and a sham plebiscite he was restored to the Greek throne. Again last year, after another sham plebiscite during which opposition forces were exiled, jailed, or intimidated, the crown was again placed upon his head.

In 1776 our forefathers fought for the right to govern themselves. Another George, George III of England, who also had German blood in his veins, looked upon them as ragged terrorists and irresponsible radicals.

How ironical, then, that the government which the antiroyalists of Valley Forge made possible should now use its money and influence to bolster a tyrannical twentieth-century monarchy.

I know from dozens of eyewitnesses whom I have interviewed in recent weeks—newspaper correspondents and American citizens who visited the country on relief missions for our Government, for UNRRA, and for the United Nations—that the present administration in Greece is corrupt, inefficient, and ruthless.

In an official report issued earlier this month the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations stated—and here I am quoting from that UN report:

> Present Greek taxes fall heavily on the poor people and far less heavily, in proportion to their income, on the well to do. * * * Most local revenues come from commodity taxes.

The UN report continues:

> Over four-fifths of the total tax revenues thus come from taxes which either reduce incomes to producers (especially farmers), or raise costs to consumers (mostly farmers and low-income city workers). Less than one-fifth of the taxes is of the type that bears primarily on well-to-do persons receiving large incomes. * * * The tax structure is responsible, in part at least, for the present exceedingly unequal distribution of wealth and income in Greece, far less equal than that in more highly industrialized countries. In every part of the country the great majority of farmers are poverty-stricken and destitute. City factory workers or public employees are not in much better shape. Yet it is on these two classes, farmers and low-income city workers, that present taxes fall most heavily. * * * At the same time that this widespread poverty exists the stores are full of all kinds of goods at high prices and the restaurants are thronged with well-dressed people, enjoying the good food and wine, who live very comfortably despite the poverty all around them. Yet the tax burden falls on them far less heavily in proportion to their incomes than it does on the low-income farmers and workers.

That is the end of the quotation from the official report of the Food and Agriculture Organization mission for Greece.

I wonder, Mr. President, if we had a government in this country which permitted conditions like that to exist, and even nurtured them, how many people possibly would be violently against our Government. I do not believe they could all be called Communists, either.

It is obvious that the Greek Government has never evolved a modern tax structure because to do so would antagonize the British interests who own the great wealth of Greece.

It is the protection of those British interests which is at the heart of the British control of Greece. And there is one other factor which is equally important. Greece strategically controls the land, sea, and airways to the great oil fields of the Middle East.

Giant and powerful monopolies are interested in the acquisition of that oil. I, for one, am unwilling to send American troops to protect the interests of those oil monopolies.

It has been contended that the State Department's proposal is necessary to curb the spread of communism in Greece. But I say to you that for every Communist made in Greece by Russian propaganda a hundred have been made

by hatred of the monarchy and its terrorist regime and the foreign governments which have imposed it upon an unwilling people. By aiding a weak and inefficient government to suppress opposition by force of arms, we are eliminating the only real alternative to communism—a liberal, progressive government responsive to the needs of Greece. By eliminating a middle-of-the-road possibility of peaceful change, we force the Greek people to choose either the extreme of Fascist monarchy or the other extreme of revolutionary communism—we would leave them no other choice. That is not the effective way to stop communism in Greece.

The present Greek Government has driven many a conservative businessman in Greece to feel that, although he hated communism, he would accept any help that enabled Greeks to throw out the fascism of the monarchy.

An UNRRA worker recently returned from Greece told me of a conversation with a prosperous Greek who is the head of a large Greek shipping firm, who said, "I am an EAM because I feel as you Americans did in 1776. We want to govern ourselves. We do not want these foreigners pushing us around and enriching themselves on our country any more than you Americans did."

Mr. President, these are people who would not support a Communist Party in Greece or a Socialist Party in Greece. They are people who want a middle-of-the-road government. But they passionately insist upon self-government; and if we insist on supporting a monarchy which suppresses all opposition, we shall drive them to take the only alternative—the extreme revolutionary course. If we endorse the King's government as our concept of democracy, we shall have given Europe a false impression of our own great country, and shall have forever discredited our own philosophy in their eyes.

Mr. President, I think that when we give financial aid to Greece, we must insist that the money contributed by the American taxpayers is wisely used, and is used for the benefit of the needy people of Greece. It should not be controlled by the royalist members of the Greek ruling class who, as collaborationists, fared as well under the German occupation as they did under the British. Almost all qualified observers will state, as the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization stated, that aid to Greece should be conditioned upon the adoption of a more efficient and more democratic government in Greece.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I should like to say a word about Turkey. It is often forgotten that half of the President's proposal is concerned with Turkey. Turkey has absolutely no relief needs. Not a single bomb dropped on Turkey. During the war it enjoyed one long, lush, uninterrupted war boom. It sold supplies to both sides; and both sides paid, and paid very well. The only purpose of aid for Turkey is a military one.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] and I have introduced an alternative resolution, Senate Joint Resolution 93, to deal with this great problem. Briefly, our resolution would, first, appropriate funds for relief and rebuilding of Greece; second, provide for the administration of that relief by the United Nations; and, third, request the General Assembly of the United Nations to institute a full-scale investigation with a view to resolving not only the Greek crisis but the problems of Palestine, the Dardanelles, and Middle East oil. I should like to point out that our joint resolution provides for immediate assistance through a stopgap advance of $100,000,000 by the RFC. It does not delay this assistance until after the meeting of the United Nations General Assembly.

Our joint resolution is equally important for the things which it does not do. These are: First, it does not provide any funds for relief or military intervention in Turkey; second, it does not provide for the sending of American military forces into Greece; and, third, it does not provide for unilateral action by the United States or for bypassing the United Nations.

A momentous decision lies ahead of us, Mr. President. Upon it hangs the future of the great idea of permanent peace through international organization. Let us not abandon that great hope so soon after its birth.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I desire to ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of two resolutions which were unanimously ordered to be reported favorably by the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, let me inquire when the resolutions were ordered to be reported favorably.

Mr. BROOKS. The day before yesterday.

Mr. WHITE. I do not wish to object, but I would suggest to the Senator from Illinois that at the present time there is a rather small attendance in the Senate for the transaction of business.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I recognize the principle the majority leader is trying to uphold, and I subscribe to it. So I shall wait until Tuesday to take up these matters.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I wish to thank the Senator from Maine, the majority leader, for the course he is following. There are not many in attendance on this side of the aisle at this particular moment. I also thank the Senator from Illinois for not pressing his request.

Mr. WHITE. If there is no other business to come before the Senate, I shall move a recess.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Before the Senator from Maine makes the motion, I wonder if he can tell us when we are to have another executive session.

Mr. WHITE. As I understand, there are only three nominations on the executive calendar. I shall move an executive session when the number of names on the calendar seems to justify it.

Mr. CHAVEZ. There is on the calendar the nomination of Gordon R. Clapp to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority, on which the committee made an adverse report. I think the Senate should act on that nomination, one way or the other, at a reasonably early date.

Mr. WHITE. I quite agree with the Senator from New Mexico. The nomination has been on the calendar for some days. I agree with the Senator that at an early date the Senate should devote itself to the consideration of the nomination, and if I can further that end, I shall be most happy to do to.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I am sorry the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB], the chairman of the committee which considered the nomination, is not present at the moment. I am sure that he would like to get action on the nomination one way or the other as soon as possible.

Mr. WHITE. I shall cooperate in any way I can to get action on that and the other nominations on the calendar.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I thank the Senator.

RECESS TO TUESDAY

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess until Tuesday next at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 2 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Tuesday, April 15, 1947, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 11 (legislative day of March 24), 1947:

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following-named candidates for promotions in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service:

SURGEONS TO BE TEMPORARY SENIOR SURGEONS (EQUIVALENT TO ARMY RANK OF LIEUTENANT COLONEL)

Hugh L. C. Wilkerson — William J. Brown
Daniel J. Daley — Luther L. Terry

SANITARY ENGINEER TO BE TEMPORARY SENIOR SANITARY ENGINEER (EQUIVALENT TO ARMY RANK OF LIEUTENANT COLONEL)

Maurice LeBosquet, Jr.

SCIENTISTS TO BE TEMPORARY SENIOR SCIENTISTS (EQUIVALENT TO ARMY RANK OF LIEUTENANT COLONEL)

Howard L. Andrews
Heinz Specht
G. Robert Coatney

SENIOR ASSISTANT SURGEONS TO BE TEMPORARY SURGEONS (EQUIVALENT TO ARMY RANK OF MAJOR)

Carruth J. Wagner — Robert W. Rasor
William L. Hewitt — George A. Shipman

SENIOR ASSISTANT SANITARY ENGINEERS TO BE TEMPORARY SANITARY ENGINEERS (EQUIVALENT TO ARMY RANK OF MAJOR)

Frank Tetzlaff
Albert H. Stevenson

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, APRIL 14, 1947

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Reverend Dr. Joseph Francis Thorning, associate editor of the Americas and World Affairs and rector of St. Joseph's Church, Carrollton Manor, Md., offered the following prayer:

In the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit. Amen.

Almighty Father, look down with favor upon the Speaker of this House and all